

Austin Strategic Mobility Plan: Planning Commission Recommendations

Prepared by: Commissioner Conor Kenny, Planning Commission
Contact: bc-Conor.Kenny@AustinTexas.gov / 512-968-3050

Contents

Introduction	4
1. Prioritizing Our Safety	4
1.1 Safety Culture	4
1.2 Designing for Safety	4
1.3 Safe Behaviors	7
2. Managing Our Demand.....	8
2.1 Land Use	8
2.2 Parking.....	14
2.3 Curb Management.....	16
2.4 Transportation Demand Management Programming	16
2.5 Shared Mobility.....	16
3. Supplying Our Transportation Infrastructure	17
3.1 Sidewalk System.....	17
3.2 Roadway System	19
3.3 Public Transportation System	22
3.4 Bicycle System.....	24
3.5 Urban Trail System.....	24
3.6 Condition of Infrastructure	24
3.7 Emerging Mobility Solutions	24
3.8 Aviation.....	24
4. Our Transportation Network.....	24
4.1 Transportation Operations	24
4.2 Closures and Detours	24
4.3 Goods Movement.....	24
5. Protecting Our Health and Environment	25
5.1 Public Health.....	25
5.2 Air and Climate	25
5.3 Water and Stormwater	25
5.4 Land and Ecology	25
6. Supporting Our Community.....	25
6.1 Equity.....	25
6.2 Affordability	25
6.3 Accessibility	25

6.4 Public Interaction.....	25
7. Implementing Our Plan.....	26
7.1 Data	26
7.2 Collaboration	26
7.3 Financial Strategies.....	26
7.4 Action Table	26
Appendices	26
A. Acronyms and Glossary	26
B. Street Network Table and Map	26
C. Maps.....	27
D. List of Attached Plans	27
E. Chapter 380 Strategies.....	27

Note: Planning Commission recommendations edited for legibility and formatting; excludes duplicative items, typically where the Commission combined several overlapping amendments into one vote.

Introduction

No recommendations from PC

1. Prioritizing Our Safety

1.1 Safety Culture

No recommendations from PC

1.2 Designing for Safety

A. PC Recommendation by Comm. Kenny

Passed 11-0

Notes: PC also endorsed similar UTC and PAC recommendations. Creates an action item to require Transportation Safety Impact Assessments for infrastructure and development projects (with relevant PAC and UTC recommendations). This is consistent with a corresponding action item for health impact assessments: Action item 158 (Protecting Our Health and Environment / Public Health), p. 281, “Health Impact Assessment criteria: Develop criteria for where, when, and how to conduct health impact assessments, and what criteria should be assessed.”

Section: New action item in Prioritizing Our Safety / Designing For Safety (p. 269).

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.

B. PC Recommendation by Comm. Kenny

Passed 11-0

Notes: PC also endorsed similar PAC & UTC recs. 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/>

Section: Action Item #9, “Speed management guidelines,” p. 269.

Text (full text of action 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.

Section: Amends Policy 1, “Manage for Safe Speeds”, p. 18.

Text (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.

C. PC Recommendation by Comm. Kenny

Passed 10-0

Notes: Strengthens the ASMP direction to minimize curb cuts as sites are developed / redeveloped. Similar to UTC recommendation on shared driveways (see appendices).

Section: Amends Policy 3, “Integrate safe design principles into the built environment”, p. 21.

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.

D. PC Recommendation by Comm. Kenny

Passed 10-0

Notes: PC also endorsed similar UTC, PAC and BAC recommendations (see appendices). Creates an action item to develop a process for consideration and designation of right-of-way to car-free zones.

Section: New action item in Prioritizing Our Safety / Designing For Safety (p. 269).

Text (new action item):

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

1.3 Safe Behaviors

No recommendations from PC

2. Managing Our Demand

2.1 Land Use

A. PC Recommendation by Comm. Kenny

Passed 8-0-2

Notes: Strengthen policy to facilitate transit-supportive density along the Transportation Priority Network and high-capacity transit routes. Works in conjunction with other PC recommendations for action items and the call-out box defining “Transit Supportive Density” (see below). Similar to UTC recommendation on transit-supportive density.

Section: Amends Policy 1, “Promote transit-supportive densities along the Transit Priority Network”, p. 36.

