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Engagement | March 4th Traffic Jam
Traffic Jam – ASMP Summary

- Approximately **230 people** attended the event
- The number of **home zip codes represented** by the participants at the event
- **11 partner agencies** and initiatives attended to provide information about their services and projects
- **30 participants** indicated their top thought was related to travel choice at the Thought Wall

- **Affordability, Travel Choice and Health & Safety** were ranked the “top priority” 19 times each out of 89 total Priority Pyramids
- **Economic Prosperity** was the **least reported priority** at the Thought Wall and Priority Pyramid
- **60 cross-sections** were developed at the Street Builder station.
- Multi-story buildings, transit amenity, bus-only lanes and wide sidewalks were the **most used street feature**
More input needed

- Traffic Jam was one of several opportunities to engage with the community
- Emphasis on engaging youth, seniors, ADA community, historically underserved/underrepresented communities
- Upcoming efforts:
  - Employer-based outreach
  - Youth engagement through local ISDs, Austin Youth Council, Colleges & Universities, etc.
  - Focus groups through hired consultant
  - Community organization engagement
  - City Council Member town hall meetings
  - & more!
Crafting Austin’s Mobility Story
Foundation Report

- Network performance
- Council District characteristics
- External forces & trends
- Graphically communicates info
- Serves as the first chapter of the ASMP
Vision

Goals

Objectives

- 47% Transit
- 9% Rideshare
- 6% Walk
- 5% Other
- 3% Bike
- 30% Drive Alone
Defining the Vision

**Imagine Austin - ASMP Vision**

Austin is accessible. Our transportation network provides a wide variety of options that are efficient, reliable, and cost-effective to serve the diverse needs and capabilities of our citizens. Public and private sectors work together to improve our air quality and reduce congestion in a collaborative and creative manner.
Crafting our Goals/Objectives

- Review public engagement results
- Consider adopted mode specific plans
- Build on Imagine Austin Indicators and policies
- Peer city considerations
- Metrics - can we measure it?

Draft Goals/Objectives
July MCAC Meeting
Scenario Planning
Scenario Planning | noun

Def: A method to explore how well different mobility strategies make progress towards achievement of goals and objectives.
What is a scenario?

Projects • Programs • Investments
What’s the Process Look Like?

Academic Answer:

- Review the Vision - expression of Community Values
- Determine what measurements of success are most important to us – Indicators
- Explore Peer Cities (how has it been done elsewhere)
- Understand the constants – Land Use and Funding
- Build and model scenarios
- Learn, refine, and identify a preferred scenario
Scenario Planning At a Glance

1. Establish a universe of projects/plans/programs
   - tdh, bike, tran, ped, its, lrtp, bond

2. Define elements and scenarios

3. Build scenarios

4. Identify indicators

5. Test scenarios
Testing Scenarios—How?

Indicator Selection ▪ Identify Priority Indicators ▪ Model Scenarios ▪ Report Results
Indicators should include a variety of traditional transportation and community vibrancy measures.
## Scenario Performance

### Report Card:

- **Transportation indicators**
- **Community vibrancy indicators**
- **Comparative analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Transportation options</th>
<th>Percentage of the transportation system under congested conditions based on vehicle miles traveled (VMT)</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Less than 5%</th>
<th>Less than 5%</th>
<th>Meets target</th>
<th>Travel under congested conditions are within targets.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peak periods</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Number of crashes per million vehicle miles traveled (VMT), on collector or above roadways, for all travelers</td>
<td>2.31 (crashes / million VMT)</td>
<td>2.25 (crashes / million VMT)</td>
<td>2.0 (crashes / million VMT)</td>
<td>Not on track to meet target</td>
<td>The crash rate has declined since the baseline year. However, it is not on track to meet the targeted reduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>Percentage of structurally deficient and/or functionally obsolete bridges</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>On track to meet target</td>
<td>There has been a slight reduction in the percentage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pavement conditions</td>
<td>Percentage of lane miles of streets (collectors and above) with unacceptable pavement conditions, based on ODOT ratings</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>No more than 5%</td>
<td>No more than 5%</td>
<td>Meets target</td>
<td>Pavement conditions ratings remain unchanged from the benchmark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete streets</td>
<td>Percentage of communities adopting complete streets policies or policies that contain those elements</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>On track to meet target</td>
<td>Dublin, New Albany, and Franklin Co. have adopted policies to encourage multiple transportation modes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Environmental justice</td>
<td>Percentage of disadvantaged population average trip travel time compared to the regional average trip time</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>Never higher than 100%</td>
<td>Never higher than 100%</td>
<td>Meets target</td>
<td>The average travel time ratio remains under the future year targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>Density (people and jobs per acre) within ½ mile of roadways (arterials and above)</td>
<td>4.5 (people / jobs / acre)</td>
<td>4.8 (people / jobs / acre)</td>
<td>6.0 (people / jobs / acre)</td>
<td>On track to meet target</td>
<td>There was a slight increase in the density.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Considerations Prior to Selection

