

ASMP Phase III Policy Comment Survey

City staff received several hundred comments on the ASMP policies. All comments were carefully reviewed as they were being submitted, and the comments were used to consider modifications to the proposed ASMP policies. The following were frequent themes mentioned in comments about draft policies:

- The ASMP looks good on paper, but how can we implement such an ambitious plan?
- Austin needs more rail or mass transit.
- Many more people drive cars than ride bicycles.
- We need to think bigger if we want to solve the many issues involving transportation in Austin.
- The ASMP is a great vision for Austin.
- Don't spend more money on roads, they just encourage congestion.
- What are the priorities for projects within the ASMP?
- It is important that "safety" is first in the ASMP because it should be the number one priority.

Pedestrian Advisory Council (PAC) Recommendation:

Austin Strategic Mobility Plan

WHEREAS, the purpose of the Pedestrian Advisory Council (PAC) is to advise the City of Austin on pedestrian planning, policy, design, funding, education, and enforcement efforts regarding the creation, maintenance and operation of pedestrian facilities;

WHEREAS, adoption and usage of the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP) is very important to the city;

WHEREAS, climate change is an urgent issue and providing all Austinites with meaningful ability to choose walking or wheelchair use throughout their daily lives is an effective strategy to reduce production of greenhouse gases;

WHEREAS, quality of life is positively impacted by an efficient transportation system, improving air quality and health;

WHEREAS, the dangerous state of our transportation system must be addressed and thus we support Vision Zero goals to eliminate fatalities and serious injuries on roadways;

WHEREAS, people of all abilities have a right to efficient, safe and reliable methods of transportation, including access to continuous sidewalks;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the PAC supports the overarching prioritization of safety in the ASMP;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the PAC strongly endorses the Supply: Sidewalk System section, and encourages the Austin City Council to prioritize achieving the vision of ubiquitous access for people of all ages and abilities to safe sidewalks throughout the city, including fully funding the Sidewalk Master Plan / ADA Transition Plan in the FY2020 budget, filling the estimated \$30 million sidewalk funding gap from the previous two years, and explicitly adding;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the PAC recommends the following modification for the Demand: Transportation Demand Management Programming section:

- Make it clear in the introduction this is about the Austin Transportation Department's specific program for better understanding by the average reader

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Pedestrian Advisory Council recommends the following modification for the Demand: Land Use section:

- Policy 1: Add the word "affordable" as follows: *Promote affordable transit-supportive densities along the Transit Priority Network: Focus on requiring or incentivizing affordable transit-supportive densities along Transit Priority Network corridors through small area planning and zoning review processes*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the PAC recommends the following modification for the Supply: Public Transportation System section:

- Discussions of sidewalk priorities should be tied to transit access and the plan should recognize that transit cannot be used without safe pedestrian access

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the PAC recommends the following modifications for the Supply: Roadway System section:

- Policy 1: change term from “vehicles” to “people” or imply people-carrying capacity so as to not seem to prioritize single-occupancy vehicles
- Policy 5: strike the word “Roadway” in the policy description or change it to right-of-way so there is understanding that single-occupancy vehicles are not the only priority
- Make sure that maximizing capacity is always clearly intended for all users
- Include discussion about trying to provide more access to places and needs by enabling shorter trips

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the PAC recommends the following modifications for the Supply: Bicycle System section:

- Clarify that the bicycle system is equivalent to a broader “small vehicle” system
- Explicitly discuss providing a complete network for small mass, lower speed vehicles including scooters, which will increase access and keep the pedestrian system safe for pedestrians

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the PAC supports adopting a goal of reducing Single Occupancy Vehicle commute mode share to less than 50% by X and recommends that this goal be explicitly incorporated into funding policy in the Implementing Our Plan: Financial Sustainability section to prioritize allocations to long-underfunded strategies that will allow Austinites not to have to drive alone so much.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the PAC recommends developing standards and practices for deploying interim improvements to rapidly meet community needs as the full ASMP is implemented.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the PAC recommends that Council adopts the ASMP and ensures that it is used to guide policy, funding, and planning decisions.

Date of Approval:

Vote:

Attest:

Bicycle Advisory Council (BAC) Recommendation:
Austin Strategic Mobility Plan Draft Policies and Maps

WHEREAS, the purpose of the Bicycle Advisory Council (BAC) is to advise the City of Austin and other jurisdictions on all matters relating to the use of the bicycle, bicycle infrastructure, and individuals of all ages and abilities who utilize bicycles;

WHEREAS, the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP) represents a unique opportunity to bring Austin's transportation plan into line with modern practices, including greater focus and funding for active transportation and public transit,

WHEREAS, the ASMP serves to integrate numerous diffuse plans, including the Bicycle Master Plan, Urban Trail Master Plan and Project Connect amongst others,

WHEREAS, transportation is currently the largest source of CO₂ pollution in America, and encouraging the use of bicycles through policy and infrastructure represents a short-term path to reducing these emissions,

WHEREAS, the principles of Vision Zero are not the primary guiding principles of Austin's currently adopted mobility plan, the 1995 Austin Metropolitan Area Transportation Plan,

WHEREAS, access to transportation choices has been shown to improve quality of life and reduce cost of living,

WHEREAS, people of all ages and abilities should have access to safe and reliable transportation choices, including facilities for riding bicycles,

WHEREAS, congestion pricing has been shown to both improve safety and provide substantial funds for alternative transportation, including bicycle routes,

WHEREAS, creating realistic yet ambitious objectives associated with the ASMP Policies are critical to both target and measure the success of policy outcomes,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Bicycle Advisory Council strongly supports the prioritization of and focus on safety outcomes throughout the ASMP,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the BAC recommends a more thorough and clear interconnection between draft policies and the underlying transportation supply and demand modeling into the next draft of the ASMP,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the BAC recommends a more clearly delineated integration of the Austin Street Design Guide into the next draft of the ASMP, including safe intersection treatments requested in BAC Recommendation Number 20180320-05A,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the BAC recommends that streets on the bicycle priority network be considered for access management in addition to those on the vehicle priority network, as automobile driveways and left turns pose a safety risk to people on bikes and pedestrians,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the BAC requests that the ASMP draft maps display bike facilities as completed or planned, similar to the sidewalk network map,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the BAC recommends that the next ASMP draft directly address how priority networks interact when multiple networks are present on the same roadway, by ensuring the safety of people walking, people on bikes and people on public transit first, before travel time reliability is considered,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the BAC strongly endorses the Bicycle System section within the Supplying our Transportation Infrastructure chapter of the ASMP,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the BAC endorses the equitable allocation of resources across modes, and recommends that Transportation Department staffing and budget be reallocated commensurate with mode-share goals delineated in the ASMP,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the BAC recommends reconsidering use of Level of Service when establishing priorities for the transportation network,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the BAC recommends the following changes (underlined) to the wording of the ASMP draft policies so as to strengthen their language:

- **Supplying Our Transportation Infrastructure**

- Bicycle System

- Policy 1: Make streets safe and attractive for bicycling
- Policy 2: Complete the All Ages and Abilities Bicycle Network
 - Provide a feasible, fully connected, comfortable system of on- and off-street bicycle facilities, deployed in the short-term with plans for long-term upgrades to more robust facilities.
- Policy 3: Remove significant infrastructure gaps in the bicycle system
 - Ensure connectivity in the bicycle system and resolve geographic and infrastructure barriers to cycling, such as highways, railroads, waterways, and subdivision boundaries.

- **Operating Our Transportation Network**

- Closures & Detours

- Policy 3 Lessen the impact of temporary right-of-way closures on mobility: Limit and coordinate closures, including for special events, on the Vehicle, Transit and Bicycle Priority Networks to minimize disruptions to transportation network operations

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the BAC recommends the following objectives be used to guide the policy implementation goals included in the next draft of the ASMP:

- **Prioritizing Our Safety**

- Safety Culture

- Policy 1: **Prioritize human life above all else in the design and operation of the transportation network:**
 - Objective: Achieve Vision Zero objective of zero fatalities by 2025
- Policy 2 **Promote a culture that prioritizes safety:**
 - Objective 1: develop and ensure that educational resources regarding safe street designs are available at public input meetings

- Objective 2: increase traffic law enforcement activities carried out by Austin Police Department, including use of the 3' passing tool
- Objective 3: Develop a ticket deferral course for drivers that focuses on safe driving around people on bikes, people walking, and public transit
- System Design
 - Policy 1: **Manage for safe speeds**
 - Objective 1: Reduce speed limit on residential and most downtown streets to 15 mph through both design and posted speed limits
 - Policy 2: **Minimize the potential for conflicts between transportation users**
 - Objective 1: Build separated bicycle lanes wherever possible
 - Objective 2: Implement bicycle signal leading interval on all bicycle priority streets, possibly through allowing bicycles to follow pedestrian signal to reduce implementation costs
 - Objective 3: Remove automobile and truck through-trips along bicycle priority network by implementing semi-diverter intersections
 - Objective 4: Stop allowing right turn on red on all city streets, beginning with downtown streets and all streets with parallel shared use paths
 - Objective 5: Prioritize safe bicycle facility implementation in high pedestrian use areas
 - Objective 6: Recognizing public health vulnerability inherent to people on bikes and walking
 - Objective 7: Identify new intersections for scatter crossing implementation to fully separate people on bikes and people walking from automobiles and trucks in intersections
 - Policy 4: **Balance public safety priorities**
 - Objective 1: Reduce street width requirement for emergency vehicle access to enhance safety for other street uses, by procuring smaller fire trucks and smaller municipal vehicles
- **Managing Our Demand**
 - Land Use
 - Policy 3: **Create places that encourage travel choice and are connected**
 - Objective 1: Require high quality end-of-trip facilities for bicycles sufficient to accommodate bike trips within new and redeveloping properties
 - Objective 2: Create city-wide methodology for including protected bicycle facilities in redevelopment projects, particularly along bicycle priority network

- Policy 4: **Minimize the impact of development on the roadway system by prioritizing multimodal solutions**
 - Objective 1: Encourage developments that provide additional interconnections for people on bikes such as between apartment blocks or out of cul-de-sacs.
- Parking
 - Policy 1: **Efficiently use existing parking supply**
 - Objective 1: Allow shared mobility solutions to utilize public parking spaces
 - Objective 2: Increase on-street bike corral capacity in high demand areas
- TDM Programming
 - Policy 1: **Implement community-wide strategies to reduce drive-alone trips**
 - Objective 1: Directly incentivize employers to encourage sustainable travel behaviors including advertising city programming such as e-bike rebate and developing bulk discounts for group memberships to mobility services.
 - Objective 2: Implement congestion pricing to reduce vehicles and increase safety in central core, with potential expansion to other major hubs within the city
- Smart Mobility
 - Policy 1: **Partner with the public and private sectors to implement new mobility solutions for historically underserved communities**
 - Objective 1: Ensure easy and robust data sharing between smart mobility companies and the City of Austin
 - Policy 2 **Provide infrastructure that enables the adoption of new mobility technology**
 - Objective 1: Prepare for rapid implementation of safety related infrastructure when considering new technology.
 - Policy 3 **Pursue emerging mobility solutions**
 - Objective 1: Streamline pilot program process for “disruptive” technologies to ensure safety and data sharing goals are met
- **Supplying Our Transportation Infrastructure**
 - Bicycle System
 - Policy 1: Make streets safe for bicycling

- Provide safe, comfortable bicycle facilities on roadways through all phases of all projects for people of all ages and abilities
 - Objective: Ensure that all detours maintain continuity of All Ages and Abilities Network
- Policy 4: Provide a comfortable bicycle system with end-of-trip facilities
 - Invest in, partner to create, and require facilities that meet end-of-trip needs
 - Objective: Include safe parking and showers accessibility target
 - Objective: Increase amount of high quality bicycle parking in the 2 mile radius of high capacity transit stations by 50%
- Policy 5: Work with partner agencies and other jurisdictions to develop a regional bicycle system
 - Enhance regional bicycle connectivity through the provision of inter-jurisdictional bicycle facilities
 - Objective 1: Develop regional interlocal funding mechanisms to ensure proportionate and efficient funding of inter-city bicycle network
- Policy 6: Maintain the usability of the bicycle system
 - Proactively maintain the existing bicycle system, ensuring it is safe, functional, and comfortable
 - Objective 1: Develop city-wide bicycle route signage to allow for dynamic routing along safe bike corridors
 - Objective 2: Implement street sweeping rotation for high usage bike routes
- Urban Trail System
 - Policy 3 **Pursue opportunities to connect to and expand the urban trail system**
 - Objective 1: Ensure that all trail heads for existing and new urban trails connect with all ages and abilities bike network.
- **Operating Our Transportation Network**
 - Transportation Operations
 - Policy 5 **Allocate signal timing to coincide with modal priorities**
 - Objective 1: Implement signal timing conducive to maintaining bicycle travel at constant 13-15 mph, especially on bicycle priority network streets
 - Objective 2: Develop connected signal system that can detect cyclists and hold signals longer for people on bikes when they are present
- **Protecting Our Health and Environment**

- Public Health
- Land & Ecology
 - **Policy 4:** Recognize and plan for trees as vital to supporting the transportation network
 - Objective 1: Develop plan for utilizing the Urban Forestry Grant Program in transportation right of way, with ultimate target of 100% canopy cover along bicycle priority corridors, first prioritizing intersections between pedestrian and bicycle corridors and major streets as these typically have the longest waits
- **Implementing Our Plan**
 - Financial Sustainability
 - **Policy 1 Ensure long-term, viable funding models to plan, finance, and maintain the transportation network**
 - Objective 1: Implement congestion pricing to enter downtown area, utilizing funds for active transportation and transit

Date of Approval: December 18, 2018

Vote: 6-0, with Nguyen, Alcorn, and Ortega absent

Attest:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. Flowers', with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

Kathryn Flowers, BAC Chair

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p data-bbox="233 188 1312 217">I'd like to submit the following statement with regard to the Austin Strategic Mobility plan:</p> <p data-bbox="233 266 1793 334">The plan must take into deep consideration, the full and complete restoration of the Capital Metro bus routes the so-called "Public Transit Agency" adopted with 'input' from the public, even after the papers were signed, the hands were shaken.</p> <p data-bbox="233 383 1818 487">The new service is a complete and utter disgrace, not designed to serve riders. Routes such as 311 turning far too early on Pleasant Valley, failing to serve the eastern end of Oltorf, are simply unacceptable, alienating far too many riders. Ending the Route 100 is also a grave mistake, putting off far too many riders. The Route 100 MetroExpress for the Airport worked perfectly as it was.</p> <p data-bbox="233 535 1766 639">One can't emphasize enough what a completely disastrous move it is to take away the already functional 311 off Oltorf - a highly dense residential street east to west, only to serve Montopolis, was also a disastrous move in the wrong direction, against what actual Metro users would prefer. There exist countless other examples as well.</p> <p data-bbox="233 688 1772 834">The 1, which once served S. Congress and North Lamar & Metric, has now been completely destroyed, failing to make a turn on Rundberg to service Metric, where it once did. Now, individuals must take additional buses to Metric. Generally speaking, citizens don't have time to monkey around with transfers simply because some misinformed individuals devise a plan to mess with the system.</p> <p data-bbox="233 883 1814 987">People plan their lives around Metro, and for that to be taken away with no years-long study, makes no sense in the least. Getting to work, to see loved ones, now takes longer and is far more infuriating, both for residents, visitors, tourists, and those that attend college. Please include a plan to restore the prior functioning system in part or in it's entirety.</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p data-bbox="233 1037 1822 1172">Can you please send me copies of the proposed ASMP maps in PDF or direct me to a site where they can be found? I always have problems with your interactive maps and find them incredibly user-unfriendly. It's easier to look at static maps and make text-based comments than to try to navigate the GIS-based maps. Honestly, you may be missing out on feedback from people who simply give up on the interactive maps.</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>ASMP Team: I love this. Honestly, I think Austin's biggest traffic problems are dead end streets and disconnected roadways. I really think this map is addressing the root of the problem and so much more.</p> <p>My concern is that I can't seem to make any suggestions on the map. If I were able to I would suggest creating some connectivity to Parmer Ln from the Copperfield neighborhood north of Yager.</p> <p>e.g. Thompkins Dr. is a dead end that should connect to Parmer. Copperfield Dr. is a roadway that dead-ends (is cut off) ironically by the Texas DMV. It could very well connect to the Harrisglenn Dr and Parmer Ln intersection.</p> <p>There is, in fact, a cluster of roadways that could be connected to form a block at the Tech Ridge Blvd/Parmer LN/Copperfield Dr./Harrisglenn Dr. junction.</p> <p>If you were to consider this, and add it to the potential new roadways system, it would be much appreciated. But, I'm sure this team is already inundated with suggestions for roadway improvements as Austin's traffic problems are a plentiful aggerated mess consisting of so many factors.</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Half of the people driving around in Austin, Texas do not have driver's licenses and do not know the rules for driving in Texas. Until this problem is fixed, you will continue to have unsafe roads.</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>I don't believe you'll have a viable Strategic Mobility Plan until you have one that includes expanding the light rail system in the Austin Metro. The last "rail bond" election would have passed had the plan called for the proposed rail line to end somewhere meaningful in south Austin, i.e. the airport!</p> <p>Because of poor planning voters were ask to approve a rail line that stopped at Grove and Riverside with nothing significant at that intersection.</p> <p>I think most voters just didn't believe the cities heart was in the project. I'm reminded of the early days of DART in Dallas. When the first line in the city was constructed the naysayers were all about the impending failure saying things like "Texans will never get out of their cars!!". Now it seems Dallas can't build additional rail connections to the suburbs fast enough!! Go figure!</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Policy 2: Add to the short description "integrated Park and Ride facilities, and direct access ramps" after "managed lanes"</p> <p>Is it possible to update policy language? I honestly think the 20yo ASMP policy for commuter buses and park & ride facilities was stronger than the one I'm seeing now. Capital Metro is advocating for commuter bus service and integrated park & rides along existing highways/future managed lane projects (i.e. US 183, North Mopac, South Mopac, I-35, US 290). We need the City of Austin/ATD to be an advocate with Cap Metro in a side-by-side position of support for these improvements. We especially need stronger advocacy at the regional level with CAMPO, CTRMA, and TxDOT for these improvements and for funding support. I would appreciate your department's consideration of a beefed up policy for commuter bus and park & ride facilities. Seattle has an amazing commuter bus/P&R network because the transportation agencies worked together. I believe we can build a similar network if we all worked together towards that goal.</p>
ASMP Inbox	How about providing a bus service that can actually be used? Poor pla bibg by the city. It would take 3 hours for me to get 22 miles to work, pathetic!
ASMP Inbox	Are you folks using Elon Musk's comments? We don't need to waste money on infrastructure that will be obsolete before it is completed.
ASMP Inbox	I am resident who lives off Southwest Parkway. I am emailing in support of having Industrial Oaks road extend to Southwest Parkway. I believe the plan below would relieve traffic bottlenecks and drastically improve safety and pedestrian/cycle access. This is something our community has been in support of for many years... and the traffic is only getting worse.
ASMP Inbox	Please vote to extend Industrial Oaks to Southwest Parkway. Just makes sense.
ASMP Inbox	Hi, we strongly support the plan to extend Industrial Oaks to SW Parkway. This would solve many traffic congestion and safety problems. As is, It's only a matter of time before there is a serious accident at Mission Oaks and SW Parkway with people turning left from Mission Oaks across both lanes of traffic to enter SW Parkway. This intersection needs a traffic light regardless of the extension.
ASMP Inbox	Asked about how the ASMP would address automated vehicles, specifically automated delivery vehicles. After realizing that the ASMP does not have much about automated vehicles he mostly wanted to chat about automated deliveries and how they will develop in the future. He did not have any further questions about the ASMP, but still wanted to understand more about how Ausitn would address automated vehicles in the future.
ASMP Inbox	Is it safer for bicycle lanes to be on busy streets (like Lamar and Burnet Road) or less busy streets? Are streets without bicycle lanes safer for automobiles and sidewalk users? Are bicycle lanes being used enough to justify their installations?