Text (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 [~~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 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.

B. PC Recommendation by Comm. Kenny

Passed 8-0-2

Notes: Creates action item for updates to downtown and UNO plans. Implementation of Policy 1 / UTC recommendation.

Section: New action item, “Update downtown and University Neighborhood Overlay plans”, p. 270.

Text (full text of action item):

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

C. PC Recommendation by Comm. Kenny

Passed 8-0-2

Notes: Amends action item to provide specificity for Land Development Code updates for transit-supportive density. Adaptation of UTC-passed item.

Section: Amends Action Item 21, “Land Development Code Update”, p. 270.

Text (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

D. PC Recommendation by Comm. Kenny

Passed 8-0-2

Notes: Provide specificity to action item for corridor-based land use planning. Adaptation of UTC-passed item.

Section: Amends Action Item 22, “Corridor-based land use planning”, p. 270.

Text (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

E. PC Recommendation by Comm. Kenny

Passed 8-0-2

Notes: Create action item to implement comprehensive transit oriented development (TOD) strategy. Implementation item for Land Use Policy 1 changes and UTC recommendation. This is also a 2015 recommendation of the City's Housing + Transit + Jobs Action Team, see <http://www.austintexas.gov/edims/document.cfm?id=239538>.

Section: New action item, "Comprehensive transit oriented development strategy", p. 270.

Text (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.

F. PC Recommendation by Comm. Kenny

Passed 8-0-2

Notes: Create indicator and target on progress in planning transit-supportive density / transit-oriented development around high-capacity transit lines. Implements changes to Land Use Policy 1.

Section: New indicator and target, Managing Our Demand chapter

Text (direction to create indicator):

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

G. PC Recommendation by Comm. McGraw

Passed 9-0-1

Notes: Creates a new action item

Section: New action item, "Evaluate development for effect on mobility goals", p. 270.

Text (full text of action item):

Evaluate current new additions to the city, their access to businesses without always driving and the potential for complete communities. Revise codes to ensure that goals are being met and Austin is not simply fostering more single use sprawl and unwalkable neighborhoods to be built on the fringes of the city.

H. PC Recommendation by Comm. Kenny

Passed 8-0-2

Notes: Revises explanation of transit-supportive densities to reflect federal grant benchmarks and evidence-based practices. Adaptation of UTC item.

Section: “Transit-Supportive Densities” box under Policy 1, “Promote transit-supportive densities along the Transit Priority Network,” p. 36.

Text (full text of box):

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 an average “Medium” grade across categories, of which density is one, even to be eligible. 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

2.2 Parking

A. PC Recommendation by Comm. Thompson

Passed 9-2

Notes: Amends entire parking supply item, replacing it with policy statement calling for elimination of parking minimums (excepting accessibility parking) in Land Development Code. Mirrors recommendation to eliminate minimums passed by UTC and Bicycle Advisory Council.

Section: Amends Policy 2, “Right-size future parking supply to encourage sustainable trip options,” p. 45.

Text (full text of policy):

Eliminate Parking Minimums [~~Right-size future parking supply~~]

Remove parking minimums from the land development code (except for accessibility requirements) to end subsidies for non-sustainable trip options, improve affordability and reduce impervious cover.

~~[Assess, design, and implement location-specific parking that takes into consideration surrounding network capacity and supports increased multimodal and environmentally-friendly travel choices~~

~~Minimum parking requirements have resulted in an overabundance of parking in many locations throughout Austin and have continued to encourage people to drive to their destination. These parking spaces are expensive to build and maintain, and promote automobile use even when short trips can be easily accessed by walking, bicycling, or by taking transit. More efficient use of our land should be considered when building new developments and when remodeling older properties.~~

~~Zoning codes should be modified to: reduce parking requirements; promote shared and off-site parking among neighboring properties; utilize unbundling of parking in conjunction with site-specific TDM plans; and to support walkable, mixed-use developments to lessen the need for parking. Unbundling of parking, for example, would help manage demand on the transportation network by only providing parking for those who use it and decrease project costs for the creation of affordable housing. Affordable housing, creative and music venues, and small, local businesses in neighborhoods especially would benefit from reductions in parking requirements.~~

~~Parking supply should be more actively coordinated on district levels to support adequate parking, particularly in commercial and entertainment districts. Reducing regulatory barriers to shared parking strategies and encouraging holistic, district parking strategies can help meet current needs for parking access while reducing the portion of built space used for parking. By right-sizing the number of parking spaces provided in the future, we can use our land more efficiently to allow for sustainable transportation and more welcoming places.]~~

B. PC Recommendation by Urban Transportation Commission

Passed 11-0

Notes: Planning Commission of UTC recommendation as-written. Presented as an instruction to modify ASMP, potentially affecting both policies and action items.