### Technical Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Percentage of traffic congestion on arterials</td>
<td>Low, Medium, High</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Percentage of traffic fatalities</td>
<td>Low, Medium, High</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emissions</td>
<td>Percentage of vehicle emissions</td>
<td>Low, Medium, High</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Percentage of noise pollution</td>
<td>Low, Medium, High</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Percentage of accessibility improvements</td>
<td>Low, Medium, High</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Percentage of community support</td>
<td>Low, Medium, High</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indicator Weighting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Engagement Results

- [Link to Engagement Results]

- [Download Engagement Results]

---

[Image of engagement event with participants discussing and presenting information]

---
Scenarios

A

Preferred Scenario

Technical Results
Indicator Weighting
Engagement Results

B
C

Mobility Strategy*

*This may include a calibration of the preferred scenario to achieve mode split/performance targets
Indicators

Transportation
- Vehicle miles traveled (total & per capita)
- Congestion
- Right of Way Impacts (Tax Base)
- Safety
- Mode Split
- Transit Ridership
- Average transit headways
- Bicycle miles traveled
- Sidewalk (linear miles and percent of street frontages with sidewalks)
- Bicycle Lanes (linear miles)
- Special district performance (downtown/employment center/activity centers)

Community Outcomes
- Housing
- Economic vibrancy
- Households within 1/4 and 1/2 mile of distance of transit and high capacity transit (percent)
- Employees within 1/4 and 1/2 mile of transit and high capacity transit
- Social equity
- Special district performance (downtown/employment center/activity centers)
- Air quality & greenhouse gas
- Healthy communities
- Energy Consumption
- Mode split
- Households within 1/4 and 1/2 mile of dedicated bike facilities
Indicators Activity

How we’ll use the info:

- Contribute to indicator identification
- Help with the organization/communication of results
- Influence the performance weighting

### Indicators

**Transportation Indicators**

Please select your top 4, and circle 1 item you would rank as most important

- Vehicle miles traveled (total & per capita)
- Congestion
- Right of Way Impacts (Tax Base)
- Safety
- Mode Split
- Transit Ridership
- Average transit headways
- Bicycle miles traveled
- Sidewalk (linear miles and percent of street frontages with sidewalks)
- Bicycle Lanes (linear miles)
- Special district performance (downtown/employment center/activity centers)

**Community Outcomes Indicators**

Please select your top 4, and circle 1 item you would rank as most important

- Housing
- Economic vibrancy
- Households within 1/4 and 1/2 mile of distance of transit and high capacity transit (percent)
- Employees within 1/4 and 1/2 mile of transit and high capacity transit
- Social equity
- Special district performance (downtown/employment center/activity centers)
- Air quality & greenhouse gas
- Healthy communities
- Energy Consumption
- Mode split
- Households within 1/4 and 1/2 mile of dedicated bike facilities

**Other Indicators**
Remaining Timeline

- **June 2017**
  Draft Goals/Objectives

- **July 2017**
  Review G&O’s with MCAC

- **August 2017**
  City Council Review of Goals/Objectives

- **January-March 2018**
  Boards, Commissions, Committees, City Council for adoption

- **December 2017**
  Finalize plan

- **October 2017**
  Review with MCAC Scenario Evaluation Results

- **Additional Public Input**
  Sept.-Dec.
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