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>The very first policy in the ASMP is: "Prioritize human life above all else in the design and operation of the transportation network."</p> <p>This is an absurd policy. I hold a Masters in Economics from UT-Austin, but anyone can tell you it is an absurd policy. The only way to achieve it is to wrap everyone in bubble wrap and have them walk slowly. If you wanted to emphasize safety, you could have expressed it as a tradeoff between speed and safety and say that people will be able to choose safety if they want. OR you could have said that safety in absolute terms (e.g., deaths per capita) will improve even as usage increases. To say "safety above all else" is an absurd fiction and doesn't deserve to be in any public document</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>In looking at the language in the Resolution [PAC recommendation resolution] I see (pasted from the resolution): Safety: Safety Culture: o Change opening paragraph to “Reducing traffic-related fatalities and serious injuries depends on a transportation planning culture that prioritizes safety” and..</p> <p>BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the PAC strongly endorses the Supply: Sidewalk System section, and encourages the Austin City Council to prioritize achieving the vision of ubiquitous access for people of all ages and abilities to safe sidewalks throughout the city,</p> <p>I realize that language evolves, and that nouns like “dialogue” and “priority” are now sometimes used as verbs; in my opinion to the detriment of clear communication. In this case I would like to make two comments about the use of the term “prioritize.” First, I do not believe that proper grammar would not include the use of a verb form of “priority”, and that it is worth it to avoid using it in official documents. Second, assuming that it were considered a verb, I believe it would meat “to place in priority order”. Accepting this, prioritizing would not necessarily place safety or achieving the vision at the top of a priority list; in fact, after “prioritized”, these items might, in some folks’ opinions, fall low on such a list. I think the intent was, in both cases, to say that these items should be “of highest priority”, “placed at the top of a list of priorities”, or some other phraseology that utilizes “priority” as a noun.</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Dear Sir or Madam: I am writing respectfully to oppose bike lanes on Harris Blvd from Windsor to Ethridge Ave. Bike Lanes would destroy whatever is left of transportation in this neighborhood. Harris is almost un drivable now because of traffic. Bicyclers do not stop for stop signs. Pedestrians have no place to walk as is. We need sidewalks, not bike lanes. There are three adults and lots of visiting children at our house who Agree with me. Don't do it. (name and address redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Dear Madame or Sir: I have read the list of streets in Pemberton Heights that are slated to have bike lanes. Since this is a safe neighborhood and there don't seem to have been accidents involving bicycles, I don't understand why bike lanes need to be added. However, if you add bike lanes on Harris Boulevard, you will be adding to present congestion. The street is narrow and would become even narrower if bike lanes are added. I assume that, if you put in bike lanes, parking will be eliminated on one or both sides of the street. People will be extremely unhappy if that happens. Gaston, Claire, and Ethridge are short, lightly-traveled streets, and I don't know why they would require bike lanes. Please leave our neighborhood alone and use that money on streets that really need bike lanes.</p> <p>(name and address redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Dear Friends at the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan: As you read in the news media (e.g., General Motors, Volvo, etc.), we will soon be having many more all-electric cars that will be needing charging stations. I think we should be planning for many more charging stations around shopping areas, dining areas, business areas (courthouses, license and tax offices, etc.), and park areas (where people can be enjoying the benefits of nature in the parks while their cars are charging. Have you thought about the sort of people the Apple impact will be bringing to Austin? They will be interested in the environment and will be driving electric cars. How can we accommodate these people and people like them who are already here?</p> <p>Roads will need clear and precise signage to direct people to charging stations. These signs should be distinct from other sorts of official highway signs. Charging stations will increase patronage of dining areas, parks, and shopping areas. Such areas will want to have charging stations near them. They need to be consulted for preferred locations. (name and address redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello, We need more direct public transit to the Austin Airport (ABIA). This would increase mobility to and from the airport and likely increase air travel for Austin area residents and tourists. We should have a central "Airport" bus stop in the North and South of the city that goes directly to and from the airport without stopping along the way. C (name and address redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello, I am writing to voice my opinion about the proposed bike lanes in Pemberton Heights. I live on Harris Blvd. and do not see any reason to segregate out bikes for several reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a greenway for bikes (Pease Park) 3 blocks over that offers much better connectivity. 2. Our streets do not have room for 2 dedicated driving lanes, a bike lane, and street parking. Street parking is a necessity for our residents. Most of the homes in Pemberton Heights are older and do not have garages or two car driveways. Street parking is badly needed for our residents, visitors, and service providers. 3. Harris Blvd. is already becoming a thoroughfare for drivers avoiding Mopac and Lamar. Harris Blvd is a residential street and does not need dedicated driving lanes for vehicles to speed down our streets jeopardizing the safety of our children. Currently, parked cars are the only thing that slow drivers down. <p>(name and address redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the creation of bike lanes on Harris Blvd. If you drive down Harris you'll see that many vehicles are parked on both sides of the road. This includes not only cars, but also many trucks with trailers. If bike lanes are put on Harris, where will these people park? Their only option is to part on one of the side streets and walk varying distances to their destination. This will not only make it difficult for construction workers, yard maintenance people, etc., but it will also result in the numerous side streets entering Harris to be virtually impassable. These streets are narrow and when cars are parked on both sides of the street it's very difficult to navigate through them. There is no way that emergency vehicles can drive down these streets and this will create a very dangerous situation. The bike lanes on Exposition work well b/c people rarely park on Exposition, but that's not the case with Harris. I'm an avid cyclist and I appreciate the city making the streets bike friendly, but not at the expense of creating difficult & dangerous driving conditions. You may recall that several years ago the city installed landscape "islands" along Shoal Creek Blvd. north of 2222. Many people parked their cars on the side of the road between the islands. This resulted in the entire street becoming much narrower which in turned forced cyclists, cars, and trucks to navigate very near to the center of the street. This obviously created a very dangerous situation for both cyclists and drivers and the islands were ultimately removed. I'm certain the same sequence of events will occur on Harris if bike lanes are installed. Additionally, since there are no sidewalks on Harris many walkers, joggers, and mothers pushing baby carriages are on the street. If bike lanes are installed they will also force these people to travel much closer to the center of the road which is clearly quite dangerous.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>I've been to several transportation open houses over the years, Cap Metro, Campo, City of Austin, and nobody gives a shit about 30,000 people EVERY DAY that come into Bergstrom and need a ride, not to mention thousands of tax paying employees and vendors out there. I don't even like to fly, but I know a real transportation system when I see one. ALL major cities have a public plan for their regional airports. If you would just put a link at the Red Line at MLK, an airport flyer or at Saltillo station, So that anybody in the ENTIRE north end of Austin or the biz district or the campus could know that they can catch a reliable ride from any station and get to the airport in less than an hour. Just like a real Public transportation system.</p> <p>(name and address redacted)</p> <p>Long time CapMetro penny taxpayer , not to mention City and Travis Property taxes</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>when and where are/were the public presentations for the proposed changes to Jollyville road? Please provide the info requested in the subject line</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Hi, I cannot make heads or tails of your website. I was just trying to see what your plans for Jollyville Road are because I drive it every day. However, here are a few thoughts I have based on what neighbors have told me (I have no idea if their information is even correct) and my experiences on Jollyville Rd.</p> <p>I really wish you would put off making a decision about Jollyville Rd. until we see how the 183 construction affects traffic flow. The amount of rush hour traffic that filters through the neighborhoods (in addition to the Jollyville Rd. traffic) is quite heavy. The intersection at Jollyville Rd. and Oak Knoll Dr. can get quite backed up in two directions during the afternoon rush, and it can require several light changes to get through. I suspect that with Austin's continued growth outward, 183 will not be able to take the rush hour pressure off the neighborhoods or Jollyville Rd. for long, so we will still need the same amount of throughput on Jollyville Rd.</p> <p>Most of my neighbors seem opposed to raised medians, but if done right, I think they could alleviate four problems I see happen a lot: Drivers frequently ignoring the double yellow line and entering a left turn lane or through lane meant for oncoming traffic (particularly immediately south of Braker Ln. and immediately north of Great Hills Tr., where their intentions are to make left turns into shopping center parking lots). Several times, I have had to stop for oncoming vehicles in my lane because the driver thought he/she was in their own designated left turn lane. Note: Right-turn-only exits onto Jollyville Rd. from these shopping centers would also help alleviate congestion in those areas.</p> <p>Drivers turning out of parking lots all along Jollyville Rd. into the center left turn lane and then continuing to drive in that lane, thereby preventing others from entering it going either direction. I have even seen drivers continue driving straight ahead in the center left turn lane through controlled intersections.</p> <p>Drivers making left turns out of the Balcones Post Office parking lot exit in the same short space as north-bound drivers are trying to turn left into the Post Office parking lot entrance. Drivers pulling half or three quarters of the way into the center left turn lane and then stopping, thereby blocking both the left turn lane and the through lane next to it.</p> <p>Of course, businesses that would be affected by may have other insights. Thanks for allowing me to express my observations,</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>About a year ago we had a meeting and the neighborhoods along Jollyville and beyond packed the room and there was overflow into another room. 99% of us were OPPOSED to the changes described by the various city/ state agencies speaking that night. It was at the Spicewood Library. We were not opposed to the sidewalks being built out. Jollyville is so crowded now that I can't imagine that these changes can possible help, it will only make it worse. The crowd that night was angry. We don't want these changes!!!</p> <p>Government is to work for us not against our MAJORITY wishes. I am AGAINST it!</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Hi, I have viewed your ASMP on the website. I am all for alternative modes of transportation including express bus and rail. I rode the express bus to work for years. However, we cannot ignore our inadequate road system for vehicles. We basically have the same road system in Austin from 40 years ago excluding MOPAC and 360. No matter how hard you try to get people out of their cars it will not work for the most part. We must widen major arteries where possible like Burnet and Lamar. Also placing bike lanes on busy streets like Burnet and Jollyville defies common sense. It makes it dangerous for both vehicles and bicycles because of the narrow lanes of traffic. I see limited movement on our road system for vehicles. I suggest making that a priority.</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>I would love to provide some input for your examination. I wrote a very long article that I did not intend to publish because it is just a first-draft I wrote to preserve the ideas. It took so long and was so difficult I decided to put it on a website so that someone might find it and get some use out of it. www.trafficjamcure.com is where the article is. Please pass it on or something. It might help. I am sorry for the way I wrote it and the length. Like I said, it was not intended for publication. My hope is to promote the ideas through a non-profit. I am just a person who has been in the traffic jams too long. I didn't just sit there stewing. I tried to develop solutions.</p> <p>I think if I had one thing to offer above all others, it would be making little electric cars, like the ones provided by Car2Go, available instead of busses. Some smart people could make it feasible and the benefits would be too many to list here. I am sure you can figure it out. Public transportation, all electric, personal vehicles, subsidized at least, totally funded hopefully. Busses are simple impractical. No one likes riding them. They get in the way. They cost too much. Little electric cars would be great. I think almost everyone would use them when they could and reduce the use of gasoline cars. That would help the environment and the ecology. Thanks for your attention</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>The rail train in north Austin is ALSO needed in south Austin (south of Oltorf) plus bus service south of Slaughter (not just 1st street for high school). South of Slaughter, Kyle & Buda has exploded with residents (check population figures) commuting to Austin for work daily. I35 south is a nightmare. Cedar Park, Leander and Round Rock aren't the only cities commuting to Austin. In the meantime, establish some park & rides south of Slaughter & I35 corridor. Mopac toll is good for northwest and southwest Southwest Austin resident (west of Manchaca)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>My name is Martha McAdams Vertrees, I have lived at 2525 Harris Blvd since 1963. I oppose having Bike Lanes on Harris Blvd. I have a garage apartment that I rent to Danielle Stafford, who has lived there (2525-B Harris Blvd) for the past 7 years. Her only parking is on the street in front of my property. Our driveway is long and narrow with absolutely no way for another car to park. We need to continue our right to parking on the street in front of our property.</p> <p>Please let us remain having our service people able to access our homes by their parking in front of our property for lawn services, repairs and visitors. Thank you for respectfully considering my concerns.</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	Please add my name to the list that thinks installing bike lanes on Harris Blvd between Etheridge and Windsor is a not a good idea. For the safety of neighbors (parking will move to the cross streets & bikers would be using a very narrow busy street), this project should be cancelled or at least re-routed. I'd be happy to list more reasons if needed but safety is my main concern.
ASMP Inbox	<p>We are registering our dissatisfaction with the proposed two way bike lane and sidewalks on Harris Boulevard between Windsor Road and Etheridge Avenue.</p> <p>This will</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. damage the residential value of these homes due to the commercial nature it will make the area feel. 2. It will hinder these residents from receiving services from service persons that cannot access these homeowner's homes. 3. In addition, it will burden and clog up the adjacent neighborhood streets where service providers will be forced to park to access those homeowners on that limited section of roadway. <p>It appears from the map that there is/will be access to a path just one or two streets parallel to this segment. It seems like tremendous overkill to provide a two way bike path that will adversely affect these handful of citizens.</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the creation of bike lanes on Harris Blvd. If you drive down Harris you'll see that many vehicles are parked on both sides of the road. This includes not only cars, but also many trucks with trailers. If bike lanes are put on Harris, where will these people park? Their only option is to part on one of the side streets and walk varying distances to their destination. This will not only make it difficult for construction workers, yard maintenance people, etc., but it will also result in the numerous side streets entering Harris to be virtually impassable.</p> <p>These streets are narrow and when cars are parked on both sides of the street it's very difficult to navigate through them. There is no way that emergency vehicles can drive down these streets and this will create a very dangerous situation.</p> <p>The bike lanes on Exposition work well b/c people rarely park on Exposition, but that's not the case with Harris. I'm an avid cyclist and I appreciate the city making the streets bike friendly, but not at the expense of creating difficult & dangerous driving conditions. You may recall that several years ago the city installed landscape "islands" along Shoal Creek Blvd. north of 2222. Many people parked their cars on the side of the road between the islands. This resulted in the entire street becoming much narrower which in turned forced cyclists, cars, and trucks to navigate very near to the center of the street. This obviously created a very dangerous situation for both cyclists and drivers and the islands were ultimately removed. I'm certain the same sequence of events will occur on Harris if bike lanes are installed.</p> <p>Additionally, since there are no sidewalks on Harris many walkers, joggers, and mothers pushing baby carriages are on the street. If bike lanes are installed they will also force these people to travel much closer to the center of the road which is clearly quite dangerous.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	Please don't substitute guest and worker parking on Harris Blvd. for bike lanes. The houses are old, drives narrow and there would be no place for visitors to park if this proposal is adopted. I am grateful for your consideration.
ASMP Inbox	Jollyville Rd. Is one of the few roads in Austin where traffic actually flows. Plans to expand bike lanes and add medians will result in more traffic conjunction and will be a complete disaster. Don't Mess With Jollyville!
ASMP Inbox	I would also like to voice my opposition to the proposal of bike lanes on Harris. I am a neighbor of Alans and longtime neighborhood resident. Alan makes very valid points and in addition the traffic on Harris has increased tremendously over the past 25 years and most significantly over the past 10 as Mopac has become more congested . There is a steady stream of commuters that use Harris as an alternative to Mopac which makes normal use of our neighborhood very dangerous during the morning rush hour but particular between 4-7 pm. Adding the additional congestive effect of bike lanes will make the streets very unsafe for routine neighborhood use.
ASMP Inbox	<p>I have heard that the city is considering putting bike lanes on Harris Boulevard near my street, Hardouin Ave. My street, which has sidewalks, is very narrow compared to the average city street. If people can no longer park on Harris, this will be an additional strain on parking on my street. Already, we residents are aware that no two cars can be parked directly across from each other. If that happens, city sanitation trucks, large delivery trucks and yard trailers absolutely cannot pass. We have had lots of cars sideswiped when someone makes the terrible error of parking directly across from another car parked on the street. This is a significant problem Residents already have a tough time getting out of driveways without hitting cars parked on Hardouin.</p> <p>Please do not make this difficult situation worse by putting bike lanes on Harris, which will force spillover parking on Hardouin Ave. It is a terrible idea, and I hope that it is abandoned immediately. Please come measure my street and see if you really think we can have additional people parking here.</p> <p>I am copying some of my neighbors in hopes they will share their thoughts about these proposed bike lanes.</p>
ASMP Inbox	I completely agree wiht (name redacted) i. These are not standard streets in our older neighborhood. They are very narrow. I can't believe that it would even be possible to have bike lanes on Harris Blvd. Anytime there is an event on any of the nearby streets in the neighborhood, all the excess parking takes place on Harris. And clearly there is not room for bike lanes and parking on Harris.
ASMP Inbox	<p>(name redacted), Thank you for putting into words my exact thoughts.</p> <p>Harris Blvd & our old cramped neighborhood does NOT need bike lanes. Bikers should use the Hike & BIKE trail, just east a couple of blocks, at the edge if our community. An incredible amount of \$ & energy was poured forth creating the green belt bike way of our Austin bikers. I think they should use it, instead if infringing on our streets. NO BIKE LANES ON HARRIS!! Get out of the way, you dobies☹☹</p> <p>Plus...How many bike trails already exist in Austin???? If you want to bike in traffic, please move to Manhattan.</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>We do not support adding a bike lane on Harris Blvd between Windsor and Ethridge Ave.</p> <p>On street parking is vital on both sides of Harris. On street parking serves residents, visitors and service people. If on street parking is lost, it will put more parking pressure on adjacent streets like ours. We need on street parking for ourselves, our own visitors and service people.</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Below are my comments to the Proposed Bike Lanes on Harris Blvd.</p> <p>First of all, I have received no notice via mail or email about these proposed Bike Lanes. I have only received word second hand from other neighbors. It is apparent that these proposed Bike Lanes have not been thoroughly thought out. The streets in Pemberton Heights were designed and built over sixty years ago and do not adequately allow for the current traffic much less the thought of further restricting traffic and on street parking. Bike Lanes would completely destroy our neighborhood not only affecting the residents on Harris Blvd but also all the neighbors on the streets off of Harris and beyond. No one in this neighborhood has adequate off-street parking and eliminating parking for service vehicles, guests and residents would be devastating to all residents in this neighborhood. Residents should not have to suffer so that bicycles can have a priority over other vehicles to pass through our neighborhood. I ask that you allow us to keep the integrity of our neighborhood that we all love.</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>I just heard last night that you are considering putting bike lanes on Harris Blvd. I live at (address redacted) just 4 houses off of Harris Blvd, and in between Windsor and Etheridge. If you are in fact considering the bike lanes, then you should inform the affected parties and give them an opportunity to provide input. Because I did not receive any notice, then I assume that you have not informed the neighborhood. You should do so immediately.</p> <p>Putting bike lanes on Harris Blvd would be a colossal mistake and a waste of taxpayer dollars. Harris Blvd is a neighborhood road that needs on-street parking for guests of neighbors and service providers such as lawn maintenance crews and contractors. Bike lanes would reduce the amount of on-street parking – pushing parking onto side streets (such as mine), further congesting those streets and causing dangers for the guests having to cross Harris Blvd on foot to access the homes. Bike lanes would also congest and slow auto traffic.</p> <p>Bike lanes don't work everywhere! Just look at the failure of bike lanes on Exposition. The cost to drivers of slower traffic, and the cost to taxpayers of creating the lanes, immeasurably outweighs the benefits to the very few bicyclists who use the lanes. As for Harris Blvd, it is not a bike thoroughfare. With the exception of a few exercise-bicyclists who use Harris early on weekend mornings, there is essentially no bicycle traffic on Harris. If you were to create the bike lanes, then they would go un-used. The result would be that you caused significant inconvenience and harm to the property owners, for essentially no benefit.</p> <p>If you were to do an objective cost-benefit analysis of bike lanes on Harris, then the proposal would fail miserably. You could not justify the project on the basis of a net benefit to the property owners or the public at large. You do not serve the taxpayers by forcing a utopian ideology, such as bike lanes, to every situation. Clearly, bike lanes on Harris do not work!</p> <p>You owe it to the neighborhood to have a public meeting about the bike lanes, and to give us written notice by mail. Please let me know your plans in this regard.</p> <p>Best Regards (Name and address redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	Where may I provide feedback to proposed "improvements"?

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>My name is (name redacted). I own 2 properties on Harris Blvd. (address redacted), my homesince 1973 (46 years); and (address redacted), a duplex rental property since 1996 (23 years)</p> <p>Between Ethridge and Windsor there are 3 streets running East: Wathen; Hardouin, and Wooldridge; and 1 street running West: Leigh. All of these streets are narrow especially Hardouin and Wooldridge.</p> <p>If you pass and build bike lanes on one or both sides of Harris and eliminate on-street parking; anytime someone living on Harris have service providers or guests the residents on Wathen, Hardouin, Wooldridge and Leigh are going to be very unhappy when their street becomes a parking lot and vehicular movement is reduced to one lane.</p> <p>With our narrow, old subdivision, single lane driveways, on-street parking is badly needed for ourselves, our visitors, service providers (yard crews, plumbers, electricians, construction crews and other repair providers).</p> <p>Additionally, on-street parking has the added benefit of slowing down traffic.</p> <p>My wife and I are strongly against the addition of bike lanes and the elimination of on-street parking on Harris Blvd. The majority of my neighbors feel the same way. (name redacted)</p> <p>It would have been nice if the city would have notified in writing all property owners on Harris Blvd and the side streets affected by the potential addition of bike lanes and elimination of on-street parking. What happened to transparency in City government?</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>I would like to register my and my wife's strong objection to adding Bike Lanes to Harris Boulevard in the Pemberton Heights neighborhood. While we now live at (address redacted) at the corner of Hardouin and Harris Boulevard, I grew up in the adjacent Brykerwoods neighborhood and have ridden bicycles, walked and driven cars through this area throughout my life and have never felt the need for separate bike lanes. Furthermore, we need street parking on Harris Boulevard more than we need separate bicycle lanes as many of the other streets in the neighborhood are too narrow to allow emergency vehicles through when cars are parked on both sides of the street.</p> <p>Our neighborhoods are for its residents. How much did we spend on Codenext before the city figured out the neighborhoods didn't want it. How much have we spent putting traffic control features on our Old West Austin neighborhood streets only to tear them out or modify them months after completion since they were creating more of a hazard than they were solving. If it's not broken, don't</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Please reconsider putting in bike lanes and eliminating parking on Harris Blvd. I live on the corner of Harris Blvd and Hardouin Ave, There are many vehicles parked on Harris currently and those vehicles are there for various reasons, If parking is eliminated, those vehicles would park on the perpendicular streets which also have many vehicles parking on them. There are days when its difficult for me to back out of my driveway on Hardouin because of vehicles parked behind it. Hardouin is a narrow street. I believe this situation would be the same on other streets (Wooldridge, Wathen, Ethridge, Leigh, Jarratt, etc) as well. Please leave Harris Blvd as it is, your proposal will make it worse for everyone who lives in our neighborhood. (Name and address redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>I oppose the addition of any bike lanes in Pemberton, especially the area of Harris Blvd. and Ethridge where I have lived since 1970's. In other words, I speak with authority as to what will work from years of experience.</p> <p>The Pemberton Neighborhood is a close knit community of people that take care of their property. The City of Austin planners are looking at a small bicycle group trying to take over. If you calculate the actual time a bicycle can be operated compared to the actual time a vehicle can be used, there is a great difference. Only a small percentage of individuals can operate a bicycle, only a limited period is conducive to operating a bicycle, and bicycle owners do not have identification (drivers license or license plate) or responsibility for paying for the support and upkeep of roads.</p> <p>When you have spent all this money accommodating bicycle riders, then you have limited, hampered and damaged all other groups of individuals who have paid and used these roads over all these years. Presently, our roads in the Pemberton Neighborhood are used by automobiles, bicycles, baby carriages, walkers, runners, wheelchairs, scooters, and exercise/walkers. In other words, under present conditions without designated bike lanes, we all work together to accommodate the needs of all. When you force bike lanes on us, you move all this to the middle of the road which endangers all.</p> <p>Why are you complicating our lives and giving them our roadway space , changing our patterns and ruining our neighborhood just for a small group of individuals who can only ride their bike at limited times. You are not using good judgment.</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>To whom it may concern -</p> <p>Please preserve the on street parking on Harris Blvd. My family owns(address refacted). Besides the continuous parade of service people who are employed at the Harris properties are we to no longer welcome friends and family to gatherings at our homes?</p> <p>The service people certainly need their trucks and a place to park; are the bridge ladies, the charity organizers, the family gatherings all to be ended for this once gracious part of Austin for the convenience of bike commuters needing a path thru this part of town?</p> <p>Whose grand idea was this to penalize the civility and social inclinations of this street? Are only bike riders to be welcomed?</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Despite several attempts, my computer did not display "the short survey below" referred to on your website when I tried to tell you what I think.</p> <p>I got on my phone and found the mobile survey. I was disappointed that the questions are so broadly stated. There is only one opportunity to actually comment, and even there you merely ask about my overall satisfaction with the policies, not my critique. Ironically, you ask for a lot of detailed demographics.</p> <p>Here are some of my specific comments and questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is unrealistic to have sidewalks on both sides of every street. If you look around at the road segments where there are no sidewalks, there is often a reason, such as steep slopes or trees where the sidewalk would be. One-size fits-all-does not work with respect to sidewalks. 2. In Austin there are hundreds and hundreds of utility poles in the middle of existing sidewalks, or where sidewalks are needed. Have you approached utility companies about relocations? 3. As far as sidewalk safety, I suspect that sidewalks that are right next to the curb are more dangerous than ones with a strip of land in between. If so, why not adopt a policy favoring having a space between the sidewalk and the curb? 4. Under Policy 3 in the bicycle system, "Remove significant infrastructure gaps in the bicycle system. Ensure connectivity in the bicycle system and resolve geographic barriers to cycling." I am troubled by the word "resolve" because it is vague and, in context, suggests connectivity should dominate over geography. 5. I understand that Urban Trails are planned have 12-feet of pavement plus 2-foot-wide shoulders on each side. Again, one-size-fits-all does not work in the real world, and requires costly alteration of natural features. An Urban Trail along a creek would often severely disrupt the riparian environment. I find it telling that so many of the well-liked trails in our parks are much narrower than Urban Trails. 6. I believe there needs to be a new category of trails that are narrower than Urban Trails, and not necessarily paved or "designed for all ages and abilities." 7. I note that some of the proposed projects (for example, trails proposed along creeks) would require the use of what is now private property. Do you have a policy that specifically addresses how and when the city makes contact with persons who own land that would be used for a proposed project?

