

Subchapter: Managing Our Demand / Land Use

Submitted by Commissioner Kenny

Amendment Index:

1. Strengthen policy to facilitate transit-supportive density along the Transportation Priority Network and high-capacity transit routes
 2. Provide specificity to action item for Land Development Code updates for transit-supportive density
 3. Provide specificity to action item for corridor-based land use planning
 4. Create action item for updates to downtown and UNO plans
 5. Create action item to implement comprehensive transit oriented development (TOD) strategy
 6. Create indicator and target on progress in planning transit-supportive density / transit-oriented development around high-capacity transit lines
 7. Revise explanation of transit-supportive densities to reflect federal grant benchmarks and evidence-based practices
-

Amendment 1

Purpose: Strengthen policies to facilitate transit-supportive density along the Transportation Priority Network and high-capacity transit routes

Origination: Commissioner adaptation of UTC items (see Background)

Amendment 1 section: Policy 1, “Promote transit-supportive densities along the Transit Priority Network”, Managing Our Demand / Land Use (pg. 36)

Amendment 1 changes (full text of policy):

Plan ~~Promote~~ transit-supportive densities along the Transit Priority Network

Use all planning tools to establish ~~Require or incentivize~~ transit-supportive densities along Transit Priority Network corridors appropriate to the transit mode planned

Appropriate land use density is the foundation for efficient public transportation; dense urban areas with multiple uses including employment centers, multifamily homes, and commercial uses make high-quality transit services, viable. Transit-oriented development is not just density; a rich mix of land uses and a great public realm with a pedestrian-friendly streetscape and amenities is what causes ~~When~~ more people to live close to transit, which allows transit to ~~to~~ can run more often and connect people to more destinations. Establishing transit-supportive development (including densities) along planned investments in high-capacity transit is essential to their success, and to securing federal transit funding, and should be a top planning and

investment priority. This can and should dovetail with established city goals to add housing near transit lines, especially housing affordable to Austinites with lower incomes.

The high-capacity transit routes planned in Austin run through different types of built environments, including downtown, commercial centers, already-dense mixed-use neighborhoods, and areas dominated by detached, single-family homes. Transit-supportive densities are measured for routes as a whole, and planning should be flexible to take into account the existing character of neighborhoods and community input to appropriately allocate density within transit corridors, but plans must be projected to achieve the transit-supportive density appropriate for the planned mode of transit.

~~Transit-supportive density can be achieved by requiring an appropriate level of density through land planning efforts and zoning regulations, as well as through development incentives associated with small area planning policies. Encouraging denser development near the Transit Priority Network will foster development patterns which will create compact centers designed to encourage walking and bicycling, and will enable transit-supportive development.~~

The full range of planning tools should be used to establish this density, including zoning reviews, small area plans, density bonuses, affordable housing investments, transit-oriented development zones, and revisions of the land development code, potentially including zone entitlements and bonuses tied to the distance from transit. The city will develop a comprehensive transit-oriented development strategy for the High-Capacity Transit Network to guide private and public investment, develop policy recommendations, establish station-level action items to foster high quality transit-oriented development, and prioritize need to allocate limited resources. The portions of the Transit Priority Network not planned for high-capacity transit should have transit-supportive densities considered in land use planning, but are a lower priority.

~~Other s~~Strategies to encourage this type of development include providing incentives in certain cases or enacting more permissive regulations for developments that go above and beyond base zoning requirements. Direct public investment in and management of redevelopment at major mobility hubs will ensure high levels of community benefits accompany density along the Transit Priority Network. These community benefits should include affordable housing, affordable space for arts, music, “legacy,” and small business uses, civic spaces, and other amenities like “green” design and childcare. Bicycle facilities, sidewalks, and other investments that allow people of all abilities to access transit should also be prioritized along the network. Affordable housing investments near the network should be steered to comply with standards in federal transit funding opportunities as much as possible without sacrificing effectiveness.

Finally, people living downtown and near the University of Texas campus already have the lowest rate of drive-alone trips and vehicle miles travelled, and increasing density in these areas is one of the surest ways to lower that rate city-wide and facilitate increased transit ridership.