Section: Affects Policy 1, “Efficiently use existing parking supply,” p. 44; action items 27, 28, 32.

Text (full text of instruction):

With respect to Action Items 27, 28, and 32, empower staff to set and adjust parking rates as necessary to achieve average occupancy rates no greater than 85 percent per blockface, reflecting a main implementation item in the Downtown Austin Parking Strategy document, potentially as part of a parking benefit district, as appropriate.

C. PC Recommendation by Urban Transportation Commission

Passed 9-0-1

Notes: Planning Commission of UTC recommendation as-written to amend action item. Parking and Transportation Management Districts are an existing tool used by the city. See here: <http://www.austintexas.gov/ptmd>

Section: Amends Action Item 28, “Parking management and pricing standards,” p. 271.

Text (full text of action item):

Identify and implement geographical Parking and Transportation Management Districts as the preferred method of managing parking demand in excess of on-street parking supply in coordination with local business and neighborhood districts.

~~[Identify and implement geographical Parking and Transportation Management Districts in coordination with local business and neighborhood districts]~~

D. PC Recommendation by Urban Transportation Commission

Passed 9-0-1

Notes: Planning Commission of UTC recommendation as-written directing new indicators and targets be created.

Section: Creates new indicators and targets for Parking sub-chapter, p. 43.

Text (full text of instruction):

Establish indicators and targets for the amount of parking per-capita within ½ mile of the High Capacity Transit Network and Transit Priority Network. Develop targets in cooperation with Capital Metro to advantage parking metrics in Federal Transit Administration grant applications. Create an action item to work with Planning and Zoning Department to develop parking requirements as part of the Land Development Code re-write to achieve targets.

2.3 Curb Management

No recommendations from PC

2.4 Transportation Demand Management Programming

A. PC Recommendation by Comm. Schneider

Passed 10-0

Notes: Creates new action item to work with government employers.

Section: Creates action item for Transportation Demand Management Programming, p. 271.

Text (full text of action item):

Government employer TDM Strategies: Seek partnerships with various federal and state government agencies and universities that are major employers within the city limits to develop pilots and demonstration projects that encourage telework, transit, and other modes and disincentivize employees to drive alone.

2.5 Shared Mobility

No recommendations from PC

3. Supplying Our Transportation Infrastructure

3.1 Sidewalk System

A. PC Recommendation by Comm. McGraw **Passed 11-0**

Notes: Creates new action item

Section: Creates action item for Sidewalk System, p. 275.

Text (full text of new action item):

Educate property owners regarding regulations and their responsibilities to maintain portions of the ROW.

B. PC Recommendation by Comm. Thompson **Passed 9-0**

Notes: Modifies existing indicator for Sidewalk System. Current city code requires that all new streets include sidewalks. It also requires that all new development on older streets include a sidewalk or fee in lieu. This means that the percentage of street frontage will rise even if we are building sprawl development and not investing in the plan at all. A metric that improves when we do nothing to move the plan forward is deceptive and destructive.

Section: Creates action item for Sidewalk System, p. 275.

Text (full text of indicator):

~~[Increase the percentage of street frontages with sidewalks]~~ Decrease the number of years to needed complete sidewalk plan based on current spend levels

C. PC Recommendation by Comm. Thompson **Passed 9-0**

Notes: Creates a new action item.

Section: Creates action item for Sidewalk System, p. 275.

Text (full text of new action item):

Develop a specific schedule and sequence of sidewalk bond referendums and other new funding policies required to meet the ASMP primary objective by 2039.'

D. PC Recommendation by Pedestrian Advisory Council

Passed 11-0

Notes: Instruction for Strategic Direction 2023.

Section: Instruction regarding Action Item #65 (Sidewalk Construction).