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>TO: ASMP</p> <p>I tried but have discovered that your maps that supposedly allow the public to comment on particular projects are extremely cumbersome to use. They have way too much data in them and navigation is difficult. They no doubt frustrate potential commenters. I could not get the search function even to allow me to input a term. I was unable to find the comments I made about three weeks ago.</p> <p>I am submitting further comments on two particular projects via this email.</p> <p>The proposed Tier 2 Urban Trail showing alignment along Williamson Creek.</p> <p>1. The proposed trail, with a conceptual alignment shown along several miles of Williamson Creek, is not justified by, and indeed disregards, the kind of trail envisioned in some neighborhood plans in the area. Those plans endorsed a simpler trail. They do not contain justification for an Urban Trail as envisioned in the ASMP. The neighborhood plans described trails with terms like "primitive" or "hike and bike," referring to the trails PARD has put in parks. For example, the 2005 South Congress Neighborhood Plan refers (page 85) to land acquisitions to "possibly create a greenbelt with a primitive trail." The 2008 Oak Hill plan (Section 10.F) refers to "safe and secure greenbelts with nature trails along Williamson Creek and other creeks." The 2002 Southeast Austin plan refers (page 73) to a "hike and bike" trail along Williamson Creek. None of the plans suggested the need for or desirability of an "Urban Trail" as proposed by the Public Works Department: a 12-foot wide road with 2 feet of shoulder on each side, or even two paved parallel trails.</p> <p>2. Williamson Creek is an important corridor for wildlife in South Austin. Having a busy, paved urban trail along it would seriously disrupt the wildlife.</p> <p>3. Because Williamson Creek meanders as it flows eastward, it does not serve as a convenient or efficient route to connect areas where people want to travel. Places of business are generally along the east-west commercial streets like Stassney. Further, when Williamson Creek does cross a road, it is always at the lowest local elevation, meaning an uphill walk or ride to get anywhere else. When I am trying to get somewhere on a bike, I prefer to ride the ridges rather than having to go up and down hills.</p> <p>4. Even with a narrower trail, due to topography the trail would have to cross the creek numerous times, resulting in intrusive and expensive to maintain bridges.</p> <p>5. Having an urban trail aligned along Stassney would provide much better connectivity to places people are traveling to.</p> <p>6. Note that I do not oppose the concept of an Urban Trail. However, there are typically going to be serious problems with putting one along a creek.</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Hi, Wanted to provide some feedback on the ASMP, but felt that the online form at the end of the ASMP was too 'generic'. Wanted to give some more specific feedback.</p> <p>BTW – my job has involved me in the development of strategic plans within a corporate environment, so my views are colored perhaps by how I go about developing strategies within a business, rather than a City such as Austin.</p> <p>1. I think you are missing clear objectives. Or at least they were not clear to me. I would have thought you should have half a dozen or so clear measurable objectives that can be used to a) drive policies and b) measure whether the policies are being effective. Something like..</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reduce the average travel time for commuters into the CBD (Central Business District) from X mins to Y mins after 5 years. b. Increase the numbers of commuters using private vehicles into CBD from X% to Y% after 10 years. c. Provide mobility options so that X 100,000 of low cost housing (measured as say 50% or below of median Austin house prices) are within 30 mins commuting distance by public transport of CBD, within 10 years. [This allows lower paid employees to have both access to low cost housing and also access to jobs]. d. Improve the average air quality of Austin (AQI) from X to Y within 5 years. e. Increase the number of passengers and employees of Austin Bergstrom airport using public transport from, X% to Y% within 10 years. f. Reduce the annual road death rate (car passengers plus pedestrians) in Austin from X to Y within 5 years. <p>2. Think you have too many policies! I make it that there are 128 policies. Way too much. It comes over that you have had multiple focus groups in the city put up yellow sticky pads to cover every conceivable policy (by department??) and they were then all written down. Why not try and cut down to say 20 key policies? 128 is just so large its mind numbing and will just lead to lack of focus. Here are some suggestions to get the number of policies down:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Remove the duplicates/consolidate. Eg. the policies “Engage community members in transportation decisions” and “Pro-actively maintain community relationships” seems very similar to me and could be combined into one, policy. Many other examples of this. b. Focus on what is important – “Use streets strategically as key components of the city’s drainage and water distribution systems”. Probably a nice thing to do, but I would not say it’s a strategic policy area. Or... “Ensure coordination of code and criteria manuals that optimize mobility and water management goals” – nice ‘bureaucracy speak!’, but again just not important and/or should be standard

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>I would like to express my thoughts in regards to my opposing making Escarpment into a 4 lane roadway. I'm also opposed to extending South Bay Lane and Dahlgreen to connect to a signalized intersection at MoPac, and extending Barstow Avenue to Davis Lane. My family, including my 4 year old daughter and 7 year old son, travel via bike regularly throughout Escarpment, Lacrosse, and South Bay Lane regularly. It is our main form of transportation to school, and to extracurricular activities at the Slaughter and Escarpment intersection. I fear that extending the lanes to connect to MoPac and making Escarpment into a 4 lane road would raise the speed limit beyond 35mph (which people rarely follow anyway), and create more traffic throughout the area. This would cause a potentially hazardous area for young children to ride their bicycle to and from school or just traveling throughout the area. There are many families and children who travel via bicycle, including bicycle clubs, and many runners. I fear the additional traffic would make the area unsafe for those people.</p> <p>The area does not seem to be overloaded with traffic, and when the diamond interchanges at Slaughter and Mopac, and Lacrosse and Mopac open, it should alleviate any stress the the area might be seeing (not that there is any).</p> <p>Thank you for your time, and for allowing me to voice my concern for my neighborhood. ☺</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Bike lane on W 29th and stop light at Jefferson/W29th</p> <p>This is the most absurd idea you've come up with in a long time! I am totally opposed to making W29th from Lamar to Jefferson a no-parking bike lane, as well as putting a stop light at W29th and Jefferson. Residents along W29th must park on the street because of the already difficulty in getting out of their driveways because of the heavy traffic.</p> <p>Placing a stop light at W29th and Jefferson is just plain stupid. The stop signs there regulate traffic just perfectly. Bikers don't stop for stop signs, so what makes you think they will stop for a stop light? You are wasting taxpayer's money and destroying our neighborhoods!</p> <p>I'm all in favor of biking, but the bicycle lobby in Austin is selling you a bill of goods.</p>
ASMP Inbox	Placemaking - people don't necessarily know what this is, but once they understand they think it's important, especially in people's neighborhoods
ASMP Inbox	Uber, Lyft - where are these in the plan?
ASMP Inbox	Sidewalk System is critical for people with disabilities. How can we elevate the importance?

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	Dockless scooters- can you be on the sidewalks? What are the dockless rules? Concerned about safety and enforcement. AVs, how are we addressing these and preparing for them? Do we have proactive relationships with AV companies?
ASMP Inbox	Scooters downtown are dangerous. You had done so well making it easier to walk downtown and now it isn't. I also don't like the clutter that they create. I want to be forward thinking, but I'm concerned about safety.
ASMP Inbox	We need more transportation - need railroads
ASMP Inbox	I live in Brykerwoods and I think it would be good to have the bike lanes proposed along 29th st and along Jefferson, and the others. Thank you for asking for input.
ASMP Inbox	I strongly oppose both the bike lane and the stop light at the intersection of 29th and Jefferson. Please consider other traffics solutions. (Name and address redacted) The feedback map is hard to use (received from a reply email to the stock response)
ASMP Inbox	I just learned about the mobility plan changes for 29th St. and have two concerns: 1. Are you sure adding a light will improve things? I can see that intersection from the house, and I believe rush-hour traffic might actually worsen with a light. During rush hour, traffic southbound on Jefferson often backs up to (& north of) that intersection because cars entering loop 1 are backed up. Have you looked at that? With a light further limiting opportunities for cars westbound on 29th St to turn south on Jefferson, the currently (barely courteous) “take your turn” process will become more constrained and cause more driver anger than already exists, as people block the intersection entirely to avoid having to sit through a green light. 2. Of greater concern, how will the bike lane on 29th affect average speeds? Will parking be allowed in the bike lane? on the other side of the street? Not at all? We have had repeated problems with speeding along 29th, and parked cars have forced some slowing of that traffic. We are concerned that eliminating parking will cause increased speeding and danger to residents. Replacing a stop sign with a green light will also increase speeding. As you improve flow from city center, PLEASE also do something to control speeding & help keep this neighborhood safe for its residents. (Name and address redacted)
ASMP Inbox	I am not in favor of bike lanes on Harris Blvd. I do not see this a solution for any problem. Parking on side streets a bigger problem as is through traffic from MoPac.

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>PLEASE DO NOT PUT BIKE LANES OR NOT PARKING ZONES ON HARRIS BLVD. THERE SIMPLY IS NOT ENOUGH ROOM FOR CAR TRAFFIC, WALKERS AND RESIDENTIAL PARKING TO STICK BIKE LANES ON HARRIS. WE USE OUR NEIGHBORHOOD STREETS FOR DAILY LIVING.</p> <p>BIKERS SHOULD DIVERT TO THE BEAUTIFUL BIKING TRAIL ALONG PEASE PARK, WHERE THE CITY HAS ALREADY SPENT LARGE MONEY TO CREATE THIS THOROUGHFARE FOR BIKERS. OUR PARKING IS LIMITED, WE USE OUR STREETS FOR RESIDENTIAL PARKING AND WALKING DUE TO LIMITED SIDEWALKS.</p> <p>THE CURRENT SITUATION IS NOT BROKEN. PLEASE DO NOT IMPOSE YOUR INTERCITY "CROWD" CONTROL ON OUR RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD. ☹</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>As residents on Harris Blvd., please note that we are adamantly opposed to bike lanes being placed on Harris Blvd. Due to our narrow driveways we need on street parking for ourselves, our visitors, and our service providers. An additional and very significant benefit of on-street parking is that it effectively and very necessarily slows traffic on Harris Blvd. Please do not put these bike lanes on our street.</p> <p>(Name and address redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Folks,</p> <p>I am a professional engineer in Texas of 45 years experience in transportation, mostly in Texas. This is the most screwed up plan I have ever seen. Apparently you don't want public feedback as it is very difficult to read much less have input. I hope a consulting firm did not write this plan as it is the worse one I have ever seen. I helped write the Harris County and Fort Bend County Major Thoroughfare Plans and they put this plan to shame.</p> <p>Now, my question is, what is there to gain to extend South Bay and Dahlgreen to Mopac? You would wiser to extend 45 to 290 like on the older plan.</p> <p>Most of these ideas in this plan are similar to the current situation at LaCrosse during construction where the right lane heading south is for straight thru and right turns whereby the left lane is for left turns where there is very little movement. Most all of the traffic is thru or right turn into Circle C. A simple temporary right turn lane will solve the congestion at LaCrosse. The left lane should be for left turns and thru traffic.</p> <p>It seems to me that the City Transportation folk work in reverse. The 45 extension and Slaughter/La Crosse intersections will only make the congestion at the bridges at 71 occur faster and not solve the congestion getting to downtown from that point. The 1826 roadway is also being ignored and it is a death trap.</p> <p>Come on gang. Let's get some real solutions to the traffic congestion by buying new ROW and new roadways and not try to play with existing roadways which will not solve the 50 or 100 year problems.</p> <p>Please answer my South Bay/Dahlgreen question.</p> <p>Thanks.</p> <p>(name redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>We are long-time residents (16 years) of Harris Blvd located between Wathen and Ethridge Ave. We are writing to express our deep concerns and opposition to the bike lanes being proposed for Harris Blvd between Windsor Rd. and Ethridge Ave. Pemberton Heights is a beautiful, historic neighborhood with narrow, single-car driveways and narrow streets. This makes it necessary to regularly use on-street parking for our family of 3 drivers and friends who visit. Additionally, this neighborhood hires a significant amount of service providers (contractors, repairs, yard crews, babysitters, etc) who need street parking as well. The bike lanes would force their cars onto neighboring streets causing an influx of parking problems for our neighbors. Again, the street parking on Harris Blvd is a necessity.</p> <p>Probably the greatest benefit of on-street parking is that it slows down the traffic that regularly speeds down Harris Blvd. Even with the completion of the Mopac Toll Lane, people still regularly use Harris Blvd as a cut through to bypass the traffic on Mopac. Having an empty street without cars parked on it would certainly increase the number and driving speed of people choosing this route to avoid the traffic. I'd love to see our efforts be spent on creating sidewalks, speed bumps and crosswalks to make this neighborhood safer and more walkable for everyone.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>I am writing in regard to the proposed installation of a stop light at 29th Street and Jefferson. There is absolutely no need for a stop light at that intersection. With the four-way stop, traffic flows just fine and installing a stop light at that intersection would negatively impact the Bryker Woods neighborhood. We are a residential neighborhood and having a stop light at that intersection would make it even more difficult to get out of our cross streets. We do not need the rush hour traffic that cuts through our neighborhood to back up on 29th and Jefferson and it should be noted that on the weekends and holidays, there is very little traffic through that area. If the city wishes to put in a bike lane on 29th that would have less impact on the neighborhood.</p> <p>I am very much opposed to the installation of the stop light. ☹</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>To whom it may concern; I live on Wathen Ave., which intersects Harris Blvd., and my house is the first house off Harris Blvd. This has been my family's residence for 17 years. With narrow driveways and limited space, residents on Harris Blvd have a great need for on-street parking. Even without bike lanes currently, visitors, service providers(contractors, electricians, plumbers, yard and construction crews, etc) and family members already are sometimes forced to park on the adjacent streets like mine. There seems to always be a construction project of some sort going on in this part of the neighborhood. Adding bike lanes to an already significant problem area will clearly only make the situation much worse. Our little street already has enough congestion as it is, and we do not need any more, which would result from this initiative. I'm a biker myself and do not believe that bike lanes on Harris will add any benefit to other bikers, and will definitely aggravate an already existing parking problem. Thank you for your consideration.</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Hi there,</p> <p>I had one question after reading all of the documentation on the new mobility draft plan. On the map view it showed an Access Management item in the Roadway System Map section, and the way it read to me it seemed as though those changes would involve removing the center turn lanes, in favor of medians? Is that correct? I've read about how center turn lanes help improve traffic efficiency and safety, so it seemed odd to make a move to remove them. Just wanted to check to make sure I read that correctly.</p> <p>Thanks!</p> <p>michael</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p data-bbox="233 191 302 215">Hello,</p> <p data-bbox="233 269 1814 370">I would like to comment on certain of the ASMP proposals for Harris Boulevard. I live in the neighborhood and have run, walked and biked on Harris over the years, probably on the order of a 100 times (and hope to continue to do so). I understand from the ASMP website maps there are two proposals for Harris — sidewalks and dedicated bike lanes.</p> <p data-bbox="233 423 1818 565">Let me address the sidewalks first. I think the most important improvement that can be made for mobility and especially for safety is to add 4 1/2 blocks of sidewalk to provide a continuous sidewalk the entire length of Harris. It would be a huge benefit to the neighborhoods of the area and I think promote a safe additional pedestrian path from Pease Park. I do not believe a dedicated bike lane could come close to the benefits that sidewalk could provide.</p> <p data-bbox="233 618 1818 873">I do not believe dedicated bike lanes are a good idea on Harris. It is not a good street for an all ages and abilities dedicated bike lane. Many have commented on the disruption that eliminating parking will cause to home owners on Harris and the adjacent streets. Like other cross streets, Hardouin, where I live is narrow and additional street parking will cause safety and other problems, especially for delivery and service trucks and for the large trucks providing city services. I have biked on many city streets with dedicated bike lanes and on-street parking. I do not believe that is possible on Harris in a functionally safe way. The safest path for bike lanes to cross Windsor is at the Jefferson/Hartford stop light (existing bike path 29). From that intersection one can get to the Johnson Creek bike path; something one could not do safely from the Windsor/Harris intersection.</p> <p data-bbox="233 927 1818 1219">With all of the stop signs on Harris, I think it is fine as it is for bicyclists. Also keep in mind it is not a well-connected street to integrate into the bike system. The south end at the Windsor intersection is not safe for a bike crossing (unless one is an experienced risk taker) and a bike lane will not improve it. The north end is a dead end. The proposed ASMP map shows a proposed blue line path extending further north. Details are difficult to see, but with the private homes and the enclosed school property in that area, not to mention the very steep terrain, making that connection to the existing Lamar/Shoal Creek unlikely based on my knowledge of the area. That Lamar/Shoal Creek path is a very good north/south path (and will be much improved when the Shoal Creek trail is repaired) and the Hartford/Jefferson path is another good north/south path connecting to the dedicated Bull Creek path. Harris in between is not needed as another dedicated path, nor can it be connected up to be a similar usable north/south one.</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Dear City Council Members,</p> <p>I am opposed to bike lanes being added to Harris Blvd, which would run directly in front of our house on Harris. Our streets are our sidewalks and with three young children it would make the neighborhood much less accessible for our family who often walks the neighborhood. Harris Blvd. is already very congested for a residential street. The street already has a huge walkability problem, and adding bike lanes will only make it worse. Speeding cars and children safety is already a concern. Please consider sidewalks in this neighborhood instead! (From everything I have read, there is a also a large gender gap in bike commuting. Please consider that providing this bike lane in the middle of a residential neighborhood will be to the detriment of parents--often women--with their children in strollers on this residential street.)</p> <p>On-street parking is also a huge concern for a residential neighborhood. One of the reasons we live where we do is because it has residential parking. While we support alternate modes of transportation, turning a residential street into a biking superhighway that will also increase car congestion and car speed while making the neighborhood less walkable is the worst of all worlds. The upside of adding a couple more blocks of bike lanes is limited and it will have serious detrimental effects for our safety and neighborhood community.</p> <p>Thank you for taking public comments on this matter under serious consideration. This proposal has already been rejected once for good reason.</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>I write in strong opposition to the proposed traffic signal at 29th Street and Jefferson. This proposal is a terrible idea and will only make traffic in my neighborhood worse.</p> <p>I have lived in Bryker Woods for nearly 20 years and used that intersection frequently. The current four-way stop sign is more than adequate to handle traffic during both morning and afternoon commute times and lighter weekend traffic. Imposing a stoplight at this intersection punishes those of us who live in the neighborhood and use that intersection during off-peak traffic hours. Why in the world would you subject a neighborhood corner like 29th and Jefferson to a traffic light on the weekends, holidays, etc. and impeding travel while we wait on a light to turn — with no one coming from the other direction? All you will end up doing is forcing people on to other streets to get around the light. And you can be sure that commuters during peak traffic times will figure out the same.</p> <p>PLEASE do not put a stoplight at 29th and Jefferson. This proposal is a waste of money and will cause problems where there currently are none.</p> <p>Thank you, (name redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Wife and I live at 1405 Ethridge av. And we walk the length of Harris Blvd twice daily. There is not enough bike traffic there to warrant bike lanes. Such lanes will divert Harris parking to our street that is already a test for service providers and guests to find parking space. Please NO BIKE LANES!</p> <p>(Name and address redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p data-bbox="233 188 1766 256">I am opposed to the proposed bike lanes on Harris Boulevard because it is already a very congested street and to deny on-street parking will make the situation far worse.</p> <p data-bbox="233 305 1818 412">The houses in this area are primarily old (my own house being 81 years old) and require continuing maintenance involving a need for parking for those doing the repairs. Many of the house have narrow driveways and parking for only single cars, which compounds the problems.</p> <p data-bbox="233 461 1812 529">It also seems odd to include only the area from Windsor Road to Ethridge, which would deny on-street parking only to those living in that section of Harris.</p> <p data-bbox="233 578 1766 607">I am also worried that if this goes into effect the impact of parking being made to shift to adjoining streets would be detrimental.</p> <p data-bbox="233 656 401 724">Sincerely, Chandler Ford</p> <p data-bbox="233 773 583 797">(Name and address redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>To supplement the comments below, stop light at 29th and Jefferson is not the issue. No need to expend resources on this. Again, this is a neighborhood. We want to keep it that way.</p> <p>To whom it may concern, My name is (name and address redacted)t. According to a post I read on Next Door, the City has plans to add bike lanes on 29th and there is a deadline of January 11 to respond. I am very strongly opposed.</p> <p>Among my concerns are the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of notice. As an affected landowner, I would have expected more direct and timely communication from the City. 2. Lack of response on pending traffic calming request. The neighborhood has been seeking traffic calming devices on 29th for almost two years. The response to this request has been slow, inefficient and unproductive. Please review your files. Even at this late date, we still do not have a response to this request. Instead, with little to no attention to the needs of the affected parties, the City proposes to exacerbate the underlying issue, by proposing a bike lane. 3. Safety. The reason for the request above was to address the speeding and safety issues we are already experiencing on 29th. First and foremost, this is a neighborhood and not a thoroughfare. It is difficult to safely cross the street or enter or exit driveways as it is. There is too much traffic already and the street is narrow. We do not need to increase traffic and add cyclists to the existing congestion of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. 4. Physical characteristic of street and neighborhood inconsistent with adding bike lane. Our driveway is a single lane driveway. Most on the street are as well. The lots on the street are narrow, making expansion difficult or infeasible. Even assuming that expansion was feasible-and it is not-the costs for doing so would be significant. There are three adults living at our home, with jobs at different locations and thus, three cars. We are already constrained with respect to parking and must use the street. What is the City's proposal to address this issue?