Amendment 2

Purpose: Provide specificity to action item for Land Development Code updates for transit-supportive density

Origination: Commissioner adaptation of UTC items (see Background)

Amendment 2 section: Action Item 21, “Land Development Code Update”, Managing Our Demand / Land Use (pg. 270)

Amendment 2 changes (full text of action item):

Land Development Code Update

Update the land development code to:

- Require a more compact and connected street network
 - Revise zones, an immediate zoning map, and/or bonuses to A allow for and incentivize transit-supportive densities and require a mixture of land uses along the Transit Priority Network and within ½ mile of planned high-capacity transit, in a manner that blends-in with, and is sensitive to, existing forms of housing
 - Allow for missing middle housing types, including mixed-use infill development types
-

Amendment 3

Purpose: Provide specificity to action item for corridor-based land use planning

Origination: Commissioner implementation of Policy 1 changes and UTC recommendation (see background below)

Amendment 3 section: Action Item 22, “Corridor-based land use planning”, Managing Our Demand / Land Use (pg. 270)

Amendment 3 changes (full text of action item):

Corridor-based land use planning

Conduct corridor-based land use planning in parallel with corridor mobility planning and implementation to calibrate zoning and land development code requirements with needs, constraints, and opportunities to create cohesive multimodal corridors, quality built environment, ~~and transit-supportive~~ and context-sensitive density scale that is projected to achieve Federal Transit Administration transit supportive density ratings of “Medium-High” (for the Project Connect BRT-Light network) or “High” (for the Project Connect High Capacity Rapid Transit and Commuter Line networks) within ½ mile of planned high-capacity transit investments

Amendment 4

Purpose: Create action item for updates to downtown and UNO plans

Origination: Commissioner implementation of Policy 1 changes and UTC recommendation (see background below)

Amendment 4 section: New action item, “Update downtown and University Neighborhood Overlay plans”, Managing Our Demand / Land Use (pg. 270)

Amendment 4 changes (full text of action item):

Update downtown and University Neighborhood Overlay plans

Refresh the downtown and University Neighborhood Overlay zoning and land use regulations to allow for greater density to meet mode-share goals.

Amendment 5

Purpose: Create action item to implement comprehensive transit oriented development (TOD) strategy

Origination: Commissioner implementation of Policy 1 changes and UTC recommendation (see background below)

Amendment 5 section: New action item, “Comprehensive transit oriented development strategy”, Managing Our Demand / Land Use (pg. 270)

Amendment 5 changes (full text of action item):

Comprehensive transit oriented development strategy

Action item: Collaborate with Capital Metro to develop a comprehensive transit oriented development (TOD) strategy, including an implementation action plan and a system to track and monitor success to refine and improve the strategy in the future.

Amendment 6

Purpose: Create indicator and target on progress in planning transit-supportive density / transit-oriented development around high-capacity transit lines

Origination: Commissioner implementation of Policy 1 changes and UTC recommendation (see background below)

Amendment 6 section: Indicators and Targets, Managing Our Demand

Amendment 6 instruction: Create a new indicator and target showing which portion of the planned high-capacity transit lines have fully completed plans that project appropriate transit-supportive density

Amendment 7

Purpose: Revise explanation of transit-supportive densities to reflect federal grant benchmarks and evidence-based practices

Origination: Commissioner implementation of UTC recommendation (see background below)

Amendment 7 section: “Transit-Supportive Densities” box under Policy 1, “Promote transit-supportive densities along the Transit Priority Network” (pg. 36)

Amendment 7 text:

Transit-Supportive Densities

Population density refers to the amount of people that live, work, or play within a specified geographic area. It is generally measured by people or units per acre. When enough people live, work, or play in an area, it means that public transportation serving the area can be economically, environmentally, and socially efficient.