Text (full text of instruction):

Sidewalk Construction – Ensure Council Strategic Direction 2023 achieves Action Item #65 (Sidewalk Construction)

E. PC Recommendation by Pedestrian Advisory Council

Passed 11-0

Notes: Instruction regarding Sidewalk Plan.

Section: Applies to Sidewalk System section.

Text (full text of instruction):

Sidewalk Plan – Expand Sidewalk Plan / ADA Transition Plan to fund all missing sidewalks in the City

F. PC Recommendation by Pedestrian Advisory Council

Passed 11-0

Notes: Instruction regarding Sidewalk Obstructions.

Section: Applies to Sidewalk System action item #69.

Text (full text of instruction):

Sidewalk Obstructions – Achieve Action Item #69 (Vegetative Obstruction and Removal Program) within 3 years and develop policies to ensure motor vehicles do not obstruct the pedestrian right of way

3.2 Roadway System

A. PC Recommendation by UTC / Comm. Thompson

Passed 9-0-2

Notes: Endorses Urban Transportation Commission instructions regarding Transportation Criteria Manual revision and related processes. Level of Service Analyses tend to support demand inducing infrastructure investments that increase VMT and Greenhouse Gas Emissions while VMT, TDM and person-trip analysis reduce them. Recommendation also approved by UTC.

Section: Amends action item #234, "Transportation Criteria Manual, p. 287.

Text (full text of new action item):

Coordinate with City departments and external stakeholders to update the Transportation Criteria Manual. Including,

1. Transportation Impact Analyses should focus less on peak 15-minute period traffic congestion and more on aligning with larger plans and goals, such as the ASMP, Vision Zero, active transportation plans and goals, and Capital Metro operating and capital plans;
 2. Specifically, remove intersection level of service (LOS) as a metric and include VMT per person-trip and target mode share as replacements to better align analyses with the City's goals;
 3. Change the language of these analyses to reflect person-trips and not vehicle trips;
 4. Create and/or adopt a person- trip generation model specific to the City of Austin that includes the specific context of the development and location and has as its major output person trip generation by mode;
 5. In the event that any parking requirements are maintained, create a parking generation model specific to the City of Austin that includes the specific context of the development and location;
 6. Incentivize low VMT per person-trip and high non-SOV mode share developments;
 7. Re-examine the Rough Proportionality and cost-sharing requirements to more directly reflect the impact of the development and not the cost of historical infrastructure;
 8. Focus on Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies rather than supply-side improvements (LOS analysis);
 9. Develop TDM standards for development that focus on the inclusion of TDM elements rather than trip reduction results;
 10. Develop a TDM model specific to the City of Austin that predicts the impacts of TDM strategies.
-

B. PC Recommendation by Urban Transportation Commission

Passed 10-0

Notes: Qualifies that any projects to expand roadway capacity should not damage progress towards mode share goals, and that projects on roadway segments that are part of the Transit Priority Network and Bicycle Priority Network must first complete those networks before adding roadway capacity. Also approved by UTC.

Section: Amends Action Item #73, “Roadway capacity projects,” p. 275.

Text (full text of action item):

Develop projects that increase person capacity on our roadway system at strategic locations to manage congestion, facilitate emergency response, and provide connectivity, but not at the expense of achieving mode share goals. Lane additions and roadway widening along the Transit Priority Network and Bicycle Priority Network must first dedicate space to building that segment of the networks.

C. PC Recommendation by UTC / Comm. Kenny

Passed 10-0

Notes: Amends Policy 1 in “Roadway System” to give priority to planned transit and bicycle improvements when right-of-way or other existing constraints do not allow for both those improvements and planned roadway expansions. Also approved by UTC.

Section: Amends Policy 1, “Strategically provide new roadway connections and add capacity for vehicles,” p. 88.

Text (text of addition, to be placed as appropriate):

Where right-of-way is constrained, prioritize bicycle and transit improvements over roadway improvements for private automobiles.

D. PC Recommendation by UTC / Comm. Kenny

Passed 10-0

Notes: Amends Policy 3 in “Roadway System” to establish commuter transit as the highest priority in highway projects that overlap with the Commuter Transit Service. Recommendation also approved by UTC.

Section: Amends Policy 3, “Increase the person-carrying capacity of the highway system,” p. 90.