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>I live in the Brykerwoods neighborhood less than a block away from the intersection of 29th Street and Jefferson. I was made aware of the City's proposal to add bike lanes to 29th Street and add a stop light at the intersection with Jefferson. I cannot stress the my disapproval with this proposed plan enough. I strongly urge the City to eliminate the proposed bike lane and stop light.</p> <p>The streets in this neighborhood are primarily local traffic with very little cut-through traffic in the neighborhood. The exception to this, is 29th Street and Jefferson where some commuters will use these streets to access MoPac from campus or downtown. However, a stop light at 29th and Jefferson will not alleviate any congestion. There is never more than a few cars backed up along 29th Street, and although Jefferson can have a significant line of cars trying to access MoPac, the proposed stop light would not address the problem since the backup is due to Jefferson and Northwood intersection as well as access to MoPac itself. A stop light at this location would only serve to degrade the local neighborhood feel of these streets and provide no improvement to traffic congestion. Furthermore, there is not sufficient right-of-way to allow for turn lanes.</p> <p>Regarding the bike lane along 29th Street, I do not see this as a viable solution either. Most of these homes were built prior to cars being common, and therefore, do not have garages or sufficient driveways. Therefore, many residents are forced to park on the street. At times, this forces commuters driving in opposite directions to "take turns" using the middle of the street to weave in-between the parked cars. As a result, there is not sufficient space available for a dedicated bike lane, unless street parking was eliminated. For many homeowners along this street, that means they would be required to park on an adjacent street which could be up to 6 houses away. As a new father, I can attest to the need to be able to park as close to the front door as possible. Furthermore, dedicated bike lanes in this neighborhood are not needed. With the exception of 29th Street and Jefferson, most of the traffic is local neighborhood traffic. Any bike commuter should take their own safety into consideration when commuting via bike. There are plenty of parallel streets (30th Street, Glenview Ave, etc.) that have little to no traffic most of the time. A dedicated bike lane will encourage cyclists to join vehicular traffic and result in increased risk to all commuters. If cyclists commute one block away from these main roads, there will be less traffic and improved safety for all. When I was riding my bike work every day, I identified residential streets like 30th Street in order to avoid vehicular traffic to improve my safety with little to no impact on my commute time. This alternative route should be encourage, which is how the road system is currently designed.</p> <p>In summary, I strongly oppose both the proposed bike lane along 29th Street and the stop light at the intersection with Jefferson.</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the City's proposed bike lanes for Harris Boulevard.</p> <p>In the 10+ years of living on Ethridge Avenue, walking the neighborhood, riding in the neighborhood and traveling by car, I can honestly say there is very little bicycle traffic on Harris.</p> <p>On school days you occasionally see children riding bikes but they are on Northwood Road.</p> <p>On weekends you see adult cycling groups using Harris but they seem unbothered by cars, in fact they typically cruise through the series of stop signs without even pausing.</p> <p>The real hazard to cyclists in our neighborhood are the deep potholes and/or pavement upheavals.</p> <p>Thanks again for your letter and opportunity to offer comments.</p> <p>Lisa Dunlevy Bordelon</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>To whom it concerns-</p> <p>Our street intersects Harris Blvd (we live on (address redacted)). With their narrow driveways, Harris Ave residents will have great need to park now in front of my house. If bike lanes are placed on Harris Blvd they will be forced to park on adjacent streets like ours but we have a great need for our on-street parking for ourselves, our visitors and service providers. Thank you for your consideration</p> <p>(name and address redacted)</p> <p>78703</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello ASMP team,</p> <p>Could you please email me a copy of the ASMP maps as a PDF? I am discussing with other planning commissioners and need to print them out. I realize that sacrifices a level of detail but electronic viewing isn't feasible at this meeting.</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>I am opposed to bike lanes being placed on Harris Blvd. because, due to our narrow driveways, we need our on-street parking for ourselves, our visitors, and our service providers. Additionally, on-street parking effectively slows traffic on Harris Blvd, which is important because Harris Blvd. is now a cut thru street and traffic is heavy and tends to speed. Bike lanes would also change the character of the main artery feeding into this historic neighborhood.</p> <p>(name and address redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Thanks for your reply. We are reading the article in today's Statesman and went to your website. It is a bit confusing because Harris Blvd. has a green line on it which seems to indicate that our street is part of the Bicycle Priority Network. Can you please clarify this for us? Thanks again, (name and address redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>I am a cyclist and live on Harris Blvd. Bike lanes on Harris Blvd are a solution to a problem that simply does not exist. I have always felt safe on a bike on Harris Blvd, and bike lanes would actually make me LESS safe because I'd be required to be in it, and it would no doubt be full of pedestrians, dogs, and strollers, which I see on Harris much more often than cyclists. Slower traffic in a bike lane is actually more of a danger than riding down a neighborhood street!</p> <p>Because of our old and very narrow driveways, we need our on-street parking for ourselves, our visitors, and our service providers. The lots are small in Pemberton, and our driveways are single lane, plus we certainly don't have room for circle drives in front of our homes. So on-street parking is used daily by all of us, for visitors, workers, and sometimes ourselves. I can't imagine the congestion and parking-lot nature of our side streets – and how unhappy our neighbors would be about that – if our guests and our workers were required to park in front of THEIR houses instead of mine.</p> <p>In addition, on-street parking effectively slows traffic on Harris Blvd, which is important because Harris Blvd. is now a street that people take to avoid MoPac traffic during rush hour. Even at other times of day, traffic is heavy and tends to speed. In fact, we've been trying to get speed bumps on Harris for decades. If you want to invest in something that will increase the safety of everyone - pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers - please install speed bumps instead.</p> <p>Thank you, (name and address redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>True story - on my drive home from work one day, I stop at stop sign. As I wait for the cross traffic to pass, a cyclist approaches from behind and slams the top of my car with his fist. Since my window was down, I asked why he did that. His response was to spit on me. I am vehemently opposed to bike lanes on Harris Blvd. Cyclists are inconsiderate and do not share the road. Most cyclists I see to and from work are in spandex, so they are using the road for exercise and recreation rather than their commutes to and from work. In addition, they frequently ride side-by-side, far outside the boundaries of the bike lanes (on Exposition and Shoal Creek, for example) and are extremely hostile, confrontational, and act possessively entitled while riding on the streets. Bike lanes would change the character of the main artery feeding into our historic neighborhood, and the Shoal Creek hike/bike trail runs exactly parallel to Harris and is very close and convenient to bikers.</p> <p>Again, I am opposed to bike lanes on Harris Blvd.</p> <p>Sincerely, (name and address redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>I am opposed to bike lanes on Harris Blvd. With their narrow driveways, Harris Blvd. residents have a great need for on-street parking and bike lanes would eliminate that. Those vehicles would be forced to park on side streets like ours, and we also have a great need for on-street parking for ourselves, our visitors and service providers. Bike lanes would also change the character of the main artery feeding into this historic neighborhood.</p> <p>(name and address redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>I am opposed to bike lanes on Harris Blvd. With their narrow driveways, Harris Blvd. residents have a great need for on-street parking and bike lanes would eliminate that. Those vehicles would be forced to park on side streets like ours, and we also have a great need for on-street parking for ourselves, our visitors and service providers. Bike lanes would also change the character of the main artery feeding into this historic neighborhood.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>(name and address redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Dear Sir:</p> <p>I am writing to oppose the proposal to put City bike lanes on Harris Blvd. in Pemberton Heights.</p> <p>While bike lanes are a nice idea in the abstract, the proposal also requires prohibiting parking on Harris Blvd. This would be catastrophic for home owners on the street. Long stretches of Harris have homes that only front on Harris. Eliminating parking would prevent visitors, guests, repairmen, family members from readily accessing these homes. It would even prevent home owners from parking in front of their own homes.</p> <p>This would diminish the resale value of these homes and would ultimately impact the City's tax base. It would force on street parking onto adjacent east-west streets and inconvenience the home owners on those streets.</p> <p>This reminds me of another recent very ill-considered "traffic calming plan for the neighborhood that the Transportation Department tried to force on us several years ago. Our neighborhood mainly just wants to be left alone by your department.</p> <p>Pemberton Heights has no need for bike lanes that eliminate parking. I think this opinion is nearly universal in the neighborhood. Please don't adopt this unnecessary plan. It is a solution in search of a problem.</p> <p>(name and address redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>I am opposed to bike lanes on Harris Blvd. With their narrow driveways, Harris Blvd. residents have a great need for on-street parking and bike lanes would eliminate that. Those vehicles would be forced to park on side streets like ours, and we also have a great need for on-street parking for ourselves, our visitors and service providers. Bike lanes would also change the character of the main artery feeding into this historic neighborhood.</p> <p>(name and address redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>We are opposed to bike lanes on Harris Blvd. With their narrow driveways, Harris Blvd. residents have a great need for on-street parking and bike lanes would eliminate that. Those vehicles would be forced to park on side streets like ours, and we also have a great need for on-street parking for ourselves, our visitors and service providers. Bike lanes would also change the character of the main artery feeding into this historic neighborhood.</p> <p>(name and address redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>I am vehemently opposed to bike lanes on Harris Blvd. With their narrow driveways, Harris Blvd. residents have a great need for on-street parking and bike lanes would eliminate that. Those vehicles would be forced to park on side streets like mine, and we also have a great need for on-street parking for ourselves, our visitors and service providers. Bike lanes would also change the character of the main artery feeding into this historic neighborhood.</p> <p>As one stops to think about it, I cannot fathom the mess and inconvenience when a high school student can't park in front of his own house on Harris. A perhaps service personnel. How are lawn crews, pest control, HVAC repairmen, electricians, etc. expected to handle this? Or relatives visiting, social groups such as bridge, bible study and the like? This is going to create real problems for those on Harris but really compound the issue for side streets. This is a case of general policy over reality with the pushing of City-led initiatives such as more bikes without consideration for the actual impact in this case.</p> <p>Leave us alone please!</p> <p>(name and address redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p data-bbox="233 188 323 215">Hello ...</p> <p data-bbox="233 266 1738 334">I'm the Communications Committee chair for the Travis Country Subdivision just north of Southwest Parkway near Mopac. We publish a monthly newspaper which is hand-delivered to all 1,507 homes, reaching around 4,500 residents.</p> <p data-bbox="233 383 1812 488">I took pictures of survey crews working and leaving ribbons where Republic of Texas Blvd meets Southwest Parkway. There are also ribbons left in the curve on Boston Lane. Is this survey in active preparation for an extension of Republic of Texas across to US 290 as shown by the hatched line on your map?</p> <p data-bbox="233 537 1812 605">Also, I note on the map on your web site there is a proposed extension of Industrial Oaks over the creek to cross Southwest Parkway at Monterrey Oaks. What's it's status?</p> <p data-bbox="233 654 1545 682">Residents here are of two minds. Some want to be isolated. Others wish for both of these projects to proceed.</p> <p data-bbox="233 730 1463 758">What is the timeline for these projects? Would it take a new bond issue, or is the money already there?</p> <p data-bbox="233 807 363 834">Thank you.</p> <p data-bbox="233 883 579 951">Best, (name and address redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Adding a signal at this intersection will hurt more than help. First, there isn't an existing problem; there is minimal back-up for ~1 hour in the evening. Second, when there is minimal congestion, it's caused by back-up coming from the intersection 2 blocks away at Jefferson St. and Northwood Road (which is the more logical location for a new traffic signal, although I wouldn't necessarily say that's warranted either). Nevertheless, the issues caused by traffic backup from this neighboring intersection will not go away with the installation of a traffic signal on 29th and Jefferson. Moreover, traffic flow may actually get worse if the backup from the neighboring intersection reaches all the way to the new signal and the light changes with nowhere for cars to go. The natural traffic flow at the current 4-way stop at Jefferson and 29th is free flowing for ~23 hours/day and installing a traffic light risks disrupting that. I cannot understand the rationale for this proposed signal and would suggest it be re-analyzed to avoid making a non-existent or minimal problem worse. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>(name and address redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>i am strongly opposed to the bike lanes workers at houses in the proposed area would have no parking and we have to much traffic on harris now without a bunch of bad riding bikers.(name and address redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello,</p> <p>We own a residence at (address redacted) and heard about some mobility plan in the works for Harris Blvd (78703) where there would be plans to put a bike lane along Harris Blvd. We are vehemently opposed to any sort of bike lane design that imposes a no-parking zone, or encourages any type of faster cut-through of our neighborhood, not to mention the incredible safety concerns it would bring.</p> <p>Please confirm receipt of this opposition and that is filed accordingly.</p> <p>(name and address redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>I am a resident of Harris Blvd and oppose the plan to adding bike lanes at this time for two reasons:</p> <p>i) There are no side walks on the portion of Harris Blvd where you plan to add bike lanes. Current on-street parking on Harris Blvd slows cut-through traffic because the street is effectively one lane wide where there are parked cars. The cut-through traffic flows quite quickly where unobstructed by parked cars. The hazard to pedestrians will be considerable if there is bike traffic + high speed vehicle traffic + no sidewalks.</p> <p>I AM ONE OF A NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD WHO WALKS TO WORK (AT THE UNIVERSITY IN MY CASE). PEDESTRIANS ARE AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE TRANSPORTATION MIX TOO AND ARGUABLY THE GREENEST PART!</p> <p>THIS CHANGE WOULD FORCE ME TO TO START DRIVING TO WORK AS IT WOULD BE TOO DANGEROUS TO WALK ALONG HARRIS BLVD DURING RUSH HOUR. (BECAUSE OF THE CUT THROUGH TRAFFIC IT ALREADY REQUIRES ALERTNESS.) I CAN SAY WITH SOME CONFIDENCE SINCE I WALK ALONG THIS PORTION OF HARRIS TWICE EVERY DAY THAT THERE IS MORE PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC ON THE STREET THAN BIKE TRAFFIC, INCLUDING MANY PEOPLE WORKING IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD WHO WALK FROM NEARBY BUS STOPS. ADDING BIKE LANES AND REMOVING PARKING WOULD BE A MOVE AWAY FROM MAKING AUSTIN A MORE WALKABLE CITY.</p> <p>PLEASE DO NOT ADD BIKE LANES TO THIS PART OF HARRIS BLVD UNTIL THERE ARE CONTINUOUS SIDE WALKS ALONG THE STREET !!!</p> <p>ii) Like many other residents of Harris Blvd my wife and I cannot park both of our vehicles in our drive way. We will be forced to park on neighboring side streets which are already often effectively single lane because of parked cars.</p> <p>Sincerely, (name and address redacted) ☒</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p data-bbox="233 188 537 219">To whom it may concern:</p> <p data-bbox="233 266 747 297">Proposed W 29th St. Buffered Bicycle Lane:</p> <p data-bbox="233 344 1822 451">I understand that the City of Austin is requesting input from residents on the bike plan proposal for W 29th Street in the Brykerwoods neighborhood in Austin. The streets affected are 38th, 34th, 29th, Harris, Jefferson, and Northwood. The plan proposes changing the designation on 29th street from Shared Lane to Buffered Bicycle Lane.</p> <p data-bbox="233 498 1749 605">I am currently residing with my elderly mother at a home I co-own on the proposed W. 29th Street bicycle lane route. My usual residence is one house off of W. 29th St. on Glenview Avenue, currently occupied by other family members. Both residents of (address redacted). are opposed to the redesignation.</p> <p data-bbox="233 652 1770 721">Because of small lot sizes, the neighborhood has limited on premises parking capacity. City of Austin impervious ground cover restrictions discourage creation of additional on premises parking. Street parking is therefore essential for residents of the street.</p> <p data-bbox="233 768 1766 911">Further, uncontrolled speeding on this section of W. 29th St. has been and, despite neighbor attempts, continues to be a serious issue. Clearing on-street parking will make this situation worse and will create more hazardous conditions for residents as well as bikers who might choose to use the redesignated lanes. Bicycle lanes would be much better situated on lighter use neighboring east/west streets, such as Mohle and W. 30th St., on which uncontrolled speeding is less of an issue.</p> <p data-bbox="233 958 726 989">W. 29th St. at Jefferson Road Traffic Light</p> <p data-bbox="233 1036 1822 1219">I understand that feedback has also been requested for a proposed traffic light at W. 29th St. and Jefferson Road. I am in favor of that proposal. That is a very dangerous intersection, and very heavily used during traffic rush hours. Many drivers unfortunately do not seem to understand proper use of 4 way stops, and consistently proceed through the intersection 'out of turn.' This creates uncertainty among other users and has led to accidents. During non-rush hours, it is not unusual for traffic to ignore the stop signs entirely and drive through the intersection without stopping at all. I think the presence of a light would be helpful in resolving both of</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p data-bbox="233 191 537 219">To whom it may concern:</p> <p data-bbox="233 267 1793 375">My wife(name and address redacted)Wathen Avenue, which intersects Harris Blvd. three blocks north of Windsor Road. Lydia and I recently learned that the City of Austin proposes to add bicycle lanes on Harris from Windsor Road to Ethridge Lane. We strongly object to this proposed action by the City for at least the following reasons:</p> <ol data-bbox="233 423 1808 837" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="233 423 1808 565">1. The proposed bike lanes will be very dangerous for cyclists to use. Harris is a very narrow street and will not allow reasonably safe and sufficient space for increased bicycle use and rapidly increasing automobile use. Unfortunately, Harris is now heavily used by motorists seeking to avoid bumper to bumper automobile traffic on Mopac. This will only get worse in the future and more dangerous for cyclists and motorists. <li data-bbox="233 574 1713 643">2. Harris dead ends into Windsor, which is a street that is completely unsatisfactory and incredibly dangerous for bicycle use. Encouraging cyclists to use or even cross Windsor would be dangerous and irresponsible. <li data-bbox="233 652 1808 760">3. Many people who work on construction projects, landscaping, housekeeping and yard work must park on the streets of our neighborhood, including Harris. Eliminating parking on Harris will be a major problem those people because they must be able to get their equipment and materials to the places where they work. <li data-bbox="233 769 1776 837">4. Harris and connecting streets have narrow driveways, and the residents need on-street parking for themselves, visitors, and for people who work in the neighborhood. <p data-bbox="233 886 1199 914">Therefore, I respectfully request that the City not add bicycle lanes to Harris Blvd.</p> <p data-bbox="233 963 709 990">Thank you for considering our concerns.</p> <p data-bbox="233 1039 579 1107">Sincerely, (name and address redacted)</p> <p data-bbox="233 1156 1818 1224">Notice: This transmission may be (i) subject to attorney-client privilege, (ii) attorney work product, or (iii) strictly confidential. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please do not disclose, print, copy or disseminate this transmission or the information</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>ASMP Team,</p> <p>I wanted to provide some feedback on your plans for transportation improvements in Austin.</p> <p>I think you've good a good framework here but recommend in the strongest possible terms that you eliminate all bicycle amenities. They only serve a small fraction of the commuting and traveling public while taking away precious roadway space from vehicular traffic.</p> <p>Not to mention the tendency of cyclists to ignore traffic laws which endangers themselves and others.</p> <p>Please continue full speed ahead with roadway and pedestrian improvements.</p> <p>(name redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Allow “No parking minimums” as a rule in some parts of the city or for developments of some types. Minneapolis allows no parking minimums throughout the city, as I understand it.</p> <p>Dick Kallerman Austin Sierra Club</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>I think it is good that this group is planning for future transportation needs in Austin.</p> <p>I am 100% opposed to making Escarpment Boulevard a 4 lane road.</p> <p>We all need to wait and see how the improvements at Slaughter and Mopac, La Crosse and Mopac, and 45 SW alleviate existing traffic issues in the area before converting a neighborhood street into a major 4 lane road.</p> <p>Please feel free to contact me if you would like to discuss my input further.</p> <p>Thanks, (name and address redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Would like to convert E 5th from 2 way to 1 way. With all the reconstruction and new development, parking, scooter expansion, it is very narrow and dangerous</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	Widen 2222. Widen Burnet road south of HEB. Also, we should incentivize semitrucks (and automobiles as well) to use SH 130 and get off I-35. Maybe giving some sort of frequent use discount, or discount for driving the whole length of SH 130, with the idea being that you otherwise would have taken I-35.
ASMP Inbox	<p>Wants to see W. Anderson Ln as another future mobility corridor to study, because it is an Imagine Austin corridor and center; entire corridor should be looked at together, both east and west of Burnet Rd.</p> <p>Disagrees with making Wootne Rd a new roadway connection, because it already has active transportation facilities there and is already a Quiet Zone for the rail. Believes a new roadway connection here would disincentivize walking and bicycling. Related, wants a bike/ped connection at the end of Wooten Rd to connect past 183 (because there is a Tier II Urban Trail indicated there). The Tier II Urban Trail should also connect to the North Lamar Transit Center.</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Drivers should not be able to leave vehicles that are running/in-service for breaks, and it should be a felony offense to do so.</p> <p>Bathrooms at the Cap Metro Transit Store downtown should be open for public use, or at least for use by those visiting the Transit Store to be served. If the bathrooms are not made available for public use, they should be welded shut for no one's use. This is because they are paid for with tax payer money and because people with certain disabilities need access to them per state law.</p> <p>Restore routes 392 and 240. Disability Rights Texas HQ was built where it is partially because of these routes and nearby CommUnity Care. Also, CommUnity Care's board did not receive notification of Cap Remap. This is also a location for people to vote at in elections.</p> <p>Cap Metro should cut management staff if money is tight, not cut routes. They should also have partnered with HEB as their food pantry partner, not Whole Foods, because HEB is right next to Cap Metro HQ and because it is cheaper than Whole Foods.</p>
ASMP Inbox	Wants to see safety and mobility improvements for all modes along FM 969. Especially wants to see transit service extend farther east along FM 969, as people currently in Austin's Colony have to walk an extremely long way to get to a bus stop.

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p data-bbox="233 188 1829 334">Hi. I am the President for Milwood Neighborhood Assoc. (a neighborhood of over 1700 households off of Parmer and Amherst). From the feedback we have received from our residents and those of Walnut Crossing, Preston Oaks, and Northwood neighborhoods, I am reaching out to respectfully request that an area be ranked as high priority for the sidewalk needs on your Sidewalk System Map for the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan.</p> <p data-bbox="233 383 1814 448">It is a stretch on the South side of Parmer from Ganymede to Amherst. An area that allows connection for our area to the pharmacy, shopping center, library, park, community garden and 142 Metric Flyer bus stops.</p> <p data-bbox="233 496 1818 602">Currently there is a small strip of sidewalk from Ganymede to the entrance of the first parking lot then nothing else. In addition there is a crosswalk from the North side of Parmer at Silver Creek Dr and then it drops the users into a parking lot entrance with no where to go but down into the parking, no sidewalk at all.</p> <p data-bbox="233 651 1803 716">It is a well used route that is quite dangerous for the pedestrians and cyclists and also with the lack of sidewalk it very much isolates residents from the community and forces them into their cars unnecessarily.</p> <p data-bbox="233 764 768 797">Please see attached for a better explanation.</p> <p data-bbox="233 846 1803 911">In addition we would also ask that the city add a very small one house length stretch of sidewalk on the west side of Silver Creek Dr. just after the intersection of Silver Creek Dr and W. Parmer Ln. to more fully complete the connectivity for the area and safety.</p> <p data-bbox="233 959 1793 1024">Thank you so much for your consideration on placing this small stretch of missing sidewalk to HIGH priority. Please call or email me with any questions.</p> <p data-bbox="233 1073 1205 1138">Our area is very excited about the possibility of having this sidewalk gap resolved. (name redacted)</p>



Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello,</p> <p>The draft Strategic Master Plan shows the extension of S Bay Lane eastward to form an intersection with S Mopac, in addition to extension of Dahlgreen Avenue to S Bay Lane. Could you provide an explanation on why these particular roadways were identified for inclusion within the ASMP?</p> <p>Thank you in advance for any information you can provide.</p> <p>Best regards, (name redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I just became aware of the mobility plan and comments. Although the comment period has closed, I hope you will consider these requests.</p> <p>We desperately need a sidewalk along both sides of Silver Creek Dr for the first block; currently the sidewalk only extends to Parmer on the east side, and the traffic crossing is on the west side, so pedestrians (including children) who want to stay on the sidewalk as long as possible have to cross Silver Creek close to Parmer, which means vehicles entering or exiting the neighborhood on this street could hit them - and this is the only entrance to Parmer with a traffic light so it is heavily used by the nearly 900 homes in this corner of Parmer/MoPac.</p> <p>Additionally, a sidewalk extension along the blocks from Ganymede to Amherst on the South side of Parmer Lane would similarly be a huge safety improvement. And one more request: We need to increase the capacity of the exit from Southbound Mopac at the Duval exit to match the increase in traffic to the Domain.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration. This will be a huge improvement in this part of town.</p> <p>(name redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Allow “No parking minimums” as a rule in some parts of the city or for developments of some types. Minneapolis allows no parking minimums throughout the city, as I understand it.</p> <p>(name redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p data-bbox="233 188 302 217">Hello,</p> <p data-bbox="233 266 1283 295">I am a homeowner in Walnut Crossing near Parker and Amherst. For your consideration:</p> <ul data-bbox="233 344 1730 526" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="233 344 1730 412">- We desperately need sidewalk along both sides of Silver Creek Dr for the first block, and along the blocks from Ganymede to Amherst on the South side of Parmer Lane. <li data-bbox="233 461 1730 526">- We need to increase the capacity of the exit from Southbound Mopac at the Duval exit to match the increase in traffic to the Domain. <p data-bbox="233 574 579 604">(name and address redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p data-bbox="233 610 386 639">ASMP Team,</p> <p data-bbox="233 688 1341 717">I wanted to provide some feedback on your plans for transportation improvements in Austin.</p> <p data-bbox="233 766 1797 870">I think you've good a good framework here but recommend in the strongest possible terms that you eliminate all bicycle amenities. They only serve a small fraction of the commuting and traveling public while taking away precious roadway space from vehicular traffic.</p> <p data-bbox="233 919 1446 948">Not to mention the tendency of cyclists to ignore traffic laws which endangers themselves and others.</p> <p data-bbox="233 997 1163 1026">Please continue full speed ahead with roadway and pedestrian improvements.</p> <p data-bbox="233 1075 428 1104">(name redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Hi!</p> <p>I'm sorry I missed the Mobility Plan feedback from the city. I wasn't aware of this until after the due date BUT I'm hoping that this email will still be read and considered.</p> <p>Myself, and others, in my neighborhood and surrounding area would benefit greatly by having a sidewalk in specific areas on Parmer lane. Here is the request that would greatly improve our mobility to access businesses nearby safely:</p> <p>-Sidewalk along both sides of Silver Creek Dr for the first block, and along the blocks from Ganymede to Amherst on the South side of Parmer Lane.</p> <p>Additionally, with the traffic increase near the Duval exit due to the Domain, it needs some attention to improve the flow and safety for all individuals whether heading home or to the domain. (ie. Increase the capacity of the exit from Southbound Mopac at the Duval exit.)</p> <p>Thank you for your time!</p> <p>(name and address redacted) ?</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am a resident of the Milwood neighborhood right behind the shopping. Center on Parmer and Amherst. As a community, we've been talking and we have agreed there need to be a few changes. We desperately need sidewalks along both sides of Silver Creek Dr for the first block, and along the blocks from Ganymede to Amherst on the South side of Parmer Lane, We need to increase the capacity of the exit from Southbound Mopac at the Duval exit to match the increase in traffic to the Domain. I would like to personally request that the exit ramp for Duval/Burnet heading Northbound on Mopac have the white border sticks put up so people can't cross the solid white line and cut into to the domain. The same thing for the drive way leaving the domain. People cut over these lines or stop in the middle of the exit ramp till they can cut across to the domain instead of going down and turning around or waiting till the next ramp to get on Mopac. It causes man accidents and there are never police there to enforce the solid white line law. My brother was exiting one time and someone cutting over to the entrance ramp pulled out in front of him in the rain. My brother told us he knew if he didn't crash his truck into the barrier, he would have killed that man. He was only 17 at the time. The fact that he had to make such a quick decision to sacrifice his safety for someone else's life because they were careless enough to not follow the law, is terrifying. I get that comes with driving, but this particular stretch of service road is dangerous. It happens everyday without fail. Please help us do something about it by putting up the barriers at the least.</p> <p>Thank you for your time, (name redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>-We desperately need sidewalks along both sides of Silver Creek Dr. for the first block, and alog the blocks from Ganymede to Amherst on the South side of Parmer Lane.</p> <p>Bonus Request:</p> <p>-We need to increase the capacity of the exit from Southbound Mopac at the Duval exit to match the increase in traffic to the Domain.</p> <p>Thanks for taking the time!</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>We desperately need sidewalk along both sides of Silver Creek Dr for the first block, and along the blocks from Ganymede to Amherst on the South side of Parmer Lane.</p> <p>We need to increase the capacity of the exit from Southbound Mopac at the Duval exit to match the increase in traffic to the Domain.</p> <p>(name and address redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>We desperately need sidewalk along both sides of Silver Creek Dr for the first block, and along the blocks from Ganymede to Amherst on the South side of Parmer Lane.</p> <p>Bonus Request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We need to increase the capacity of the exit from Southbound Mopac at the Duval exit to match the increase in traffic to the Domain.
ASMP Inbox	<p>To whom it may concern-</p> <p>I am a recent homeowner in the Millwood neighborhood and would like to pass along the following:</p> <p>We have an unfortunate lack of accessibility along the few blocks of Parmer for our neighborhoods due to MISSING SIDEWALKS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We desperately need sidewalk along both sides of Silver Creek Dr for the first block, and along the blocks from Ganymede to Amherst on the South side of Parmer Lane. <p>Bonus Request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We need to increase the capacity of the exit from Southbound Mopac at the Duval exit to match the increase in traffic to the Domain. <p>Thanks for your time, (name redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Mayor Adler,</p> <p>I do not agree with the ASMP plans for Jollyville Road. The neighborhoods surrounding Jollyville Road were built with automobiles in mind. Jollyville Road is a major road with many businesses that residents access. Fifty percent of the time when I run errands, I access Jollyville Road. Changing the median to a raised median will cause congestion and accidents. The ASMP is supposed to solve problems. Eliminating the center lane is creating problems. I have lived in the neighborhood for 29 years, and I don't know of one resident who agrees with the proposed changes. Please reconsider.</p> <p>I tried to leave comments on the ASMP website, but after hours of navigating, I gave up!</p> <p>I also don't agree with a raised medium on Burnet Road or any other major road. It's dangerous and insane.</p> <p>No district found for the address provided. ?</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Hi!</p> <p>I know this is past the deadline, but I would like to provide comment on the map--particularly regarding the transit options in NW and Central Austin.</p> <p>It would be very useful if you guys could provide more options for those of us with kids to drop off South of 183 and Mopac. I would love to take the kids and use a park and ride for the rest of my drive in. There are no good options (say around the Far West/Hart Lane area) where I could park and use transit. If there were a transit garage that was free of charge for bus riders, with an express option to UT/downtown, that would be great.</p> <p>Thanks!</p> <p>(name redacted) </p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello, I was looking at the map below and noticed something odd.</p> <p>https://austin.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapJournal/index.html?appid=68e40fc5942d4b06b2b6e5e0b5c415ad&folderid=daa08e09f6c1457e8e1cc6dbdb3a2d0c#</p> <p>You have a new road proposal to expand Howard Rd all the way to Bolm Road. Are you aware the 183 bridge over Bolm has been demolished and will not be rebuilt? There will be no way to cross 183 at Bolm.</p> <p>--</p> <p>(name redacted) </p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>I, a resident of 29th Street, strongly protest the City proposal to create buffered bicycle lanes on 29th Street, and the proposal to add a stop light at Jefferson and 29th.</p> <p>The proposed stretch of 29th Street is a strictly residential street, but has become one of a number of streets that serve as an East/West highway between Mopac and the rest of the city. The proposed changes would increase traffic speed endangering the many neighborhood residents who walk on 29th Street, raise children and pets, and back their cars onto this small neighborhood street. Anything that increases traffic speed is a cause for extreme alarm. Because buffered bike lanes unlike our current Bike Ln PK situation generally do not allow parking, and parking has long been considered a means of slowing traffic on 29th, I very strongly protest such a proposal.</p> <p>Currently, Northwood Street (2 streets south of W 29th Street) has traffic calming humps. While this City determination significantly reduces the through traffic on Northwood between the University and its neighborhoods and Mopac, it significantly increases the traffic on 29th Street without traffic calming humps. Bikers traveling on Northwood to Woolridge would be much safer on this route than on the busier 29th and Jefferson Streets.</p> <p>I further question why two streets so close to each other should be designated as buffered bike lanes, particularly when one would offer more safety. Not only is Northwood a wider street than 29th Street, Northwood can actually be reached quite easily and more safely from the south via the Shoal Creek Hike and Bike Trail intersection with Shoal Creek Boulevard than the worst choice of all, the steep hilled and winding 29th Street. Northwood clearly is more appropriate for a buffered east/west bike lane.</p> <p>Regarding the addition of a light at 29th Street and Jefferson, I can only wonder why the City would want to spend funds to install a light where one is not needed at all. I use the existing 4 way stop frequently every day and have had not a single problem with this low cost remedy of traffic management in the past decade and simply do not understand a rationale for adding an expensive light. It also seems such a light would encourage regular users of 29th Street to Jefferson Street to turn instead on Woolridge or Harris to go via Northwood to Mopac or beyond. The proposed signal light would simply make matters worse by causing traffic to avoid this inconvenience by darting through quieter residential streets.</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>My name is (name and address redacted_, which is located between Harris Blvd. and Jefferson Ave.</p> <p>For over a year I have been a contact for my neighbors on 29th St. with the City Transportation Department regarding traffic mitigation on our street. 29th through our neighborhood is a residential street. We all back out of driveways on to 29th to depart our homes by automobile. Our main concern is increasing speed and traffic on our residential street. The former plan for traffic mitigation is being revised. We do not know how the new plan will affect our traffic.</p> <p>This email is to provide information to you regarding my thoughts about the 2014 Bicycle Plan proposals. Do the suggestions you present affect the speed or traffic? I would like your consideration of this question in approving your implementation of changes, if any.</p> <p>My opinions after some discussions and research are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Leave the bicycle designation on 29th Street from Jefferson to Lamar as is. I am not clear what "Bike Ln Pk" means as your information sheet does not explain it and I could not find its definition in the Bicycle Plan 2014. On-street parking is needed on our street. 2) If a light at Jefferson and 29th would slow and decrease traffic in our neighborhood, I support it. <p>Thank you for requesting my input. ☺</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>To Whom It May Concern</p> <p>I am hoping that I can get some questions answered that have come up with the draft plan that was sent out for comments.</p> <p>1. This plan shows Barstow Ave being extended to Davis. Question – that parcel of land was deed to the HOA and is park land. Is this a plan that should have been removed and has not been.</p> <p>2. The map shows South Bay Lane being extend to MoPac. Question – the ownership of the property makes us wonder again if this should have been removed and just has not been.</p> <p>3. The proposed along Escarpment is very vague and I am sure that you have seen the overwhelming negative feedback on this. Question – Do you have any additional information on what is being proposed?</p> <p>Feel free to contact me here at the office or via email</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>(name and address redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p data-bbox="233 188 306 215">Hello!</p> <p data-bbox="233 266 1818 370">As an Austin resident, I strongly encourage the City of Austin to eliminate all parking minimums from its zoning code throughout the entire city and establish parking maximums for new development. This is potentially the most important policy step the City can take toward a more sustainable future.</p> <p data-bbox="233 420 306 448">It will:</p> <ul data-bbox="233 459 1562 678" style="list-style-type: none"> - remove a massive bias and subsidy toward single or low occupant vehicles - support demand for public transit and active transportation - improve the physical health of residents by increasing active movement and reduce air pollution - slow consumption of land for low efficiency impervious surfaces such as parking lots and vehicular travel lanes - allow for more compact development that is both transit supportive, bikeable, and walkable - and more. <p data-bbox="233 729 1824 797">A second suggestion is to get started on a light rail line from downtown to the airport. Don't put it out for vote, just be leaders and do it. It will be popular and will serve as a catalyst for building out more high capacity transit services throughout the City.</p> <p data-bbox="233 847 1667 915">A third suggestion is to limit or freeze new road construction and redirect those funds toward investing in legitimate BRT infrastructure: dedicated lanes, sign prioritization, off bus ticketing, platform stations, etc.</p> <p data-bbox="233 966 1824 1070">A fourth suggestion is to partner with AV companies to deploy shared-use and multiple occupant AVs in smaller fixed routes in high density areas such as downtown. This should be done in tandem with strict regulation or prohibition of single occupant / single owner AVs from operating in the City.</p> <p data-bbox="233 1120 1824 1188">A fifth is to partner with the county to increase the cost of licensing and registration for trucks and other large passenger vehicles that are dangerous to bikes, pedestrians, and smaller vehicles and more expensive to accommodate on public infrastructure.</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p data-bbox="233 188 1220 220">Regarding the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan, please accept the following feedback:</p> <ol data-bbox="233 269 1822 1024" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="233 269 1822 334">1. The ultimate goal of the ASMP should be to reduce individual Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and increase shared or active transit use / miles. <li data-bbox="233 342 1822 407">2. As a critical price of transportation demand management, parking minimums should be removed across the entire city to better utilize existing supply and encourage alternative transportation that does not require such intensive land use. <li data-bbox="233 415 1822 561">3. In any roadway project: dedicated bus / service vehicle lanes should be prioritized to increase bus efficiency and ridership; protected bike / scooter lanes should be provided to encourage and buffer riders of all ages and abilities; and these improvements should be made possible by lane width reductions to 10' lanes maximum and lane reductions where in excess of two lanes in a non-highway condition. Refer NACTO guidelines on lane configurations and widths. <li data-bbox="233 570 1822 634">3. Citizen health, safety, social equity, and carbon emission reductions should always be raised to justify these improvements and complaints of traffic should be countered with studies of induced demand. <li data-bbox="233 643 1822 789">4. Redesigns (restoring / reconstruction) to slow car speeds on non-highway roads to 30 MPH or less should be prioritized to make streets safer for vulnerable road users. The city's Vision Zero policy needs more focus on design vs. enforcement / education because everywhere I go, cars and trucks continue to speed despite knowledge or threat as the many streets of Austin were designed decades ago to encourage high speeds. <li data-bbox="233 797 1822 1024">5. Specific need that I am familiar with: 5th and 6th street one way couplets, specifically the stretches from Lamar to Mopac, are incredibly dangerous for bikers and pedestrians. I walk and bike these roads multiple times a week and cars and trucks are regularly speeding due to poor design. Three lanes each way encourage vehicular speeding, particularly as cars approach Mopac. Kids walking to and from Austin high / people walking to the town lake trail are regularly made unsafe when accessing connecting trails, as is anyone else not in a car. Recommend returning these streets to two way along with lane reductions and protected bike / scooter lanes, to minimize conflicts and slow speeds. <p data-bbox="233 1073 432 1138">Thank you, (name redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I want to make some comments on the Mobility Plan.</p> <p>I think there needs to be clear commitments on policies like transit priority and parking "right-sizing." Buses should get dedicated or at least priority lanes on the most important corridors, starting with Guadalupe. Minimum Parking requirements should be eliminated in most or all of the city and parking maximums considered.</p> <p>My husband was hit on his bike at 12th and Pleasant Valley. Please fully implement the bike plan as written: do not compromise in the name of feasibility.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>(name redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	Reduce parking minimums
ASMP Inbox	<p>The absolute core requirement of the ASMP is it must give residents the greatest possible flexibility to travel by the best mode choice for them, including all externalities. This means that expanding bike, walking, (scooter) and high capacity mass transit options and not encoding automobiles as privileged options with requirements like parking minimums or excessively wide and dangerous streets. We need to offer a built environment where it doesn't require a car to go from where the majority of people are to the majority of their destinations, which include downtown, UT, and major employers including the neighborhoods along Lamar, Guadeloupe and South First. There should be abundant bike, sidewalk and transit options all over those areas and allow appropriately large buildings to support more people living a compact and connected life.</p> <p>(name and address redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p data-bbox="233 190 1829 334">Dear Team ASMP, My wife (name redacted) are the owners and residents of (address redacted). We understand today as the deadline to voice any concerns about the currently contemplated Austin Mobility Plan – more specifically the proposed Bicycle Priority Network and how it may or may not effect Harris Blvd.</p> <p data-bbox="233 381 1829 568">Laura Dierenfield was nice enough to return(name redacted)’s call and send us an email that explained the current status of the plan, and that there was no cold hard “plan” in place that would start implementing changes to our street. We understand that things need to be vetted, coordinated, approved, funded etc before anything happens, and that we would be brought into the process at some point. As designers we also understand that as this city grows at its current pace, city planners need to address traffic, density, mobility, affordability and a myriad of other concerns or else things will get worse, not better. That’s the big picture.</p> <p data-bbox="233 615 1829 911">Our small picture, though, has to do with where we live everyday. We believe that the mopac improvements have sent cut-through traffic into streets like Harris and made them much busier. While we would love to see a sidewalk, maybe even a speed bump here and there, we worry about the increasing traffic on our street. A “quiet street” design could attempt to help this concern, but any plan that takes away parking on the street because of a bike lane really does the following:</p> <ul data-bbox="233 768 1829 911" style="list-style-type: none"> - sends parked cars to side streets along the route and crowds those secondary streets - enables more cutting through and increases speeds along Harris since there is nothing to slow anyone down - given the narrow width of Harris only makes things less safe. Widening to deal with volume will only make Harris faster and more dangerous. <p data-bbox="233 958 1829 1027">We are not ignorant to the changes happening here. We just think that a cumbersome, slow, neighborhood street beats by a mile creating any sort of default byway through our neighborhood.</p> <p data-bbox="233 1075 1829 1144">Thanks for your consideration. (name redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>To whom it concerns: Thank you for your hard work on the Strategic Mobility Plan and thank you for reading my comments. The current draft of the ASMP represents a big step towards a more multimodal Austin. I am confident with some more work and revision, we can make an even better plan. As I'm sure you know, the goal of a twenty first century transportation plan should be to transition from autocentric mobility to a true multimodal transportation system. Car dependency has failed: we have a system that costs billions of dollars, kills 30,000 people a year, pumps catastrophic amounts of green house gases into the air, and doesn't even achieve its basic goal - induced demand means we can never truly eliminate congestion. Getting away from this system is imperative if Austin is going to The draft ASMP policies take some important steps towards this goal, but does not go far enough. I am concerned, though, that without specific goals attached to them, they will not go far enough. Here are comments on specific policies: System Design: Street design is critical for safe speed. I would like to see this policy commit to specific design speeds that will protect life. I am troubled that the intersection you show on this page is Lamar/Palmer one of the most dangerous intersections in the city - note the incredible road width, the slip lanes. and speed limits in the 50s. This is a system designed to maximize as many multi-ton vehicles moving as quickly as possible, not ensure safety or accessibility for anyone. Land Use Policies - General Comment: This section says the right things, but needs specifics to have effect. Imagine Austin's "compact and connected" could not translate to specific policies in CodeNext, something well-intentioned but vague like "Promote Transit Supportive Densities along Transit Priority Corridors" might not translate to concrete policies. Austin Transportation Department will not have control over land use, but the Planning Department will do nothing without specific direction. Land Use POLICY 1 Promote transit-supportive densities along the Transit Priority Network - Needs more specifics, such as Upzone parcels along the Transit Priority Network; reduce parking Land Use POLICY 4 Minimize the impact of development on the roadway system by prioritizing multimodal solutions - California recently enacted a statewide policy that replaced Transportation Impacts Analyses based on Level of Service with TIA based on VMT. I believe that ATD is currently revising its TIA rules, but it would be great to see the ASMP formally commit to eliminating Level of Service as a metric. Parking Policies: POLICY 1 Efficiently use existing parking supply - It would be good to see a commitment here to pricing parking. Free parking leads to unregulated demand, incentivizes driving, and imposes inequitable costs on non-car users. POLICY 2 Right-size future parking supply to encourage sustainable trip options-- This policy needs specific commitments: eliminate parking minima or, ideally, enact parking maxima. Otherwise, "right-size" could mean almost anything. Transportation Demand Management: TDM is a critical strategy to reducing autocentricity. It should be required of every new development. The city can lead by example, but it can also pass regulations. It should do both. Even if the new TIA regulations will require TDM, this should still be enshrined as a policy in the long term mobility plan. Smart Mobility: This section should have a policy about allocating additional right of way to smart mobility options. "Smart" mobility options that are stuck in the same traffic as "dumb" mobility options. Vehicles: POLICY 3 Increase the person-carrying capacity of the highway system -- As AURA noted in its comments, " "prioritizing multimodal solutions" and a "culture of safety" are not necessarily compatible with "increasing highway person-carrying capacity," since highways are the locus of a large percentage of our automotive-related deaths and serious injuries." Public Transportation: Robust public transportation is critical to a 21st century mobility system. The policies here sound good but should commit to specific items, rather than broad strokes. This should include a commitment to funding public transportation. POLICY 1 Give public transportation priority ---Priority treatments include a wide range of treatments, from a queue jump to a full lane. The ASMP should commit to the highest level of transit priority, especially on corridors where public transportation serves as many or more people as cars. POLICY 2 Enhance commuter public transportation service --- Unfortunately, commuter service is the least efficient use of public transportation dollars. Care should be taken to ensure that city spending on public transportation is equitable. Bicycle System: POLICY 2 Complete the All Ages and Abilities Bicycle Network - I am confused by the word "feasible" in this policy. Does this mean the city is abandoning the 2012 bicycle master plan for one deemed more feasible? Urban Trail System: General comment: The urban trail system is important, but it should not be considered a replacement for an on-street bicycle network. On-road bike improvement should not be pre-empted by nearby urban trails, since the two do not serve the same purpose. Air and Climate: This section will not work without specific commitments. Measures like highway widenings and parking requirements are incompatible with reducing greenhouse gas emissions and protecting the climate. In 2017, Austin was already behind on its transportation emissions goals for its climate action plan - this language will not get us there. A meaningful policy would do something like "If emissions have not declined to a certain point, Austin will stop all road expansions" or Austin will implement congestion pricing" or "Austin will give priority to transit on every street". Land and Ecology: It is disheartening and counterproductive to this goal to see the large number of road widenings in Southwest Austin. The city decided in the 90s that growth in this area needed to be discouraged in order to protect Barton Springs. But transportation planning that widens road is effectively planning for growth in that area. Specifically, the plan should not have widenings on FM 1826, Old Bee Cave Road, Barton Creek Boulevard, and Hwy 290. The Oak Hill Parkway must be carefully implemented so as to minimize environmental impact, including fro the growth it will induce. Aviation: To the greatest extent possible, the transportation improvements to the airport should be funded out of the Airport's own budget rather than Austin Transportation Department. Half of Austinites do not fly in any given year and it is inequitable for them to have to</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Good evening,</p> <p>I am writing to register my opposition to widening Escarpment Blvd through Circle C. This project is inconsistent with a neighborhood street and would create unsafe and hazardous conditions for residents and children in the area. Please do not pursue this project.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>(name and address redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p data-bbox="235 190 1304 219">First, let me state that I work and walk downtown, where we have SO MANY SCOOTERS....</p> <p data-bbox="235 266 1514 295">And now they have been appearing everywhere around my home (around South 1st and Ben White Blvd)....</p> <p data-bbox="235 342 1818 487">I am very worried about safety (or the lack of) with these scooters. I feel these should be RELEGATED TO THE STREET ONLY - NOT SIDEWALKS. I cannot tell you how many times walking downtown I have been almost bowled over by scooters going the max 15mph, and with my mobility challenges I cannot move out of the way fast enough - and that's assuming I can see them coming toward me and not from behind.</p> <p data-bbox="235 534 1310 563">If we must have scooters, PLEASE REGULATE THEM SO THEY MUST TRAVEL IN THE STREET.</p> <p data-bbox="235 610 1377 639">I would be happy to participate in whatever panel or discussion group you have about this issue.</p> <p data-bbox="235 686 579 716">(name and address redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>ASMP, Please consider the following suggestions to improve traffic flow & safety. On major roadways like Lamar, Burnet, Braker, Airport, Enfield, 38th, 45th, Koenig:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Time the lights; *Remove suicide lanes; add medians & restrict left turns; *Remove bike lanes & widen vehicle lanes; *Remove empty buses from schedule; provide small shuttles instead of oversized buses; add bus pullout lanes; *Remove pedestrian beacons at road level; provide bridges or tunnels instead; *Remove empty red line rail cars from schedule; no new rail line construction on major roadways. <p>General suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Ticket red light runners; *Restrict electric scooter use; require helmets; ticket scooters on park trails; *Restrict bike use to slower, safer roads & add protective dividers for bike lanes; *Allow free use of toll lanes by cars w/ 4 passengers (HOV); *Use Houston as model to improve traffic flow; and *Eliminate 1 cent tax for Capital Metro since no traffic improvements have been noted in 30+ years & bonds are always requested for traffic improvements instead of using dedicated funds. <p>Thank you for considering this input. (name redacted) Austinite since 1978 ☺</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>I have lived on Wathen Avenue for 38 years and am familiar with the need for street parking on Harris Blvd. for residents, repair personnel, landscape crews, family visits, to name a few. I believe the designation of bike lanes from Ethridge to Windsor would be a mistake as the street width is needed for the above needs, and traffic exiting Windsor onto Harris is often at a speed which would endanger the bicyclists.</p> <p>Parking on streets such as Wathen by people needing access to residents on Harris would cause a dangerous situation as there are children playing in yards and streets. Vehicle parking by residents/repair persons from Harris would block the view of children who could possibly be injured by a vehicle travelling Wathen or other such street.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration to not install bicycle lanes on Harris Blvd. (name and address redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Either require Cap Metro to replace giant busses with smaller vehicles on routes that carry only a handful of riders or eliminate those routes. Either ban unlicensed vehicles or require APD to enforce traffic laws on cyclists who ignore stop signs and red lights. Use technology to make traffic signal lights more efficient. Return ALL lanes to use by vehicles carrying working &/or shopping people instead of mostly empty busses or exercising cyclists.</p> <p>(name redacted)Austin TX ?</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I live at (address redacted), between 29th Street and Mohle. Between the hours of 3 and 6pm the traffic on Jefferson is such that we can hardly get out of our driveway. I cannot see how a traffic light can alleviate this, and can only see how it will hold traffic in both directions making it even harder for us to exit our driveway safely. Please send someone by during the late afternoon to observe the traffic congestion. I oppose the traffic light concept until proven wrong.</p> <p>(name redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p data-bbox="233 188 1829 529">Hello - read the article about the Mobility initiative in the paper today and understand that Sunday is the last day to provide input. I didn't see an place to do that - so thought i would send an e-mail. My concern is with the scooters - the scooters seem to have taken over downtown Austin. They abide by no rules or laws and ride on the streets in traffic lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks and the trail. They go at fast speeds and don't seem to care about others or any cars that are around them - obviously this isn't always the case, but it does seem to be the case in the majority of situations I have observed. We live in downtown Austin in the Raney St neighborhood and the scooters are out of control. I live in fear that I'm going to hit one because they dart across the street in front of you with no regard for traffic or that they are going to hit me as I walk on the sidewalk. I know your concern is with mobility around Austin and in my opinion the scooters are, for the most part, not helping with that but are rather hindering. I do see a few folks taking scooters to get to work, bars, etc - but for the most part they seem to be a group fun activity - kinda like the Segway - just no tour guide.</p> <p data-bbox="233 574 1829 797">My understanding of the Austin law is the scooters are not allowed on the trail - but there are scooters there all day long - tonight from my porch I counted over 50. As I mentioned they are normally in groups and the folks who are using the trail as it was intended are constantly dodging the scooters and jumping out of the way. There is little to no signage on the trail saying that scooters are not allowed and there is no enforcement. The scooter companies even stage the scooters close to the trail which would encourage the usage. I honestly don't think most of the folks on scooters on the trail don't know they aren't supposed to be there. The scooter providers actually park their scooters adjacent to the trail..Duh, folks hop aboard and off they go.</p> <p data-bbox="233 842 1829 1024">I applaud your efforts to address the mobility issue in Austin - but I truly wish we could get the scooters under control. Many other cities have banned them all together (walking in downtown Chicago was pleasant interlude to Austin's "scooterville" environment) - or strictly enforce the laws of where they are supposed to be - we need to follow suit. If the city does not intend to enforce laws or rules concerning bikes and scooters, than just don't bother to have rules or ordinances. As I read in a AAS letter to the editor today —"Keep the motorized vehicles off the trail."</p> <p data-bbox="233 1070 1209 1102">Please get them off the trail and set up some rules and regulations for the streets.</p> <p data-bbox="233 1148 432 1224">Thank you (name redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>I wrote earlier on line that I am in favor of a bike lane on one side of Harris Blvd, as long as the opposite side is available for on-street parking. I live in the portion between Ethridge and Harris Blvd that now seems to be slated for bike lanes on both sides. Please don't do that! One side is enough for bikes.</p> <p>I need street parking for visitors, contractors, my yard crew, repair people, family etc, and I have a one lane narrow driveway. I have the last bit of sidewalk that comes north from Windsor Road on the west side of Harris Blvd, and I am delighted to know there will be more sidewalks on Harris and all over town. They are needed and keep the many people who walk and run on Harris Blvd, often with children in strollers and/or dogs, safer than being in the street.</p> <p>I have lived in my house since February 1971 and raised my children here. Now my grandchildren and 3 great grandchildren visit often, as do friends, many of whom would not be able to walk the distance from a side street in the dark for our weekly dinners or other visits.</p> <p>I appreciate your consideration.</p> <p>(name redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Hi,</p> <p>How does one comment on the proposed changes that are planning to be made on Old Spicewood Road, from Loop 360 to Old Lampasas Trail?</p> <p>Thank you, (name redacted)</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>Please don't make changes to Jollyville. The middle turn lane is needed. No one who lives here wants it changed! I can't stress enough how much of a hot button issue this is!!!</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Hi,</p> <p>In the ASMP bike policy 2 reads: "Complete the All Ages and Abilities Bicycle Network</p> <p>Provide a feasible, short-term, fully connected, comfortable system of on- and off-street bicycle facilities.</p> <p>What do you mean by feasible? Does this mean that ATD no longer thinks the bike master plan is feasible?</p> <p>I think the bike master plan is feasible, but implementation has been in seemingly random chunks instead of systematic. (There may be a system that is just hard to tell from the outside.) I think we need it, especially upgrading unprotected bike lanes to protected bike lanes. There is a world of difference between the protected bike lanes on, say, 3rd, and the unprotected bike lanes on streets like 38th and 12th. I should know - I was hit by a car on 12th street while riding my bike.**</p> <p>Anyway, it's alarming to see "feasible" here when we have an ambitious and mostly unimplemented plan sitting on a shelf. I would hate to discard that to spare money and right of way for roads and cars.</p> <p>Thank you!</p> <p>** I was hit in an intersection, so technically protected bike lanes would not have directly helped. Indirectly, more bike infrastructure could have raised the profile of people riding bicycles such that the driver would have looked more closely for bikes instead of turning left in front of me. That's a but if a stretch, but I would still like a protected bike lane anyway.</p> <p>-- (name redacted)</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>Greetings ASMP team,</p> <p>We, the Westcreek Neighborhood Association board members, noticed and were concerned about the proposed road addition extending Brush Country through to Monterey Oaks. This particular road extension has been contested in our neighborhood for many years. At this current time, the city is collaborating with our neighborhood on the development of a greenway trail system through this tract. Improvements include advancement of native species, improved pathways and low water crossing, and construction of a pavilion. Is your team aware of these efforts? Are these road plans made with those efforts in mind? Our contact person with the city for these efforts has been Tracy Ho, Tracy.Ho@austintexas.gov.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Michael Sarahan, on behalf of the WNA board ☐</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>To: ASMP Staff, Austin Transportation Department From: (name redacted) Date: Jan. 10, 2019 Re: Comments on ASMP Policies</p> <p>1. Community outreach showed a strong interest in more and better transit, and a plurality of the public (42%) preferred Scenario C, which “emphasizes investing in public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian projects”.¹ Therefore, the ASMP should include an overarching policy statement similar to the following from San Francisco: Within San Francisco, travel by public transit, by bicycle and on foot must be an attractive alternative to travel by private automobile. Decisions regarding the use of limited public street and sidewalk space shall encourage the use of public rights of way by pedestrians, bicyclists, and public transit, and shall strive to reduce traffic and improve public health and safety. [S.F. Charter, Transit First Policy, 11/6/07. 2]</p> <p>2. In addition to an overall policy, the ASMP should set goals for multi-modal use. For example, the GoBoston 2030 goals are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ 100% of households within a 10-minute walk, 1/2-mile, of a rail station, key bus route stop, Hubway (bike share) station and carshare. ◦ All health centers within a 5-minute, 1/4-mile, walk of a bus stop and train station. ◦ 100% of households within a 1/4-mile walk of bike protected or shared use path. <p>The city could then measure our progress in relation to those goals.</p> <p>3. City Council passed a resolution on April 14, 2016 calling for a Transit Priority Policy (TPP); and in March 2017, ATD stated in a report to the Mobility Committee that the TPP would be included in the ASMP. 2 The transit policies in the Draft ASMP do not meet the needs of a TPP and should be supplemented with a TPP that is attached by reference. The TPP would be similar to current city master plans for sidewalks, bicycles, urban trails, and Vision Zero. The Transit Priority Policy should include criteria for how projects are evaluated and prioritized. The ASMP map defines “Near Term Transit Improvements: These improvements can include far side bus stop placement, transit signal priority, transit queue jumps, peak hour transit only lanes, and transit only lanes.” Longer term improvements in the Project Connect Vision Plan include dedicated guideway. The staff and community need specific information on how each measure will be selected on each corridor and how priorities will be set.</p> <p>4. Based on the goals and policies established under the three points above, the ASMP should include criteria for prioritizing all of the projects and rank them according to priority. Priorities should be based on access and movement of people, not on level of service (LOS) or other outdated criteria. Washington D.C.’s plan, MoveDC, prioritizes all of the projects into four tiers and lists the known costs for each project (prioritization criteria are on pp. 109-10.) The ASMP should similarly prioritize projects and provide costs, so that we can allocate funding for the top priorities.</p> <p>1 From the ASMP Phase II Public Engagement Report, August 2018, p. 6: “5,774 people participated in the survey overall; 1,844 of them were members of at least one of the four focus populations. Below are some highlights of what we heard from participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 42% of the overall population chose Scenario C as the starting point, with Scenario B as the second most popular choice. Scenario C was also the most popular starting point for the focus populations, although it was chosen by only 38% of respondents; Scenario B was again second most-popular. • The top strategy participants chose to address transportation issues was Provide more public transit service and enhance connections to/from public transit. This was the top strategy for both the overall population and the focus populations. • Positive comments about transit were the most common comments received by substantial margins in both the overall and focus populations. More than one-third of all comments we received discussed the need or desire for more transit in the city.” <p>2 These documents are available under the Mobility Committee’s March 1, 2017 meeting notice. http://www.austintexas.gov/department/city-council/2017/20170301-mobc.htm</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>I notice your plan seems to have removed the greenbelt status from a section of Walnut Creek. 2100 Park Bend area. It is also an area that you plan on putting in more concrete trails. Can this transportation project be beneficial to the environment when you plan on removing the greenbelt designation of an area so you can build more 10 foot wide concrete trails that are 98% recreational?</p>