Different contexts, including whether a place is urban or suburban, whether it is residentially- or commercially-focused, and other differences, may require different densities to be transit-supportive. Transit-supportive densities are also different for different levels of transit service; generally the higher the level of investment, the higher the density. Within the urban and suburban contexts of Austin, Capital Metro has defined what transit-supportive density levels are. There are three principle sources for appropriate transit-supportive densities: Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant benchmarks and the Puget Sound Regional Council 2015 meta-analysis, “Transit-Supportive Densities and Land Use,” address density around high-capacity transit and Capital Metro has standards for general bus service. Both the FTA and the Puget Sound study measure density as an average across an entire transit line - individual segments may have higher or lower densities - which helps give flexibility in planning.

FTA benchmarks are important because their grants are a substantial portion of funding for transit projects. The FTA set them to “ensure that neighborhoods surrounding proposed transit stations have the fundamentals in place to ensure that as service is improved over time there is a mix of housing options for existing and future residents.” All projects submitted must achieve the “Medium” density grade to be eligible, and a “Medium-High” or “High” level makes grant proposals more competitive. The FTA measures density in half-miles from transit stations, so transit lines with stops spaced less than a mile apart and final station locations that are not set can be measured along the corridor ½ mile from a transit line, while greater-spaced transit lines or those with set final station locations can be measured in a ½ mile radius around stations. The FTA also takes Central Business District Parking levels into account.

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

The Puget Sound study provides appropriate density ranges for different modes of transit to ensure adequate ridership and costs-per-passenger, and to achieve decreases in BMT and drive-alone trips. These are not thresholds to meet but goals that, as we achieve them, the health of our transit system improves.

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

Capital Metro measures density ¼ mile from transit corridors that support basic transit service. By achieving these transit-supportive densities along the Transit Priority Network and other existing bus lines, Capital Metro can avoid service changes that eliminate or move routes due to a lack of density and riders.

Capital Metro Residential transit-supportive density: 16 people per acre

Capital Metro Commercial transit-supportive density: 8 people per acre

Background:

This policy revision and the associated action items amendments are an adaptation of the following UTC recommendations:

- With respect to Action Item 21, update the Land Development Code related to housing and transit-supportive density to:
 - Increase density not just on identified transit-friendly corridors but within ¼ mile of those corridors to further shift mode choice away from single-occupancy vehicles; transition zones from corridor should reflect ImagineAustin and extend one to four blocks on either side of the corridor;
 - Increase residential zoning to more ably address the housing affordability crisis and provide more options (including "missing middle" housing);
- Insert new action item after Action Item 22 to state: "Plan for downtown growth. Plan and zone for the downtown and the university to grow in both residential and employment density as fast as the region's growth or faster." Downtown is a special part of the transportation network as the one part of the city that can reach and be reached by public transportation to and from anywhere in the city that is on public transportation. The existence of the downtown housing and job cluster makes it much easier for job movers and two-earner households to find transit supportive residential and job locations.
- Amend Policy 1 ("Promote transit-supportive densities along the Transit Priority Network") to direct that all land use processes and decisions adopt minimum targets of transit-supportive densities along the High-Capacity Transit Network appropriate for the transit mode planned.
- Average densities for the lines should achieve a "High" rating for the immediate portion of the High-Capacity Transit Network and a "Medium-High" rating for the evolving portion of the network, and be based on the recommended density levels in the Puget Sound Transit Supportive Densities and Land Uses study.
- An action item should be created to create and adopt a comprehensive transit-oriented development strategy for new planning along the entire High Capacity Transit Network, and an indicator showing the progress towards completing those plans. The plan should include developing pedestrian-friendly infrastructure to support walkable neighborhoods near transit.
- Make conforming changes throughout the ASMP.