Text (text of addition, to be placed as appropriate):

It is the policy of the City of Austin that all highway improvements that correspond with the Commuter Transit Service should have access for buses that is separate from traffic (e.g. as part of an HOV lane, tolled lane, etc.), that highway entrances and exits be configured to allow the smooth and efficient entrance and exit of Commuter Transit Service near stations, and that this is the top priority when dealing with such projects with regional and state transportation agencies.

E. PC Recommendation by Comm. Thompson

Passed 10-0

Notes: Amends roadway connection/expansion policy to encourage connecting the grid as a community need despite opposition.

Amends Policy 1, “Strategically provide new roadway connections and add capacity for vehicles,” p. 88.

Text (full text of policy):

Strategically provide new roadway connections and add capacity for vehicles

Identify and develop projects that, while helping meet our mode share goals, increase vehicle capacity on our roadway system at strategic locations to manage congestion, facilitate emergency response, and prioritize connectivity of our streets for the common good over grid rupture for the benefit of the few [~~provide connectivity~~]

Throughout the transportation network, there are opportunities to strategically provide new roadway connections and make improvements to existing roads and intersections that add vehicle capacity. These new roadways connect people to the places they want to go and these improvements help facilitate how efficiently they get there.

New roads and improvements to existing roads and intersections are necessary to keep up with the amount of growth Austin has experienced and continues to experience. In some suburban parts of Austin that continue to grow, these roadways provide the basis for how people not only get around, but they also shape their environment. In some areas of Austin these new roads and intersection improvements provide relief from a congested network by providing new alternative routes. We must also recognize the importance of new roads and improvements to existing roads and intersections in facilitating faster emergency evacuation and response, whether it is people evacuating from a wildfire or a patient being transported to the hospital.

Other opportunities to add vehicle capacity include expansion of existing roads, reconstruction of existing substandard streets, managed access along existing roads, and enhancement of capacity and efficiency at intersections of roads. Expanded road projects include adding travel lanes and constructing raised medians, as well as bicycle and pedestrian elements. A substandard street reconstruction project includes updating a road to modern standards by adding curbs, gutters, and facilities for bicycles and pedestrians. An access management project includes converting a center turn lane into a raised median and consolidating driveways for increased capacity and safety by reducing conflicts of turning vehicles. Other improvements, such as constructing turn lanes and traffic signals or even innovative intersections, such as continuous flow intersections, can also add vehicle capacity.

3.3 Public Transportation System

A. PC Recommendation by UTC / Comm. Kenny

Passed 8-0-1

Notes: Creates an iterative process for ATD to evaluate roadways along the High-Capacity Transit Network and initiate lane dedications. This is identical to a recommendation passed by UTC.

Section: Adds an action item to the Public Transportation System section, p. 276, called “High-Capacity Transit Network lane dedication framework.”

Text (text of new action item):

Develop an action item to create the framework and criteria for periodic review of corridors on the High Capacity Transit Network and initiation of lane dedication by ATD.

B. PC Recommendation by UTC / Comm. Kenny

Passed 8-0-1

Notes: This is the first of three amendments to Policy 4, dealing with the “High-Capacity Transit Network.” Strengthens the policy on investing in a high-capacity transit system by committing to pursuing a large investment as soon as possible. This is identical to a recommendation passed by UTC.

Section: Amends Policy 4, “Invest in a high-capacity transit system,” p. 100.

Text (text of insertion in next recommendation):

We will pursue an immediate large investment in high-capacity transit systems.

C. PC Recommendation by UTC / Comm. Kenny

Passed 11-0

Notes: This is the second of three amendments to Policy 4, dealing with the “High-Capacity Transit Network.” This amends the Public Transportation System Map and any other mentions of the Dedicated Transit Pathway network and the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Light Network and merges them into the “High-Capacity Transit Network” and designates the former as “(immediate)” and the latter as the “(evolving)”. This is identical to a recommendation passed by UTC.

Section: Amends Policy 4, “Invest in a high-capacity transit system,” p. 100, the Public Transportation System Map, p. A16, and any other mentions in the text.