Source	Comment
ASMP Inbox	<p>I have lived in the Bryker Woods-Pemberton Heights ("BW-PH") neighborhood for over 44 years and have been actively involved in issues that affect our neighborhood, including City of Austin programs.</p> <p>Currently BW-PH is a Safe Neighborhood including for Bicyclists</p> <p>In 2008-2009, the BW-PH Traffic Calming Group, in which I was active, had access to 6 years of summaries of police accident reports for BW-PH for the prior 6 years. These summaries showed the BW-PH neighborhood to have few vehicular accidents--if memory serves, most were one car accidents (DUI's)--and none involved bicyclists. Since then I have not heard of a single vehicular accident involving a bicycle in our neighborhood, so that would possibly be 17 straight years without a single vehicle-bicycle accident. The Safety Map that accompanies the proposed ASMP shows only one serious vehicular accident in our neighborhood (Kerbey Lane at 29th St.), and BW-PH is not depicted on another map showing areas in the City in the "Bicycle High Injury Network". By any standard BW-PH is currently among the safest neighborhoods in Austin for drivers of vehicles and bicyclists, quite possibly the safest. It should be kept that way.</p> <p>Proposed Bicycle Priority Network for BW-PH: In the proposed ASMP, the following streets or street segments in BW-PH are proposed for the Bicycle Priority Network with the recommended bike improvements shown:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Harris Blvd. from 32nd St.(south) to Ethridge Ave.-- "Quiet Street"; 2. Ethridge Ave. from Harris Blvd. (west) to Hartford Rd.--"Quiet Street"; 3. Hartford Rd. from Jefferson St. where it intersects Ethridge Ave. (south) to Windsor Rd.--"Bike Lane". <p>When considered together they provide a complete cut-through in our neighborhood from the north end of Bryker Woods all the way to the south end of Pemberton Heights.</p> <p>Further, the proposed ASMP links this prioritized cut-through in BW-PH with the bikeways prioritized in the Bicycle Priority Network that track Bull Creek Rd. and Shoal Creek Blvd. and that will serve bicyclists to the far northwestern and northern parts of the City. This would theoretically bring many more bicyclists daily into the BW-PH neighborhood. In fact, this linkage if it brought many bicyclists into BW-PH would create a Safety Nightmare.</p> <p>Safety Nightmare: The BW-PH Traffic Calming Group learned that nothing could be changed with respect to the thousands of vehicles that come through our neighborhood daily as a result of the Northwood Rd. exit on Mo-Pac. This traffic coming from Mo-Pac and going to Mo-Pac is always traveling in an east/west direction when it crosses Harris Blvd. at 29th Street and crosses Harris Blvd. at Northwood Rd.--both intersections being 4-way stops. Channeling on a daily basis multitudes of bicyclists onto Harris Blvd. in a northerly or southerly direction as proposed in ASMP will spell disaster at these 4-way intersections particularly at morning and evening rush hours as impatient drivers of vehicles traveling east/west encounter impatient bicyclists traveling north/south, many of whom, experience tells us, will "jump" the stop signs. Thanks to the City of Austin's Transportation Department's extensive efforts and expenditures of monies during the Traffic Calming Study, one stop sign facing south was installed on the east side of Harris Blvd. at 32nd St. and stop signs facing north and south on Harris Blvd. were installed at its intersections with Westover Rd. and Gaston Ave. These signs along with the aforementioned Harris Blvd. stop signs at 29th St. and Northwood Rd. (as well as parked vehicles) have proven effective in making Harris Blvd. a safe street for everyone. Making this segment of Harris Blvd. part of the Bicycle Priority Network as proposed in the draft ASMP would cause multitudes of frustrated bicyclists to encounter quickly and tempted to jump stop signs at almost every other intersection on Harris Blvd. in the segment that would be included in the Bicycle Priority Network. This would become a very unsafe situation for everyone. Anyone should be able to foresee the danger.</p> <p>Harris Blvd. is not suitable as a Quiet Street: Harris Blvd is unique. No other street both traverses the entire length of BW-PH and is centrally located in the BW-PH neighborhood; as such, it alone can facilitate the quick access to almost any area of the neighborhood. Therefore, Harris Blvd. serves the important function of being the main thoroughfare used by the Police, the Fire Department, and EMS when accessing emergencies in BW-PH. To place physical installations on Harris Blvd. to make Harris Blvd. a Quiet Street and to impede vehicular traffic will also impede these important First Responders--and needlessly endanger the safety of those who live in the neighborhood. Because of its unique position within the neighborhood, Harris Blvd, including the segment proposed for the Bicycle Priority Network, also serves as AISD bus routes in BW-PH, bringing elementary children to their homes. Frequent bus stops are necessary, requiring all traffic including bicyclists to halt for the protection of the children getting off the bus. Harris Blvd. needs to be left unobstructed to assist the school bus drivers with their enormous vehicles.</p> <p>BW-PH should not be in the Bicycle Priority Network--Waste of Money: Linking streets in BW-PH with those prioritized bikeways coming from Bull Creek Rd. and Shoal Creek Blvd. will be expensive and not serve the intended purpose. Most bicyclists coming from areas northwest and north of BW-PH are headed to the University of Texas, the Capitol Complex, or Downtown. They want to go southeast, not in the direction of BW-PH. This is particularly true because BW-PH is not a "destination"; that is, there is nothing in BW-PH that is of general public interest. If streets in BW-PH were in the Bicycle Priority Network, they would only serve as a conduit to places due south or southeast where most bicyclists will not want to go. Considering also that from most directions BW-PH is on a steep hill that most bicyclists will not want to challenge particularly in hot weather, the great likelihood is that a Bicycle Priority Network in BW-PH will be little used, an absolute bust, and a HUGE WASTE OF MONEY! Obviously, the money that would have been wasted in BW-PH should be invested in the Bicycle Priority Network that tracks Shoal Creek and Lamar Blvd south of 34th street. Heavily traveled Lamar Blvd. in its current narrow, curving condition is</p>
ASMP Inbox	<p>There is a one word correction to the second last sentence in the second last full paragraph of my e-mail to you on January 11, 2018.</p> <p>The word "southwest" should be substituted for "southeast" so the sentence reads as follows:</p> <p>"If streets in BW-PH were in the Bicycle Priority Network, they would only serve as a conduit to places due south or southwest where most bicyclists will not want to go."</p> <p>I apologize for the confusion.</p>

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	I'm not sure what the definition of a real "policy" is, but these just look like goals to me. Nothing is tangible. Great goals, but so what? What is going to actually happen? I am looking forward to increased density, mass transit, and safer pedestrian environments and bike lanes.
Policy Survey	Visually pleasing and interesting document sharing. General and soft goals, so nothing to object to or heartily embrace. OK start on which to put detail.
Policy Survey	The policies are good but there's no discussion on how the City designers and engineering firms will be held to these policies. I see great plans like this always made but never followed.
Policy Survey	The ASMP does not mention resident-restricted on-street parking programs. These programs that limit on-street parking to residents of nearby residences are an outrage. We all pay for streets, including parking spaces. These spaces should not be restricted to residents only, unless those residents pay a reasonable monthly rental fee (\$100-200 per month) to compensate tax payers for providing those spaces. Don't like it? Then store your private property on your own lot. Problem solved. You say you don't have enough room to store all your cars? That is your problem, not everyone else's. Residents do not own the streets in front of their
Policy Survey	Good coverage of important concerns. Many criteria, how difficult to implement?
Policy Survey	Human safety is #1, no question. How is increasing public transportation or high speed public transportation network not your #2 priority? Are you watching how fast Austin is growing? Not too long from now, businesses will think twice about starting or moving here. Today's employers and employees demand increased public transportation.
Policy Survey	This makes me want to move. One of the biggest issues in Austin is transportation, and the local government is doing nothing to improve it. The biggest issue is that housing is unaffordable in the city center so people have to move farther away. There is not currently sufficient infrastructure to move people more than 5 miles in a reasonable amount of time. Adding sidewalks does not dent the commute time from Round Rock or north Austin. Reducing the number of car lanes to put in bike lands does not make it easier for landscapers to get from job to job. Things that are helpful that Austin has not embraced: 1) More dedicated right turn lanes - sometimes there is a rounded corner that are useful as long as there are fewer than 3 cars waiting at a light, but in many places there are opportunities to extend these farther and it should be done. 2) Sensors in the road for dedicated left turn lanes so there isn't a long green arrow when no one is turning.
Policy Survey	Very satisfied. Appears to take users of all abilities into account.
Policy Survey	Overall I think they are pretty great! I love that you include sections on system design and its impact on safety. I also was excited to see policy 4 in Financial Sustainability, but I am unclear as to what "equitable" means in this case. If it means everyone gets the same amount of money, that is AWESOME. With the amount we spend on roads, spending equal on sidewalk and bicycle facilities would do major things for mode shift.

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	I'm concerned about how some of the policies can truly be implemented. I don't believe that we have full buy-in and resources needed to accomplish the plan. In Chapter 7 I am concerned about some of the terminology used. Some of those terms have a certain connotation in certain groups- "historically marginalized" is a term that City uses, not a term that community uses.
Policy Survey	Very satisfied. However, implementation and retrofitting the current infrastructure will be expensive.
Policy Survey	Very satisfied, great all-around focus.
Policy Survey	very satisfied; measures are missing or any mention of evaluation, however. Nor are timelines mentioned. Would be good to have both.
Policy Survey	The drafts are very promising, I hope that nothing gets lost in the implementation. The City of Austin needs to take a good look at their offices and service locations to ensure that these policies are implemented there first. You can't stand for something if you aren't actively practicing it.
Policy Survey	Overall, I think the sentiments expressed are good. But there's a real lack of detail and specific proposals - I wish that ever policy came attached with at least 3 - 5 specific programs that flesh out what is really meant by the policies.
Policy Survey	It includes a comprehensive list of policies, and I agree with them, but it just summarizes existing policies and puts them in one place. The policies as listed are too general and vague. There are no specific programs or projects and no trade-offs between policies. There is no discussion of how much the policies will cost. There is not specific information about how the policies will be implemented. One exception is "small area planning and zoning review processes", which is what we have already been using, and I do not think that is adequate.
Policy Survey	not sure that policy #3 in aviation fits there. isn't that a 'managing our demand' topic?

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	<p>Chapters 2-3 lower rating: promotes bias towards car centric highways through Austin. Historically/ nationally the trend is to revert/ remove freeway barriers.</p> <p>Work closely with partner agencies to ensure that the safety of vulnerable [PEDESTRIANS, BICYCLISTS] is a primary consideration in the design and operation of new highway construction and retrofits of existing highways</p> <p>Locate employment-intensive commercial zones [MANY ZONING CATEGORIES CREATE JOBS — JUST SAY JOB HUBS?] along existing or future public transportation service through small area planning and zoning review processes</p> <p>Coordinate on-street parking and curb management strategies [PROVIDE CLEARER DEFINITION FOR CURB MANAGEMENT — PERHAPS CURB-SIDE AMENITIES, OR SIDEWALK BULBOUTS?] for flexibility and adaptability with future parking and mobility technology</p> <p>Test [PILOT PROJECTS FOR] emerging mobility techniques and technologies to better understand their impacts and opportunities and gather stakeholder input</p>
Policy Survey	<p>Lots of good policy/strategy statements with “something for everyone,” but no clear strategic directives or prioritization. This should clearly lay out: we have to maintain what we have and that will take x%, then we will prioritize A, B, C and D or then we will prioritize this strategy in these groupings.</p> <p>Finally there should be clear outcomes...we will decrease “drive alone” travel along congested corridors or in dense areas by x%; we will reduce crashes on city streets by y%; we will increase these active, healthy indices by z%.</p>
Policy Survey	<p>I am extremely disappointed with the lack of an explicit commitment to dedicated right of way for public transit. I am also dissatisfied that the policies do not call for the elimination of parking minimums in specific areas of the city, and that the policies do not call for the densification of Central Austin to support the use of transit, walking, and biking modes for commutes and other trips. While I appreciate that the plan calls for reduction of traffic fatalities and emphasis on safety, there is no call for aggressive enforcement of these rules on drivers by the Police Department. This will be necessary for real change.</p> <p>Financial Sustainability Policy 4 is, in my opinion, emblematic of the lack of vision in these policies. We do not need to distribute resources equitably between modes - we need to take resources from single occupancy vehicles and redistribute them to public transit, walking, and biking.</p>
Policy Survey	Very. I appreciate the emphasis on modes of transportation other than cars. We need more balance.
Policy Survey	There really needs to be more policy around Transportation Demand and the variety of strategies offered.

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	<p>While all admirable items and written well, it seems like these are very nonspecific.</p> <p>What's the firm output of the process besides nice sounding policies to look back at? I'm much more interested in the city putting more hard plans to paper in these areas (sometimes in multiple, varied options vs usually the 1 large plan) for public feedback and choice than drafting policies to point towards that are less concrete.</p>
Policy Survey	I think this draft is excellent! It really covers all of the issues I feel are highly important to the healthy growth of Austin
Policy Survey	I am concerned regarding the "adding additional vehicle capacity" as it does not seem to address induced demand.
Policy Survey	I would like to see more buses to the outskirts of town.
Policy Survey	Blah, blah, blah....city council spends like nothing and creates affordability crisis then we expect them to fix it? No way. The whole plan really doesn't specifically say anything at all. Political speak only. In the end we will become more unaffordable.
Policy Survey	Very satisfied! I look forward to seeing the changes made.
Policy Survey	<p>Very satisfied, but I think it can go farther toward focusing on active transit.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider subsidizing electric bicycles for residents to encourage longer trips by bicycle. This requires prioritizing protected bike lanes. 2. Prioritize connections, like from campus to Shoal Creek. There is no access point as it stands. 3. Work toward car-free plazas. This allows cafes, open air dining, integration of green space and play spaces into multi-use areas. These are areas friendly to all ages and abilities, not just 20- and 30-year olds. It encourages business, social capital, and walkability. 4. Moving toward more frequent and smaller transit vehicles. Preferably electric to reduce emissions. 5. As 360 plans for renovations, consider adding a protected bike lane on each side. This is a great opportunity for a long distance biking corridor. 6. For teen safety, ask ride hailing companies to reduce age restrictions to 16. This will significantly reduce drinking and driving.

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	There is a lot of general language that is hiding the true intent of the ASMP, which is to eliminate driving resources (roads, lanes) and push everyone onto buses, bikes, and scooters.
Policy Survey	ASMP should more explicitly address climate change. Also, please take into account non-traditional commute schedules of musicians and other performing artists.
Policy Survey	Not at all
Policy Survey	The policies seem to be founded on ethereal hopes of what a city could be rather than reality. We don't have people riding busses. We have cars that need to get places. We don't have huge amounts of people riding their bikes to work. We need roads for cars.
Policy Survey	I liked the draft policies a lot, but I would say that I don't think this survey is designed in a way to provide constructive and targeted feedback.
Policy Survey	Slight overemphasis on expanding roadway capacity. We should be moving away from this focus entirely.
Policy Survey	Without a stated goal of phasing out and eventually eliminating private automobile traffic in the core city areas, while explicitly limiting suburban growth, I see little actual change from the status quo in this plan. There are certainly incremental improvements, but these improvements are not adequate to address the immediate climate and health crisis caused by our transportation and land use systems.
Policy Survey	Overall, these very general concepts are good ideas, but I think the document could use more urgency when describing how the City can reduce car dependence. Single-occupant auto usage and all associated elements: poor land use, pollution, poor safety, and marginalization of non-car users should be the top priority of any mobility plan.
Policy Survey	It seems good. One thing I believe Austin can do RIGHT NOW to improve mobility is IMPROVE TRAFFIC SIGNAL TIMING! I read through the ASMP kind of fast, but I believe I only saw one thing as it pertains to signal timing. "POLICY 5 Allocate signal timing to coincide with modal priorities". This is something lots of people complain about. I feel like big bottlenecks happen because the signals aren't timed. I can go down Riverside at 5 AM and hit every single red light. One after another. Same on Congress. It makes no sense and needs to be fixed IMMEDIATELY! Also, I think Capital Metro is doing a good job. The high-frequency routes are nice. I'd like to see a Cap Metro line go to Georgetown other than just the "Grasshopper" or whatever that service is called. I also think the city should embrace electric scooters as another transportation mode to help connect people from the buses.
Policy Survey	Very unsatisfied!!! What the majority of citizens want are safe and well maintained streets, less shrinking of lanes for bicycle lanes. What we want is to go from our door in all weather comfort to our destinations and find adequate parking next to jobs, entertainment, and shopping. This plan does not address these issues at all. Walking to bus stops, biking, etc. sound nice, but for handicapped, elderly, and those who prefer convenience to "multimodal" transportation, this plan is ludicrous. Fix the potholes, maintain the streets and sidewalks, and stop trying to force those of us who like open space and large lots into rabbit warren

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	I continue to be disappointed in the lack of vision for mobility in the city of Austin. In the ASMP Draft Maps, there is nothing to reflect the addition of rail in south Austin. There is the current line and one new one heading to the northeast. There is no amount of roads that you can build or expand that will help with the increased amount of traffic in this city; where is the vision? As you allow new housing developments in every open space throughout the city, those people will have but one choice to get to jobs, grocery stores, etc., their personal vehicles. I never see grocery stores pop up with the new subdivisions. The bus system here is horrible. It would take me 1.75 hrs to get to my job by bus. Yet you will move a train station to satisfy a privately held soccer team. I'm not sure this city even wants to improve mobility for the masses.
Policy Survey	Focus on multi-modal transportation, human health, and fiscal responsibility are excellent. I would like to see more to address school related traffic. It's shocking how much traffic congestion eases when school is out. Reducing the cars near and around schools should be a high priority for health and safety.
Policy Survey	Drafting is one thing, reality is another. As a pedestrian who does not drive, I am concerned with people running red lights constantly (cameras, anyone?) and making the public transport system more robust--not taking away stops from neighborhoods, or taking away routes altogether. Cap Metro was going to take my stops away, and we had to fight to retain them. Others were not so fortunate. The bus system needs to be friendlier to older people who cannot walk long distances to a stop.
Policy Survey	The bike network map is completely incorrect. Are I-35, MOPAC and 290 now bike routes? Some of the links are incorrect, there is no survey in the "Developing.." link above.
Policy Survey	There are so many more cars on the road than bikes or buses. Yet you take up lanes and road for bikes and buses. I see very empty buses all the time, although I read that during certain hours they are full. Bikes and pedestrians just don't belong on the same road if safety is in plan, as I see it is. I see very empty bike lanes all the time, especially on Hancock. You do need more parking garages. The city has spent a fortune on bike lanes that are usually empty. I know you're trying to get bike riding to work and back a think, but it's Texas and reality is people want their cars. And I'm sorry to say, a lot of bike riders do not think safety rules apply to them.
Policy Survey	As traffic worsens for the average commuter, getting more folks on mass transit and soft transportation seems key to allowing Austin to grow into a modern, ecological city. If more importance was placed on mass transit, despite its detractors, perhaps we could make real strides to avoid a situation that will otherwise only worsen.