Subchapter: Prioritizing Our Safety / Designing for Safety

Submitted by Commissioner Kenny

Amendment Index:

1. Implement NACTO “critical” recommendations for safe design speeds (with relevant PAC and UTC recommendations)
 2. Require Transportation Safety Impact Assessments for infrastructure and development projects (with relevant PAC and UTC recommendations)
 3. Develop a process for consideration and designation of right-of-way to car-free zones (with relevant UTC, PAC, and BAC recommendations)
 4. Strengthen ASMP direction to minimize curb cuts as sites are developed/redeveloped (with relevant UTC recommendation)
-

Amendment 1

Purpose: Implement NACTO “critical” recommendations for safe design speeds (with relevant PAC and UTC recommendations)

Origination:

- Pedestrian Advisory Council, ASMP recommendation #1: “Design Speeds - Target design speeds should not exceed 35 mph”
- Pedestrian Advisory Council, ASMP recommendation #2: “Speed Management - Prioritize Action Item #9 (Speed Management Guidelines) and implement it as soon as possible.”
- Urban Transportation Commission, ASMP recommendation: “Change the language in Policy 1 from “Manage for safe speeds” to “Design and manage for safe speeds” as a City of Austin value statement.
- Urban Transportation Commission, ASMP recommendation: “Update Action Item 9 to state: ‘Develop a comprehensive data-driven approach to speed management to evaluate systemwide speeds and make recommendations for reforming speed setting methodology, implementing countermeasures to address streets with documented speeding concerns, and adopting street design guidelines that help achieve targeted operating speeds systemwide, with no design speed to exceed 35 MPH. This action item will be prioritized and implemented as soon as possible.’”

Amendment 1.A section: Policy 1, “Manage for Safe Speeds”, Prioritizing our Safety / Designing for Safety (pg. 18)

Amendment 1.A changes (full text of policy):

Design and manage for safe speeds

Reduce the likelihood that crashes will result in a fatality or serious injury by designing streets for safe speeds

Given the correlation between vehicle speed and crash severity, speed management is a critical focus area of Vision Zero. The goal of speed management is to minimize crashes and crash severity, using the human body's tolerance for impact force as the guiding tool.

Our approach to speed management begins with selecting safe target speeds for all streets based on their context. Target speed refers to the speed at which we want cars to drive on the street. Surrounding land uses, traffic volumes, and pedestrian activity all affect the appropriate target speed for a street. The target speeds inform the design speed, which refers to the specific geometric features or elements of a roadway necessary to achieve the target speed. We will use design criteria that are at or below the target speed of a given street. The posted speed limits are set to help communicate and reinforce safe target speeds. After setting the target speed and implementing design speeds, we analyze operating speed, which refers to the observed speed of people using the street.

The 85th percentile of observed target speeds should fall between 10–30 mph on most urban streets. The maximum target speed for urban arterial streets is 35 mph. Some urban arterials may fall outside of built-up areas where people are likely or permitted to walk or bicycle. In these highway-like conditions, a higher target speed may be appropriate, but the use of higher speeds should generally be reserved for limited access freeways and highways and is inappropriate on urban streets, including urban arterials.

Historically, many streets were designed where the operating speed influenced the design speeds and the posted speed limit. This resulted in fast drivers raising the speed limit of roads and leading to less safe design elements such as larger turning radii and wider streets. Using target speeds instead of operating speeds to influence the design speed of our streets allows our community to prioritize safety and design our streets for safety as we work to support this goal.

Background:

- This change implements the National Association of City Transportation Officials' Urban Street Design Guide "critical" recommendations for design speed. See full text at <https://nacto.org/publication/urban-street-design-guide/design-controls/design-speed/>

CRITICAL

Design streets using target speed, the speed you intend for drivers to go, rather than operating speed. The 85th percentile of observed target speeds should fall between 10–30 mph on most urban streets.

The maximum target speed for urban arterial streets is 35 mph.⁴ Some urban arterials may fall outside of built-up areas where people are likely or permitted to walk or bicycle. In these highway-like conditions, a higher target speed may be appropriate.

The maximum target speed for urban collector or local streets is 30 mph.

Use design criteria that are at or below the target speed of a given street. The use of higher speeds should be reserved for limited access freeways and highways and is inappropriate on urban streets, including urban arterials.