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	<p>Unsatisfied. These are platitudes. I don't see anything that addresses the growth of the city and really getting people where they need to go.</p> <p>We need a comprehensive mass transit system much more than bike and hike trails. Bikes don't work for senior citizens and people who need to transport other family members.</p> <p>Can we please get real about this situation? We are already behind the 8 ball.</p> <p>Get the thru traffic off I35 thru the city...rename 130 as I 35 and take off the tolls. Put a toll on i35 into town...take a lesson from east coast cities to get the thru traffic around, not thru, a city. Get a real ring road built...not mopac and i35. People need to be able to bypass central and the next level out. Just look at the mess on Ben White- 360 at rush hour....or mopac between 1:30-7pm.</p> <p>Stop ignoring east and southeast areas. Impossible to get places.</p> <p>I used to take the bus to work, but when it took 2-3 times longer than driving, I started to drive.</p> <p>Time to get real.</p>
Policy Survey	<p>I have lived in Austin my whole life and I'm glad to see there is actual progress being made in what I feel is the right direction for transportation in our city. For too long, we have done nothing to solve the obvious mobility issue in this city. These are changes this city needs to see in order to thrive and continue to support the influx of people deciding to move here every day.</p>
Policy Survey	<p>I like the urban trail and bike parts, but Austin needs some kind of light rail. I can't believe that even over a 20 year time horizon, that is not mentioned. We need a line along Lamar Guadalupe and other east-west lines to connect to it. Taking a bus is just not worthwhile over driving my own car when I would have to sit in the same traffic and also wait for the bus, plus probably have to transfer multiple times. Having rail that only helps the suburban commuters get into Austin but doesn't help people that actually live in Austin is just ridiculous. Other cities have managed to do this. Austin should be capable of it.</p> <p>Thanks for taking feedback.</p>
Policy Survey	<p>Too early for me to have opinions to the questions above. I do, however, miss an explicit recognition of the need for inter-disciplinary processes at strategic, planning, and project levels. For example, ATX development (zoning) and mobility plans must be complementary; mobility must meet the needs for connecting locations and connectivity drives if and how locations flourish or fade. I also recommend sub-plans for interrelated projects, for example, for each of the urban trails. Shoal Creek, Waller Creek, Airport Blvd, and other Trails would have individual "Trail Plans" considering ecology, flood control, parks, public safety, destinations, etc. as well as parking, public transportation connectivity, and the other mobility aspects and not leave that to multiple project managers to make differing choices. Consensus on program plans makes project planning easier. Such evolving Trail Plans would serve to provide consistency and continuity of project plans that might span a decade or more.</p>
Policy Survey	<p>I found it to be very informative and helpful - understanding the goals were easy to follow and manageable.</p>

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	<p>I am particularly pleased with the focus on safety and transit priority. I also encourage the full development of the sidewalk plan, all-ages and abilities bike network, and additional urban trails. I am happy to see that another focus will be transit-supportive density and I hope it will be a very important priority. Most of our current problems with traffic congestion, environmental and safety problems can be traced back directly to poor land use decisions and the inability to adapt to rapid change.</p> <p>I hope the city can also push hard with our partners, TXDOT in particular, to improve safety conditions for vulnerable users like pedestrians on the roads for which they are primarily responsible for design.</p>
Policy Survey	Seem very general and generic. Where is actual play for implementation and priority along with financial documentation
Policy Survey	Without a strong push for additional transportation options, specifically light rail/subway system, expansion of roads and bike lanes will be small band-aides on a gash that will ultimately hinder Austin's ability to grow.
Policy Survey	They are all great ideas - but I'm more interested in seeing what policies come to fruition. I would be interested in seeing more about traffic trends and knowing why traffic is better or worse during certain times of the year and use those trends to reduce backups (ie: traffic is noticeably less congested during the summer months when students are out of school. Would promoting students to take public transportation reduce the number of vehicles on the road and reduce congestion during the morning rush hour?)
Policy Survey	I think this is a very good outline. I think the transportation demand management chapter is missing some elements. For example: private sector participation, encouraging vanpooling & carpooling through parking policy, reducing parking requirements, eliminating residential parking permits (and transitioning to metered parking with residential permits)
Policy Survey	The safety policy was too broad for me to have a real opinion. I wish I would have seen more specifics, like what does safe street design look like? Is it narrower and straighter roads with less chicken lanes? In demand, I would like to see the city take a stand against Texas Donut apartments. We also do not need more parking we need less. This might be too specific, but I'd like to see wider sidewalks on Woodrow. I enjoyed the curb management section. I was only dissatisfied with the roadway system on Supply. I'd like more specifics, but I think Austin needs less roads. The sidewalk improvements looked great. I was also happy that Austin was ready to tackle funding issues, and long term affordability. All of the operations goals seemed like good goals to have. In Health and Environment, I would add a section about where Austin will get its food in the future. This is a critical issue related to global warming, and we need to plan for it now. I hope for the best for all of Austin.
Policy Survey	Good overall outline and topical/categorical coverage of policies and ambitions. Would like to see more over-arching strategic goals and objectives that reflect long term vision. It would best to present a vision that illustrates what success in 5, 10, 15, 20 years would like. I am hopeful that a vibrant, growing and innovative community like Austin would step up to world-class leadership in safety, speed, health, mobility and vast investment in forward technology (including visionary rail, carless zones, etc.)

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	Disappointed because there is not enough parking reform. We need to get street parking closer to market prices (more availability), convert angled street parking to parallel (add parking protected bike lanes), require multifamily housing to unbundle parking (like UNO), replace car parking near intersections with bike parking (daylight the intersection), and remove discount for monthly parking over daily parking (encourages driving). If we keep land free or cheap for cars, people will drive. Promoting alternatives will always see limited success when free land is on the line if we continue to drive alone.
Policy Survey	Well done. You have a typo on the opening paragraph of Chapter 3... Prioritizing speed, reliability, and comfort can encourages public transportation ridership. You don't need the 's' in encourages.
Policy Survey	You are not responding to the realities of what is occurring in Austin. This plan should be building a transportation that aggressively meets travel demands and it simple does not.
Policy Survey	Way to complicated! Focus, focus, focus on getting people in and out of downtown, and a simple plan to get them any where in the area so they have to walk no more than 1/4 to 1/2 mile. Everything else can wait!!!
Policy Survey	The policies are very idealistic and general. I was looking for more specific information.
Policy Survey	The ASMP draft policies do not reflect my views on transportation wants and needs. I'm not at all satisfied with the draft policies. In a few short years voters will be issuing bonds to undo much of the infrastructure that will result from the current plan.
Policy Survey	Austin has a lot of state employees that commute to downtown every weekday, and yet they are not provided the same reduced fare to ride capital metro as the city of Austin employees. I think this is a big lost opportunity to incentivize reduction in single-person ridership.
Policy Survey	I love how comprehensive they are! Including land use, health, even the trees and drainage is so vital and so Austin. Great work!
Policy Survey	This is just basic info and common sense ideas. I came here to read about something big that would help our current mobility problem we are facing. Instead, I spent too much time reading about how "we are going to tell people not to drive while intoxicated" or "we are going to make sure our trails connect to each other". I would like timelines and actual improvements that are to be made that we will FEEL. After reading this plan, I do not feel any better about the state of transportation. We don't go out to eat dinner, we don't go shopping. The traffic is too horrendous. Feels like we live in Los Angeles.

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	I chose neutral across the board, because while I don't think the policies themselves are objectionable, I feel like they lack substance. They seem like a collection of ideals that anyone should be able to get behind - but don't offer much specificity in terms of how things will be operationalized. Further, there is no discussion around priorities - or what specific problems we would seek to address (or how). I appreciate that broad consideration is being given to a variety of issues, and that they are connected in many ways and we don't want to do something foolish like give up safety for the sake of convenience, but I also feel that unless there is more focus on the highest priority areas, nothing meaningful will take place and we will end up with more scooters fallen over in the middle of the
Policy Survey	Not very in that the way you're measuring this is really, really bad. The survey items need to be near the sections. Otherwise, no one can remember what was in each portion, never mind actually get through this document. This is a document written for planners, not the community.
Policy Survey	I'm underwhelmed. Nobody sitting in traffic cares about curbs, trails and sidewalks. We also don't want more buses that are too slow to be useful in riding to work. The majority of traffic is coming from outside Austin city limits trying to get to work along 360 and downtown. We need light rail people. Look at Dallas, Chicago, DC, cities in CA, OR I could go on. Why on earth don't we have the sad little train extended to the airport? This proposal is just so lacking I think you should all start over and start with how to implement light rail that people will support... in other words stop proposing trains where nobody lives or works. And please get rid of the traffic lights on 360, 640 and the southern part of 183.
Policy Survey	Very satisfied.
Policy Survey	The ASMP hits all of the right notes but still fails to acknowledge how far behind Austin is relative to other cities in building a transportation network that doesn't rely primarily on automobiles. The ASMP is a forward looking document that might benefit from a prologue that describes how the city ended up with such an antiquated and inefficient auto-centric system and decides what will happen if we don't dramatically alter the course we are on.
Policy Survey	Very unsatisfied. Why don't you try writing the policies with less obfuscating your intent which appears to be to create a system that drives cars from the streets of Austin while making it virtually impossible to get around this town. If you really want to improve the quality of life in Austin make traffic less congested by adding more lanes not fewer as has been done in any number of neighborhoods I travel in. More efficient movement with increased lanes - and who thought up "Good Movement" - reduces pollution and rage response due to congestion. We live in a climate where the summers are routinely in the 100's and you are pushing bikes? And buses? Instead of ceding ownership of land already designated for transportation to toll roads why don't you add

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	I think that there are too many policies to actually focus well on any of them. They also sound great, but history would tell us that they are difficult to implement, manage, and coordinate. For instance, Chapter 1's prioritizing safety work seems to be in direct conflict to increasing bike transportation along city streets or to increased access to scooter travel. Also, providing "equitable" resources to all modes of transportation is not an "equitable" way to distribute tax payer dollars when the majority of dollars come from automobile drivers. While it is strategic to improve other modal options in order to change behaviors, it is arrogant and disrespectful to apply government-driven objectives and beliefs to a system that directly impacts every Austinite and makes full-scale changes geared toward new-comers and suburban non-taxpayers at the expense of the people who have made Austin the incredible
Policy Survey	Given there were no specifics about anything or how it was going to get done none of it was very satisfying. You allow huge companies to come in (Apple on Parmer) without having the infrastructure to get people around. We don't need more businesses coming here or more people moving to Austin--Austin can't handle what is already here. Parmer is already clogged with traffic and lights that have been added make it worse. Now you are going to add more people on a road that can't handle it. You add a soccer stadium near the Domain--basically a residential area which is going to be a nightmare during games. People aren't going to walk or ride a bike to work--sorry they just aren't. Many won't take a bus, sorry they just won't. Work on getting cars around better or quicker--more lanes, less lights (hello 360). Work on light rail--it was voted down because it was outrageously expensive for ONE line that went no where. Give us a better light rail plan and we'll pass it.
Policy Survey	<p>System Design</p> <p>Overall, fantastic! As it says, emergency response shouldn't trump all else.</p> <p>Land Use</p> <p>Overall, great! But ASMP should speak to planning goals not tools. Drop references to small area planning, an ineffective tool.</p> <p>Curb Use / Parking</p> <p>A bit tepid. Dedicated space for parking destroys communities. We should minimize it not right-size it. Also, these sections make it sound like all on-street parking is car parking. Other vehicles deserve access to on-street space too.</p> <p>Sidewalk System</p> <p>Overall, great! But functional and comfortable are too bland. High-traffic sidewalks should also be attractive.</p> <p>Roadway System</p> <p>Very weak. Connectivity provides benefits beyond capacity, deserves more priority. Highways need to be mitigated not upgraded.</p> <p>Public Transportation</p> <p>All public transit should have planning priority. The Transit Priority Network should be where public transit has physical priority.</p> <p>Data</p> <p>Good. Needs to use standards not just useful format.</p>

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	<p>Specific concerns that impact safety currently:</p> <p>Lack of response to 311 safety concerns</p> <p>Lack of red light enforcement</p> <p>Maintaining paint on street lanes and speed bumps</p> <p>On street parking interferes with safe bike riding (eg, South 5th St)</p> <p>New bus routes have taken away my ability to efficiently use the system even though I reside in a “bus rich” neighborhood.</p> <p>The policies/goals are great but to increase mobility and safety there is going to have to be a great deal of coordination and commitment to following through on these.</p>
Policy Survey	<p>Thank you for your work on this important endeavor. Please pass these two simple recommendations along:</p> <p>build "cut-out lanes" for busses to use at bus stops on Airport Blvd and other major arteries</p> <p>place signage above traffic lights that indicate which lanes are turn lanes and which lanes are straight thru. Arrows painted on the asphalt do not work with the congestion this city has.</p>
Policy Survey	<p>I think they are a little pie in the sky. I don't see much hope in implementing the roadway policies when buildings are allowed to be built almost to the road way with room for a sidewalk but no room for expansion of the road. I've lived in Austin since 1978 and have seen south Austin mostly ignored with most emphasis in getting people downtown from north Austin. South Lamar has been a problem since I moved here, yet nothing has been done to enable smooth traffic flow since then. I don't see a comprehensive plan to introduce mass transit, especially trains, into the mix. I also think it was a huge mistake to allow a toll road be built to be the answer to take trucks off of I-35. Most cities have a beltway around the city to avoid the jams we have daily on that highway. One more complaint--no park and rides in south Austin and no easy way to get east to west & vice versa on the buses.</p>
Policy Survey	82%
Policy Survey	i'm pretty much satisfied with the draft policies in the ASMP . I just recommend transparency, equity, and inclusion..
Policy Survey	<p>The lack of required parking for new construction and for older alterations is abysmal. It makes no allowance for those of us who either by infirmity, handicap, age, or other factors must drive or be driven to keep independence. Most cannot walk or bike for several blocks to reach public transit stops. The assumption in most of this plan that people can walk or bike is ridiculous. Until transit stops at the doorstep of every home, disabled persons are forced to drive to exist, and park to shop or access medical or other</p>
Policy Survey	<p>NOT! I am 100% against the widening of Escapement to a four lane road. That will create a huge cut through and traffic problem in a residential area.</p>
Policy Survey	<p>You cannot have everything, you must make choices. I believe that cars will be a critically part of our mobility and should not be neglected. The road infrastructure must be addressed. Empty bike lanes are not so helpful.</p>

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	<p>On paper it sounds great. In reality the execution seems much poorer. Primarily transportation around town especially if you live south of town lake. Have a metro rail option for people coming from south austin. Have it go to downtown, UT, the Domain, the arboretum area and the airport. Have it run reasonable hours to be useful especially in the evening and on the weekends.</p> <p>Also encourage businesses to promote working from home. It has swung the other way where companies want people in the office now with little remote options.</p>
Policy Survey	Bunch of city-speak gobbledegook that likely cost a fortune to produce and which will result in very little that actually improves local transportation.
Policy Survey	This is something of an "Alice In Wonderland" program. Bicycles should carry identification plates, as cars do, which ensure equitable enforcement of traffic laws. Bicyclists often do not come to a full stop as cars do at stop signs. Many times bicyclists proceed through a red light as if it was some divine right because it would inconvenience them to remain stopped as autos are required to do. Bicycles should be taxed to support bike lanes and other options designed to favor that mode. Bicycles, as a mode of transportation, is a single user circumstance and in contravention of any desire for multi-user forms of transportation. Free-range scooter operators should have licensing and liability insurance requirements. Bicyclists are not even subject to being arrested for DUI. Equibility and responsibility. Not a free ride.
Policy Survey	Satisfied, although I feel like there needs to be more emphasis on the sustainable mass transit system. I don't feel like there were any specific explanations of how that will come to fruition. I liked the completion of a comprehensive bicycle system. Also, I'm confused how you are discouraging parking spaces to try to discourage single riders but I'm wondering what the engagement process will look like to get the single riders to where they need to go if they don't have parking spots anymore. I'm worried people will just get frustrated.
Policy Survey	<p>Overall, I feel the policies are prejudiced against small-businesses and drivers of automobiles. The policies seem to deliberately limit our freedom of choice by promoting any form of transportation other than driving. As a small boutique business, I depend on people driving to my shop from all over Central Texas. Access to my property is being reduced with no incentive provided to move. We may not belong on North Lamar, but where do we belong?</p> <p>Case in point; the demographic questionnaire below only addresses residence, not business information. I used to live in the same district as my business, but the bike lanes and speed bumps made my 5-mile commute unbearable. So I moved.</p>
Policy Survey	Looks great. Much overdue changes to Austin's transportation infrastructure.
Policy Survey	Very satisfied with the concept and the language. The devil will be in the details as to how these goals can be achieved

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	Pretty satisfied. I think the main focus needs to be even more on safety for all modes (bikes, pedestrians) and dedicated right of way transit. At this point, as a major city we should not be trying to prioritize cars or improve efficiency of single occupancy vehicle trips at all - we should be trying to decrease such trips via supporting other modes as well as better land use planning.
Policy Survey	Very satisfied! I am a car-less resident who relies heavily on public transit and our sidewalks. This plan answers so many of the concerns I've had about getting around town safely and easily. Thank you for the heard work! I just hope that you're able to implement even a small part of this -- it's very ambitious!
Policy Survey	It all looks good to me. Most important for me are: completing sidewalk network, more protected bike lanes, and developing high capacity mass transit system.
Policy Survey	<p>You plan on putting hike and bike trails in to relieve traffic congestion. No one rides their bike to work in 30 degree weather, nor do they want to bike home in 100 degree weather. You removed a greenbelt designation from an area to put in more concrete trails. Not environmentally friendly.</p> <p>Fix the traffic lights and put in bus drop off areas and you would relieve tons of congestion.</p> <p>Try to see if you can drum up service with buses that go from one pickup area and drop employees off at a large employment campus. Instead of a bus that has 50 stops in between.</p>
Policy Survey	I'm enormously impressed with the thought that has gone into these proposals, the ideas that have come forth, and how effectively you've managed to summarize them. It's a lot of information to communicate and you've done a great job!
Policy Survey	<p>Fairly, though they seem vague enough to be all-encompassing. "Spend money responsibly" gives me little to no idea about what's actually going to happen. It's still good to see that Public Transportation is a priority--apparently? Actually, that was rather confusing.</p> <p>According to the policies in the ASMP, EVERYTHING is a priority. Is it more important to provide equitable access to public transportation or to balance the budget? I don't know. The report doesn't say. Fast bus lanes would be an amazing addition, along with more park-and-rides</p>
Policy Survey	Bottom line: this all looks good at a high level, but there are very few actual details or commitments that will assure achievement of all these goals. For example, to ensure a connected network, you fail to address subdivisions that are complete islands and non-connected to each other. You fail to talk about actual ways to reduce speeding on our streets (how about speed cameras instead of speed bumps?). You fail to present any parking policies. Consequently, I am disappointed. When will I see actual implementation policies?
Policy Survey	It all sounds good theoretically and on paper; there's nothing to argue with. I'm interested to know what the specific plans are to achieve the objectives, how much it will cost and how it will impact neighborhoods.

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	<p>25% of Great Northern Blvd traffic now diverts through the neighborhood, due to city's horrible incompetence. Children WILL die.</p> <p>The neighborhood association complained about inconsiderate bicyclists, so you put sharrows on the road, to reward them for not sharing, like adults. I asked Laura Dierenfield if the second fatality would prove a mistake was made by the city. She said probably not. She means it. The city is ok with diminished safety, as long as it doesn't cost votes.</p> <p>The bicyclists, here, are HORRIBLE. They HATE the thought of sharing, preferring to block northbound traffic for 1.4 miles, while the bike lanes remain empty. Laura Dierenfield told me EXPLICITLY that was not why sharrows were put there, and the city would fix that problem she created. I know she lied, though. Where's the action? There will be none, even after children predictably start dying, here.</p> <p>I'm completely disgusted with you!</p> <p>We complained about inconsiderate cyclists. You made them MUCH worse!</p>
Policy Survey	Sounds good on paper but implementing it is another issue.
Policy Survey	I actually feel good intention is there, but know how the City operates. One tiny example: a temporary No Parking sign was placed in front of a neighbor's house in October, while work was done on our street. I reported the sign early November as left-behind. A work order number was assigned, I got a call before Christmas saying that it would be looked into , but the sign is still there. Slow and not very timely. I don't feel any of that will change. Still, the plan looks good. Good luck with that.
Policy Survey	We have become accustomed to the City spending tons of money on these surveys and then, after satisfying themselves that they have reached out, doing what they want. This is no different. It's very pretty and full of lovely pictures, which never become a reality unless you live in zip codes 78746,78701, 78703, 78737 or other west Austin zip codes.
Policy Survey	we need all forms of transportation however the city was built upon having cars and you need to satisfy and make sure that there's a sufficient parking for all of the jobs downtown it's ridiculous when buildings are being built and hotels are being built with zero parking. in addition if motorized scooters and such vehicles are going to be permitted people must use them safely and must be ticketed if they're the ones causing the problems it is unacceptable that the people in the vehicles are the only ones at fault or to blame when they aren't the ones causing the problems. We can all live and work together in the city but we need smart usage of transportation options by all parties and they need to follow the laws and the rules.

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	Mobility is important, but I disagree with 2 items specifically in the ASMP. 1) A traffic light is unnecessary at the intersection of 29th and Jefferson. I drive through this intersection many times a day and the intersection is never congested enough to warrant a traffic signal. The intersection is only slightly problematic for a couple of hours during rush hour and moves freely with no problems the other 22 hours of the day. Some mild traffic mitigation to stop cut-through rush hour traffic would be more effective at helping traffic flow through the intersection, and I suspect less costly. A light is also out of proportion with the size of the intersection and the size of the neighborhood streets. 2) Building a bike lane system under the "if we build it they will come" philosophy is not going to change Austin traffic problems. It is 105 degrees here in the summer and hot for many, many months. Biking to and from work is not a feasible solution for most people in those conditions.
Policy Survey	Safety is important, glad you listed it first. Most of the rest of the document doesn't seem to have any "teeth". Words like support, enhance, invest, improve do not really indicate action. I do not like to drive, especially in Austin traffic. but the only choice I have now is Uber. So I stay at home. Hopefully, there will be some specific actions listed especially for above or below grade mass transportation that will go some where besides a north to south route from Austin to Leander. With the current vehicle types, we will never get traffic relief until we move to elevation or underground.
Policy Survey	A traffic signal is not needed at 29th St. and Jefferson. These are small neighborhood roads. 29th St. is barely wide enough for 2 cars to pass each other. Jefferson is a small two lane road with no center lane. I can't think of another intersection in the city where there is a light at streets this small. The intersection flows freely throughout the day. Rush hour is the only issue and even then it isn't really an issue. The only thing a light at this intersection would do is increase travel time out the the neighborhood and make it impossible for neighbors to turn from their neighborhood streets onto Jefferson or 29th St.. A better solution would be traffic mitigation to reduce the amount of cut through traffic on Jefferson and 29th street during rush hour. This would also remove any possible need for a traffic light at the intersection.
Policy Survey	public input has been completely ignored....possibly the most misguided plan I've ever seen.....will cause gridlock in university and area north and slightly west of downtown...putting Bicycle Accessibility and Facilities plan on 18th St. is completely out of touch with new County Courthouse and other buildings currently in planning on 17th & 18th st. and San Antonio/Guadalupe
Policy Survey	Austin sucks! I lived in Portland, Oregon before here and they blow away Austin as far as infrastructure and preparing for the future. The mass transit system here sucks! The highways are a joke! All the improvements you've made are toll roads. There has been no changes to Loop 360, I-35, 620 etc... Build the infrastructure first before you tell everyone to move here! So stupid! They just want to keep building here without having the guts to make serious changes to the freeways or install high speed rail systems. Cars are getting bigger and we're still stuck with crappy country highways built forever ago with tons of stoplights! Leaving this crappy city

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	<p>Almost all the policies (except re roadway system) are excellent. The problem is that, for decades, the City has rejected its own excellent ideas (e.g, Imagine Austin, bike master plan, sidewalk plan, etc.) and has instead implemented the expensive road expansion plans of the wealthy old officers of the Austin Neighborhood Council and rich older suburbanites in Westlake Hills, Rollingwood, Cedar Park, Round Rock, etc. Great policies are worse than irrelevant when the City pats itself on the back for broken paper promises. Austin should re-establish its transit system, withdraw from & demand reimbursement from wasteful Cap Metro (or at least demand replacement of Red Line with light rail for downtown), expand dockless bike & scooter parking to every block, eliminate all parking req'ts, raise parking fees to market rate citywide, & eliminate resid'l parking permits (or charge much higher fees), and build the full bike & sidewalk plans before spending any more \$ on any roads.</p>
Policy Survey	<p>I am concerned with a plan to decrease solo driver trips. it seems untenable. rather a plan should include dealing with the current state and adapting to increased demand. voters are unlikely to support losing lanes when it's already congested. alternates like raised rail lines or another double deck are more likely to get support. we aren't going to be decreasing in driving demand. it goes up with population expansion, not down.</p>
Policy Survey	<p>This looks like a good start to a big problem.</p>
Policy Survey	<p>The written policy is fine, but JUST CREATE MORE ROADS FOR ALL THE CARS. STOP TAKING AWAY VEHICLE LANES FOR BIKE LANES WHEN CYCLISTS AREN'T USING THEM! The giant poles and bots dots are more traffic hazards in our neighborhoods than all other hazards combined! WHY WASTE SO MUCH MONEY?</p> <p>Does Anyone monitor those dumb things? If you follow Nextdoor- WE DO!</p> <p>NO ONE IS USING THEM to justify creating more. Invest in more roads like the city has promised us for the last 30 years and stop the bike lanes. Build subways, improve air travel- invent flying cars, but bike lanes are NOT WORKING! NO ONE IS GIVING UP AIR CONDITIONING TO SWEAT 10 MILES TO WORK THEN PEDAL HOME! WE HAVE KIDS! WE ARE OLD! WE SPENT 50 GRAND ON LUXURY VEHICLES! WE ARE NOT RIDING BIKES! THOSE 110 PEOPLE THAT DO RIDE IN AUSTIN CAN USE THE ROADS LIKE I USED TO WHEN I WAS YOUNG!</p> <p>BRING MORE LANES! WE NEED MORE CAR LANES.</p> <p>More Car Lanes, Less bike lanes-Monitor bike lanes 1st- Create subways, Lets get flying cars! The end</p>