Bring the design speed in line with the target speed by implementing measures to reduce and stabilize operating speeds as appropriate. Narrower [lane widths](#), roadside landscaping, [speed humps](#), and [curb extensions](#) reduce traffic speeds and improve the quality of the bicycle and pedestrian realm.⁵

[+ More Info](#)

Amendment 1.B section: Action Item #9, “Speed management guidelines,” Prioritizing our Safety / Designing for Safety (pg. 269)

Amendment 1.B text (full text of item):

Develop a comprehensive data-driven approach to speed management to evaluate systemwide speeds and make recommendations for reforming speed setting methodology, implementing countermeasures to address streets with documented speeding concerns, and adopting street design guidelines that help achieve targeted operating speeds systemwide. This action item will be prioritized and implemented as soon as possible.

Amendment 2

Purpose: Require Transportation Safety Impact Assessments for infrastructure and development projects

Origination: Urban Transportation Commission, ASMP recommendation, “Require a transportation safety analysis for every infrastructure and development project that reflects existing infrastructure and collision problems, as well as induced demand and actual travel speeds, and truly prioritizes transportation safety with respect to design decisions and transportation funding (Consistent with Action Item 158 -Health Impact Assessments).”

Amendment 2 section: New action item in Prioritizing Our Safety / Designing For Safety (pg. 269).

Amendment 2 text (new action item):

Transportation Safety Impact Assessments: Develop criteria and a policy to require a transportation safety analysis for every infrastructure and development project that reflects existing infrastructure and collision problems, as well as induced demand and actual travel

speeds, and truly prioritizes transportation safety with respect to design decisions and transportation funding.

Background: This is consistent with a corresponding action item for health impact assessments: Action item 158 (Protecting Our Health and Environment / Public Health), pg. 281, “Health Impact Assessment criteria: Develop criteria for where, when, and how to conduct health impact assessments, and what criteria should be assessed.”

Amendment 3

Purpose: Develop a process for consideration and designation of right-of-way to car-free zones (with relevant UTC, PAC, and BAC recommendations)

Origination:

- Urban Transportation Commission, ASMP recommendation, “Car-Free Zones - Add an Action Item for determining a process to consider whether / how a right of way might be converted to a car-free space (e.g. Speedway on UT Campus)”
- Pedestrian Advisory Council, ASMP recommendation #7, “Car Free Zones – Add an Action Item for determining a process to consider whether / how a right of way might be converted to a car free space (e.g. Speedway on UT Campus)”
- Bicycle Advisory Council, ASMP recommendation, “BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the BAC recommends adding an action item for identifying possible streets as Car Free Zones such as pedestrian and bicycle malls or connectivity-focused pocket parks, particularly in areas where the road network is over capacity such as West Campus;”

Amendment 3 section: New action item in Prioritizing Our Safety / Designing For Safety (pg. 269).

Amendment 3 text (new action item):

Develop a process for considering and implementing existing right-of-way as car-free bike and/or pedestrian zones.

Background:

Amendment 4

Purpose: Strengthen ASMP direction to minimize curb cuts as sites are developed/redeveloped

Origination:

- Urban Transportation Commission, ASMP recommendation, “Incentivize shared driveways for all types of development to both reduce impervious cover and better manage access points along roadways.”

Amendment 4 section: Policy 3, “Integrate safe design principles into the built environment”, Prioritizing Our Safety / Designing for Safety (pg. 21).

Amendment 4 text (full policy text):

Integrate safe design principles into the built environment

Ensure that all new development or redevelopment contributes to a safe transportation network through site design and access management

Future land development activities should reflect the current understanding of safe design principles, which contribute to a safe transportation network and built environment. This means including standards that minimize the potential for conflicts between street users and prioritize the safety of vulnerable users in all City codes, ordinances, plans, studies, manuals and programs governing land development.

A built environment that facilitates safe mobility will vary greatly based on context. Infill development may help create compact places, lighting increases safety for all users, and strong access management policies help minimize conflicts at driveways or in parking lots. Developing strong access management policies that address safety at entry and exit points along a roadway is a critical area of focus in this regard. The Federal Highway Administration estimates that comprehensive corridor access management strategies can reduce injury and fatal crashes on urban/suburban streets by up to 30%. City land use policies should require and incentivize reducing the number and size of curb cuts - especially those that interact with the Bicycle Priority Network - including relocating or consolidating driveways. Techniques to do this could include reducing curb cuts to minimize conflicts between modes or consolidating driveways. This means several properties would be accessed through one driveway, and requires joint use easements to allow movement into and out of the site. Driveways with high car volumes should generally not cross the Bicycle Priority Network unless there are no alternatives, and then safety analysis and controls should be implemented.

Raised medians, another access management strategy, can limit potentially dangerous cross-roadway movements.

Potential amendments to ASMP Action Items in the “Managing our Demand,” “Supplying Our Infrastructure,” and “Implementing Our Plan” chapters.

Submitted by Commissioner Kenny

Action Table Location	Action Title	Suggested Action Text	Existing Action Text
MANAGING OUR DEMAND			
<i>Land Use</i>			
New Item	Housing Entitlement Model	Develop transparent, validated, demand-aware model that estimates the supply effects of new housing entitlements and the related impacts on mode choices.	NA
<i>Parking</i>			
New Item	Parking Modernization Omnibus	City Manager will present a draft parking reform ordinance that implements all of the parking “Policy” items that are not covered in the land development code.	NA
SUPPLYING OUR INFRASTRUCTURE			
<i>Sidewalk System</i>			
New Item	Sidewalk Capital Scenario	Develop a specific schedule and sequence of sidewalk bond referendums and other new funding policies required to meet the ASMP primary objective by 2039.	NA
<i>Roadway System</i>			
Item 81	Neighborhood-focused data collection	In collaboration with the "Trip Surveying" action, develop a data collection effort to support the implementation of traffic management strategies within and around existing neighborhoods to mitigate disruptions caused by changing travel patterns and surrounding roadway improvements.	Develop a data collection effort to support the implementation of traffic management strategies within and around existing neighborhoods to mitigate disruptions caused by changing travel patterns and surrounding roadway improvements.

<i>Public Transportation System</i>			
Item 83	Transit Enhancement Program	Develop a preferred sequence of for the allocation of right-of-way to transit. Provide clear triggers based on a mix of congestion metrics and deployed transit service hours. Develop Transit Enhancement Program guidelines and strategies for transit enhancement treatments and when to apply them.	Develop Transit Enhancement Program guidelines and strategies for transit enhancement treatments and when to apply them.
New Item	Transit Capital Scenario	Develop a specific schedule and sequence of sidewalk bond referendums and other new capital funding policies required to meet the ASMP primary objective by 2039.	NA
New Item	Transit Operating Spending Scenarios	Prepare a report outlining specific funding plans that include the estimated new contributions for transit operations from the City, County, and Central Texas Regional Mobility Authority necessary to meet the ASMP primary plan objective by 2039.	NA
<i>Bicycle System</i>			
New Item	Bicycle Capital Scenario	Develop a specific schedule and sequence of bicycle bond referendums and other new capital funding policies required to meet the ASMP primary objective by 2039.	NA
<i>Urban Trail System</i>			
New Item	Urban Trail Capital Scenario	Develop a specific schedule and sequence of urban trail bond referendums and other new capital funding policies required to meet the ASMP primary objective by 2039.	NA
IMPLEMENTING OUR PLAN			
<i>Data</i>			
New Item	Trip Surveying	Develop a local surveying capability to survey mode choices in a more granular fashion and at a higher tempo than Federal programs.	NA

<i>Financial Strategies</i>			
Item 265	Budget alignment	Prepare a "Mode Shift Budgeting" report that provides an exhaustive listing of legally-viable funding and policy changes that incentivize the land use and sustainable mode spending that supports the ASMP primary objective. Regularly evaluate the document for alignment with desired outcomes as defined by the Strategic Direction, this plan, and other related City-adopted plans.	Regularly evaluate budgets for alignment with desired outcomes as defined by the Strategic Direction, this plan, and other related City-adopted plans.
New Item	Comprehensive Capital Scenarios	Develop a comprehensive schedule and sequence of bond referendums and other new capital project funding policies required to meet the ASMP primary objective by 2039.	NA