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	<p>Very satisfied with how comprehensive and thoughtful the plan is. Concerned that the complexity will not be able to be realized due to political interference and unwillingness to invest adequately in all phases of the plan.</p> <p>Transportation issues that directly affect my daily life and make me discouraged about living in Austin are: 1. Evening rush hour congestion southbound from UT through downtown, on I35 and MoPac. 2. Inadequate greenlight management throughout the city. 3. Cap Metro's limited schedule for the 171 Oak Hill and 111 South Mopac Flyers. Service needs to start at 5:00 am and conclude no early than 7:00 pm. 4. UT needs to be asked to adjust its 8-5 workday and institute policies to encourage working from home and carpooling. 5. Overall unpleasantness of walking in Austin, other than in the affluent neighborhoods. 6. Dangers to cyclists and safety of pedestrians.</p> <p>Thank you for your work on these important quality of life issues for all of the residents of central Texas.</p>
Policy Survey	<p>I want more focus on transit affordability. Expanding the network will likely increase ridership by improving convenience, but people still won't use the system unless it is sufficiently affordable. We should seriously consider making transit free for a large portion of the community - perhaps focusing on those who live or work in high-priority areas or who live in low income zones, regardless of their personal income. Also allow large business the option to offer transit free to employees - similar to the existing system for UT employees/students.</p>
Policy Survey	<p>Satisfied with draft policies but interested in implementation of actual plan. I appreciate the emphasis on safety, as someone who walks on the trails and on the downtown streets as my commute to work. Traffic is out of control. It is crazy that I can walk four miles home faster than I can drive it in the afternoons. But I have almost been run over by cars, bikes and scooters and I was hit by a car last year. It is unsafe to commute by foot regularly. Please address the recent arrival of scooters. Speeding down sidewalks, running lights, and then dumping wherever (behind and between parked cars, in the middle of the sidewalk or trail, even on the side of the road, etc. Dangerous and also mobility-impairing for anyone trying to navigate city sidewalks in a wheelchair. Similarly, lack of sidewalks in traditionally low income neighborhoods (SouthEast/Riverside/Oltorf). Hills plus curves minus sidewalks plus increased car traffic = recipe for pedestrian-vehicle collisions. Thanks.</p>
Policy Survey	<p>It is illogical to try to recreate in and around Austin a transportation system that has the idea that people on bicycles should be able to travel successfully on streets with a multitude of transportation modes that outweigh bicycles by thousands of pounds. Plus, the City has spent hundreds of thousands of our tax dollars on bike lanes that by and large are highly underused and always will be because so much of the year we live in weather conditions that are not conducive to riding a bicycle to work. The City should reverse it plan to try to make Austin like Amsterdam. Austin, Texas will never be anywhere close to Amsterdam because the cultures are so different and the infrastructure is so vastly different. Focus on ways to help people work from home, or ways to improve the bus service especially east of Austin.</p>

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	Overall, I'm quite pleased to see such a comprehensive look at transportation planning across the city. I hope that some thought is going into the impact of on-demand bicycle, scooters, and possibly new forms of such transportation on the transit hub, bicycle, sidewalk, and trail systems. For instance, I live in Northwest Austin and work at an office site along Southwest Parkway, and still no transit options appear to get me close to the office. Some on-demand last mile transit might allow me to take public transportation rather than be part of the rush hour problem on Mopac.
Policy Survey	<p>Land Use - need to affirmatively require new development to include at a minimum horizontal mixed-used development and should be verbiage about redoing CodeNext</p> <p>Parking Maximums should be implemented in core areas and parking minimums should be eliminated elsewhere</p> <p>Curb Mgmt. -include policy about parking for bicycles and new mobility providers</p> <p>Public Transport - Policy1: Dedicated lanes/ROW = imperative to make transit a real solution in ATX. Policy 2&3 should affirmatively promise to use city bond and other dollars for transit prioritization infrastructure projects explicitly!</p> <p>Bicycle System - should be policy about shared bicycle mobility (dockless and B-cycle system)</p> <p>Air & Climate - Policy2 - include CMTA fleet in GHG reductions</p> <p>Smart Mobility - Policy5 - use new technology to enhance existing modes (bus/rail) which will always be the most space efficient mode of mass transit</p> <p>Roadway System - Policy5: Manage ROW space for all users, but main goal is safety (VZ) not roadway capacity</p>
Policy Survey	I at a loss for words to express how deeply dissatisfied I am with the policies in the ASMP. I don't like it one bit. This is an agenda-driven plan to try to shift transportation from cars to other modes of transportation. While that is the goal of the most passionate of activists, the average person in Austin just wants functional roads and a reliable bus system. The average person does not want to replace lanes for cars with bike lanes. The average person does not want lanes for cars replaced with sidewalks. The average person wants more available and affordable parking. Many of these plans work fine for people who are wealthy and have short commutes to work, but they harm people who cannot afford to live close to downtown by making traffic worse by eliminating roads. These policies hurt people who are not wealthy and need to travel to work or to take their kids to a decent school. I wish these people would put their bike agenda aside and help those who are struggling.
Policy Survey	Proud that my home town is taking an all inclusive and thorough look at the concept of Strategic Mobility, but slightly weary of the city's capacity to achieve a fair and balanced implementation of the policies without unintentionally neglecting certain goals mentioned. We may want to consider declaring distinct core values which can serve to both direct and maintain the longterm plan.
Policy Survey	Less planning and more building. Austin love to plan but, things take forever to get built and done. We need infrastructure now and way down the road.

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	some seem unnecessary and make the entire Strat plan too long. Just too many things get covered that may not need to be to the extent- example sideway usage, aviation and environment. Stick to the point get more people faster safely. Nothing about getting us out of reliance on toll roads and toll roads taking more away from public infrastructure than they are adding (such as shoulders and lanes on loop1 south over the river, or the biggest bottleneck maker- too few lanes over the Colorado river. How many lanes have been added since the doubling of population? There are many simple fixes, each adding to solutions, that are not be addressed by anyone.
Policy Survey	I think it is a great plan for a city. It's focusing on the right things necessary for improvement of existing networks as well as future growth.
Policy Survey	I'd like the plan to acknowledge that some people need to us a car. Some older people, and people with disabilities for example. I am concerned about minimizing parking. Perhaps you should talk about prioritizing parking. Seniors may need a ride, but don't qualify for handicapped parking. Also re: curbs and sidewalks, I'd like to see areas designated for pulling over and picking up and dropping off riders. Again, to address needs stated above. Also, because ride share is a fact of life now, so they need safe places to drop off and pick up.
Policy Survey	<p>I strongly object to your current push to turn neighborhood greenbelt trails into freeways for bicycles by widening them and connecting them all up. What you've done at Walnut Creek Park widening for bicycles is OK, because there are many connecting "natural" trails where one can wander and appreciate nature without bicycles whizzing by in both directions. That is not the case with neighborhood greenbelts.</p> <p>Stop trying to make natural areas into high volume transportation corridors! Thanks for reading.</p>
Policy Survey	I replay support the creation of transportation hubs to make the system more useable. I do have a particular thought about increasing capacity of transportation (vehicles?). It seems that smaller vehicles that run more frequently or between more places should at least be considered. For example, I wanted to use the airport flyer and I live in the downtown area. The problem was being able to get to the bus line from my house - just one little mass transit dilemma.:)
Policy Survey	It seems like a goof place to start. As guiding principles, I am pleased to see that demand management is placed second only to security in importance. We absolutely must be able to get cars off the road. As an Austinite, I favor more options for public transit with dedicated roadway, more incentives for carpooling or taking the bus, and smart, visionary policies that lead us to electrify our current system.

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	<p>Neutral.</p> <p>Prioritize:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Slowing the Cars <p>Broadly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -reconnect streets, the traditional grid -narrow streets, design speeds less than 30 mph -allow people to more easily request temporary and cheap (relatively) pedestrian and bike infrastructure improvements <p>Focus on an all ages and abilities bikes/scooters and pedestrian network.</p>
Policy Survey	<p>Austin needs more and wider roads especially crossing Lady Bird Lake/Colorado. Austin needs park and bike/scooter parking areas so people don't have to drive across the water ways. Consider tolling non-Austin residents that drive into Austin at the city limits. Mopac is just not wide enough for the size of the city. I-35 through traffic creates lots of problems for Austinites. Expressways are built with many inefficiencies: merging should be on service roads (not expressways), lanes should be added for every main artery that feeds the expressways (Bee Cave to Mopac, 360 to Mopac, 290 to Mopac). Encourage businesses to move out of downtown--there isn't enough space for all the people, density is too high for no subway. Encourage private commuter services with more private seating. Consider bridges over the roadways for pedestrian crossings--leave ground level for handicap. Cesar Chavez is gridlocked at 5-6pm; stop developing downtown until fixed. Mopac svc roads empty for rush hr; fix.</p>
Policy Survey	<p>Policies lack connection to a larger vision of the transportation system (what does the transportation system look like in Austin's future?), do not explicitly mention modes to encourage to reach safety, affordability, sustainability, and efficiency goals (e.g., low speed electric modes like neighborhood electric vehicles(NEVs)), and do not question long-held ideas (e.g., that we must have expensive high-capacity transit or signalization systems, should plan for a bike-only network, or manage speed through infrastructure design and enforcement rather than encouraging wide range of practical low speed modes). See what LA Metro and San Diego Association of Governments are doing to promote NEVs. Reduce conflict points (e.g., innovative continuous flow designs, separate modes by speed and compatibility). Add ciclovias. Add Austin culture and economic development to "Supporting Our Community." Solar panels alt to trees. Incl. individual costs (ex healthcare) in financial policy 3.</p>

Source	Comment
Policy Survey	<p>I'd like to see two additional things mentioned explicitly in the ASMP policies:</p> <p>1) Add connectivity within the existing urban footprint and when adding onto the city at the edges. Many block sizes are very large, and a new ped-bike path or road connecting across such large blocks would generally improve mobility. This policy would also support the "compact and connected" goal in Imagine Austin.</p> <p>2) Reduce curb-to-curb road widths in the existing urban footprint, when possible. Many of our roads are overbuilt, e.g. 40' wide for a local/residential street, when 15'-28' would do.</p> <p>I'll also note that there is too much emphasis in the ASMP on expanding roadway capacity on existing roads. While some roads should be built or expanded here and there, the degree of roadway expansion described in the ASMP is not financially sustainable (since it facilitates a larger urban footprint per capita).</p>
Policy Survey	<p>I think there is a lot of good here but no where in the entire plan did I see the words "reduce vehicle miles traveled". We are in a CLIMATE CRISIS and any suggestion of increasing roadway capacity for cars is climate denial. We need to make it extremely clear that an overarching goal of this plan and all City policies should be to reduce carbon emissions and reduce VMT. Now is the time for bold climate action. Our federal government is NOT doing it and we need to step up.</p>
Policy Survey	<p>Way, way too much emphasis on bike/ped. Need to focus on modes of transportation that can have real impact on our congestion issues. Need to emphasize transit and high-capacity transit options. Cannot have affordable housing without viable transit -- Capital Metro is not the answer to this unless they have a complete change in mindset. Need to have more "doing", less "planning". Need more disabled parking in downtown central business district. Need regional planning to address I-35 congestion and growth issues.</p>
Policy Survey	<p>My suggestions to improve ASMP: 1. end parking minimums, 2. dedicate lanes for buses, & 3. reduce VMT.</p>
Policy Survey	<p>This is a great and important step. I find that the plan does not emphasize enough goal to move residents away from individual transport to more shared transport. Although present as an underlying idea, it is not clear to me how this shift can be implemented without first providing strong alternatives - for which money, land, and other resources are often lacking. Second it is not clear to me how growth of individual traffic on the short term can be managed without building a large new network of streets that will eat all resources. Modern types of traffic flow are barely mentioned and should include traffic regulation, synchronization, and an emphasis on regional flow patterns. I like the incentives for clustered development for living and work. Lastly, I understand that the plan has many public transport ideas - what is lacking is a strategy to make it useful - where is the light rail to the airport or Round Rock - and the rail to San Antonio, Houston, Dallas - people and goods!</p>
Organization Feedback	<p>See attached for Bicycle Advisory Council recommendations</p>

Source	Comment
Organization Feedback	See attached for Pedestrian Advisory Council recommendations
Organization Feedback	Is a transportation plan now "putting the cart before the horse" in relation to a major land development code revision?
Organization Feedback	What technology is assumed in the transportation demand model?
Organization Feedback	How does the ASMP address affordability regarding the way that Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority is funded through a regressive sales tax?
Organization Feedback	Is there something baked into the ASMP that would "resurrect" CodeNEXT / Is staff trying to sneak failed CodeNext measures into the ASMP
Organization Feedback	How will amendments to the plan be handled? We should be nimble in how to amend to be able to respond to disruptions quickly
Organization Feedback	Appreciate that the Safety Chapter comes first in the plan
Organization Feedback	Suggestion to reword this policy, had a difficult time getting it but did after a few readings

Source	Comment
Organization Feedback	Need to prioritize systems by speed and not by mode
Organization Feedback	where do scooters fit in, especially if the Sidewalk Plan is dated?
Organization Feedback	Urban trail connection between Springdale/MLK area and Muller across the Morris Williams Golf Course
Organization Feedback	Will the ASMP address signal timing for pedestrians?
Organization Feedback	Suggestion for funding strategy to match investments with modes that move us towards our 50/50 mode share goal---look to San Luis Obispo for one way to do it
Organization Feedback	plans vs political reality... has seen plans adopted and never implemented due to public pushback,speak to likelihood of that happening w projects proposed through ASMP
Organization Feedback	congestion pricing will be considered?

Source	Comment
Organization Feedback	<p>Dear Mayor, Mayor Pro Tem, Councilmembers, City Manager, and the Austin Transportation Department:</p> <p>Please find the attached comments from AURA on the draft Austin Strategic Mobility Plan. There is more detail in the letter, but the basic message is that the Draft ASMP has promising language, but lacks the overarching ambitious, measurable, and clear goals that are both necessary to create the path to a brighter future for Austin, and have been contained by most of the other master plans and blueprints the City of Austin has produced over the last decade. The Austin Transportation Department needs a clear mandate from City Council to prioritize reducing greenhouse gas emissions, stopping sprawl, and improving safety, while doing so equitably. We hope that the ASMP can move more in that direction before its final adoption. Please don't hesitate to email me if you have any questions or would like to discuss any of this further. Best, Brennan Griffin on behalf of AURA</p> <p>*ATTACHMENT* To: The Austin Transportation Department, Austin City Council From: AURA Re: Comments on the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan</p> <p>AURA, a grassroots organization that believes in an Austin for Everyone, began its existence as a transit advocacy organization. Since then, we have released multiple reports and engaged in continual advocacy around transportation and transit issues. The Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP) will be a key document in shaping the future of Austin. As it stands, our current mobility policies have largely led to unaffordable, disconnected, unhealthy, unsafe, and environmentally destructive sprawl. With the ASMP, especially in combination with land use reforms, we can begin charting a new course - one that includes environmental justice and greenhouse gas reductions, economic vitality, effective transit, and safer, more walkable communities everywhere.</p> <p>The draft ASMP needs significant work to get to that point. There are nods to many good, if vague, policies throughout the written document, but it nowhere lays out the overarching vision and clear policy priorities that we need to get to a brighter future. There are tradeoffs in many of the decisions that must be made about mobility: “prioritizing multimodal solutions” and a “culture of safety” are not necessarily compatible with “increasing highway person-carrying capacity,” since highways are the locus of a large percentage of our automotive-related deaths and serious injuries. Policies that do not aim to set clear, measurable goals, with baselines and projected improvements, are incredibly hard to evaluate. Without that guidance, and a clear hierarchy of priorities, and when there are too many general policy pronouncements, virtually any decision can point to whichever policy best justifies it. These policies will guide technical documents including new Street Design Guide and the Transportation Criteria Manual. These are critical documents that will determine street safety, development patterns, and Austin’s environmental footprint, potentially for decades. But these manuals get very little concrete direction from the policies enumerated. By contrast the Strategic Housing Blueprint identified clear goals for the production of different types of housing, and the Watershed Master Plan shows specifics of the types of watershed projects that need to occur and where. The ASMP needs to follow a similar track and provide much more clarity.</p> <p>To deliver the kind of city that is mandated in Imagine Austin and countless resolutions since, the goals of the ASMP should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clear mandates on reducing Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) and greenhouse gases ● Policies that prioritize safety, including clear targets of when and how Austin will accomplish its VisionZero goals. ● Prioritizing transit, cycling, and other low-environmental impact mobility solutions over single occupancy vehicles, including targets on improving modeshare for those alternatives. ● Efficiently managing parking in line with current best practices. ● Remove all ‘crash gates’. The city must reject a handful of vocal residents to disconnect a neighborhood. ● Initiate a Streets Master plan to identify and reconnect the traditional streets grid in addition to mapping street grids for future subdivisions. ● Disallow subdivision approval without full connectivity. ● The city should plan major protected bike/scooter highways that connect Downtown/UT to other parts of the city. ● Moratorium on new traffic signals, explore small scale roundabouts instead. ● Specific direction to reduce/eliminate parking minimums, and ideally enact parking maximums ● Identify more east-west streets for 4->3 road diets and protected bike lanes. ● Remove road widenings in the Barton Springs Zone. In particular, the Oak Hill parkway must be carefully planned to minimize environment impacts in this sensitive area. <p>With clear, ambitious, but achievable goals, the ASMP can help us on the path to a much brighter future for Austin, but that vision is currently lacking in the draft. We hope that future drafts will begin to address these issues.</p> <p>Sincerely, AURA For questions about these comments, please contact Brennan Griffin at brennan_griffin@gmail.com</p>

Source	Comment
Organization Feedback	<p>The Austin Board of REALTORS® recognizes the value of an updated long-term strategic mobility plan for Austin. We are pleased the City is prioritizing mobility and planning for Austin’s long-range needs, including improving existing infrastructure and preparing for new investments. As an initial policy outline, the draft ASMP sets out a promising framework for identifying mobility priorities and variables that inform transportation investments. The ASMP demonstrates broad thinking about factors that impact mobility dynamics, such as land use policies, and it recognizes important secondary dimensions of mobility, such as: equity, health, climate, water, and accessibility. However, at this time, the ASMP appears to need more fleshing out before it can be considered a viable plan that informs operational decisions. ABoR understands that a complementary “action table” is being developed that will add detail and greater depth to the high-level policies that are currently available. We are eager to see the action table and would like a further chance to comment when the policy document has been fleshed out with specific operational recommendations. In further revisions, we would like to see the ASMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • speak more directly to strategies for relieving congestion; • add greater detail about how to improve travel time reliability for the vehicle priority network; • build in a robust implementation plan that sets out recommendations for prioritization and estimated timelines; and • recommend more explicit strategies for solidifying regional partnerships and building a regional vision for mobility. <p>Strategies for relieving congestion:</p> <p>Most Austinites believe congestion to be a critical and pressing concern for the city’s mobility network. Congestion is addressed in two separate places in the draft ASMP; once in the context of managing it as part of our roadway systems, and again in the context of mitigating it through transportation operations. It is also discussed indirectly in the context of transportation demand management.</p> <p>Given the importance of congestion to how most Austinites perceive transportation challenges, ABoR would like to see a more explicit and organized approach to addressing congestion. This could be done through an organizational change in the document or via a separate resource that assembles recommendations related to congestion and explains how it is addressed in the ASMP.</p> <p>More clarity on how to improve travel times on the existing network:</p> <p>The draft ASMP also could use greater clarity on what strategies it is recommending to improve the vehicular efficiency of the existing mobility network. This is partially addressed under Roadway System Policy 2, which references improving travel time reliability on the Vehicle Priority Network. However, it is unclear from the policies and maps what types of projects will improve travel time reliability and how these will be prioritized.</p> <p>For instance, the text that is associated with the map viewer suggests that travel time reliability on the network will be boosted by “signal timing and synchronization, limiting closures of the street during peak travel times, and implementing emergency vehicle preemption technology.” While these tactics may each be valuable, they do not provide the clarity that ABoR hopes to see when addressing an item that so critical to our membership – how to improve travel times on existing roads.</p> <p>Implementation plan with prioritization and timelines</p> <p>ABoR would like additional information about when an implementation plan with prioritization timelines will be available and how stakeholders will be engaged.</p> <p>A key function of a long-term strategic mobility plan is to help decision makers prioritize how to allocate scarce resources for mobility projects and also how to evaluate mobility investments. The vehicle for this should be a prioritization scheme with a timeline for implementation that will be helpful to Council and staff in determining what types of resources are needed and when these must be available.</p> <p>Solidifying regional partnerships in pursuit of a regional mobility vision: One area of significant opportunity is working with regional partners on a shared vision for mobility investment long-term. ABoR recognizes and applauds the growing effort within the City of Austin to work more closely with mobility partners and tackle other challenges that are regional in scale. Collaborating with regional entities is cited multiple times in the draft ASMP policies in regard to the transportation network, the mobility of goods, regional air quality, and plan implementation. The inclusion of regional partnerships and collaboration in the ASMP is commendable and a good foundation for building an even stronger regional emphasis. Yet the draft ASMP does not mention the CAMPO 2040/2045 plans. It also does not make clear how the City will strive to work the ASMP into a broader, shared regional vision. Collaborating with partners is valuable, but it should be guided by a coordinated regional vision similar to those adopted by other large Texas municipalities. The ASMP is a good opportunity to build a regional mobility vision that can be placed in the context of planning activities undertaken by regional partners.</p>

Source	Comment
Organization Feedback	<p>The Downtown Austin Alliance fully supports the City’s initiative to replace its 1995 Transportation Plan by creating a new, forward-looking Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP). We believe that, as the beating heart of the city and home to 13% of its jobs, downtown is particularly poised to benefit from a thoughtful transportation plan that will ultimately move the most people to, from and around downtown. With respect to downtown, we look forward to partnering with the City to develop the Austin Core Transportation Plan (the ACT Plan) and incorporating lessons learned from an existing body of knowledge, including the Downtown Parking Strategy, Downtown Vision, Congress Avenue Urban Design Initiative, Downtown Austin Plan and any current and future downtown district plans. We consider the following goals for the ACT Plan imperative to the success of downtown Austin:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify Modal Priorities for Downtown Grid. The ASMP maps for downtown identify certain streets as “high-injury for pedestrians” and also identify such streets as priority networks for transit, vehicle and bicycles. However, each of these networks has conflicting objectives. The ACT Plan must prioritize the function and form of each street in downtown. 2. Lead on the Vision for I-35. The ASMP and the ACT Plan should provide leadership for the lowering of I-35, rather than defer to TxDOT. Include in the maps tolled managed lanes and call for east-west connections at grade. 3. Support a Performance-Based Parking Management System. The ACT Plan should support implementation of a performance-based management system that includes dynamic pricing with an 85% on-street parking space availability target, as recommended in the Downtown Parking Strategy. 4. Plan for a Slow-Speed Mobility Network and Infrastructure. The ACT Plan and ASMP should include a slow-speed network that provides a safe environment for slower modes, particularly pedestrians, and anticipates a future in which modes such as scooters, e-bikes, Neighborhood Electric Vehicles and other devices are widely used for transportation. These modes have a symbiotic link to pedestrian activity. (Example: Slow Speed Network Strategic Plan for The South Bay) 5. Comprehensive Wayfinding. With the performance-based parking management program, as well as to improve walkability downtown, signage and wayfinding is especially important to communicate information to pedestrians and cars. Street signage should be used to display pricing tiers and level of availability for multiple parking options. 6. Effective Transportation Demand Policies. The ACT Plan and ASMP should include comprehensive and coordinated improvements in employee-focused mobility services and programs, which should be developed with developer and business input. Among other policies, the City should consider moving away from Transportation Impact Analyses with a Level of Service metric for downtown. With limited right of way, the current methodology overstates traffic generation, reduces density and increases development costs. Ideally, a new rough proportionality model would provide a more “individualized determination” in place of the current one-size-fits-all arterial construction model. 7. Balanced Curbside and Pavement Design. Design the pavement and curb interface for multi-modal prioritization while taking the infrastructure needs into consideration (i.e., storm water, utilities, trees, amenities, etc.). Map, prioritize and coordinate infrastructure projects with mobility projects. 8. Downtown Circulator to Encourage Vehicles to Park Once. Create a network that supports a high-frequency downtown circulator with connections to adjacent districts, destinations and peripheral parking facilities. 9. People-Focused Grid Optimization. The policies recommended in the ASMP and ACT Plan should measure street success based on moving people, not just cars. 10. Comprehensive Plan for Street Conversions. The ACT Plan should include a comprehensive plan for converting downtown streets from one- to two-way. <p>We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on the draft ASMP and to initiate the conversation on how the Downtown Austin Alliance can be a true partner to the City of Austin in creating the ACT Plan.</p> <p>Sincerely, Dewitt Peart President and CEO</p>