Text (text of instruction):

Amend Policy 4 (“Invest in a high-capacity transit system”) and the Public Transportation System Map (pg. A16) to designate the “Dedicated Transit Pathway” network as the “High Capacity Transit Network (immediate)” and incorporate the “BRT-lite” network into the High Capacity Transit Network as the “High Capacity Transit Network (evolving)”. While the immediate part of the network is the highest priority for investments and planning, the evolving part of the network is also a high priority.

D. PC Recommendation by UTC / Comm. Kenny**Passed 10-0-1**

Notes: This is the third of three amendments to Policy 4, dealing with the “High-Capacity Transit Network.” An identical item passed UTC.

Section: Amends Policy 4, “Invest in a high-capacity transit system,” p. 100.

Text (text of instruction):

State that it is city policy that the High Capacity Transit Network (Evolving) lines be transitioned to full dedicated-pathway status with high service-level Bus Rapid Transit by the completion of the ASMP term (2039). This policy should guide actions to identify opportunities both immediate (e.g. re-striping lanes downtown to be dedicated transit pathways) and longer-term (e.g. future bond issues or federal funding applications). Land use planning should also anticipate the future complete High Capacity Transit Network and plan transit-supportive development appropriate to a Bus Rapid Transit along the network corridors. Make conforming changes through the ASMP.

Text (full text of Policy 4 incorporating the three applicable recommendations):

Support the creation of a high-capacity transit system in Austin

Austin is one of the largest cities in the United States to not have a high-capacity transit system. High-capacity transit service can be any variety of high-quality transit services, including commuter rail, light rail, streetcar, bus rapid transit (BRT), and other emerging technologies. High-capacity transit service is intended to be fast, frequent, and convenient, and is differentiated by other public transportation service by operating in fully dedicated space separate from the rest of traffic, or in “dedicated transit pathways.”

In order for the City of Austin to accomplish our mode share goals, it must create a complete transit system, including investing in high-capacity transit. High-capacity transit provides a substantially higher level of passenger capacity, speed, and reliability that will undoubtedly change the landscape of Austin, influencing where we choose to live and work, and how we choose to get around.

In 2016, Capital Metro began updating their high-capacity transit planning effort, called Project Connect. The planning effort followed the Federal Transit Administration’s process to identify corridors that meet all of the criteria to support a high-capacity transit investment. These corridors are included in the Project Connect Long Term Vision Plan and include high-capacity transit operating in its own dedicated pathway. These corridors include some of Austin’s highest transit ridership corridors, North Lamar, Guadalupe, South Congress, and Riverside, and are designated as the “High-Capacity Transit Network (immediate)”. The City of Austin will continue to work with Capital Metro and other regional partners as Project Connect advances the Vision Plan further in 2019 and into 2020, and will as soon as practical pursue a large investment to implement the “High-Capacity Transit Network (immediate).”

For corridors that are not slated for dedicated transit pathways in the near-term, we must continue to advance the levels of transit service, such as by increasing frequency to less than 15 minutes and by providing high-capacity vehicles, in order to have a complete high-capacity transit system in the long-term. This includes a commitment to incrementally transitioning the “High-Capacity Transit Network (evolving)” over time into full dedicated pathways by 2039.

3.4 Bicycle System

No recommendations from PC

3.5 Urban Trail System

No recommendations from PC

3.6 Condition of Infrastructure

No recommendations from PC

3.7 Emerging Mobility Solutions

No recommendations from PC

3.8 Aviation

No recommendations from PC

4. Our Transportation Network

4.1 Transportation Operations

No recommendations from PC

4.2 Closures and Detours

No recommendations from PC

4.3 Goods Movement

No recommendations from PC

5. Protecting Our Health and Environment

5.1 Public Health

No recommendations from PC

5.2 Air and Climate

A. PC Recommendation by Comm. De Hoyos Hart

Passed 11-0

Notes: Instructional amendment.

Section: Instruction to incorporate changes throughout this subchapter.

Text (text of instruction):

Incorporate the policies and goals of the Austin Community Climate Plan

5.3 Water and Stormwater

No recommendations from PC

5.4 Land and Ecology

No recommendations from PC

6. Supporting Our Community

6.1 Equity

B. PC Recommendation by Comm. De Hoyos Hart

Passed 11-0

Notes: Instructional amendment.

Section: Instruction to incorporate changes throughout this subchapter.

Text (text of instruction):

Establish the city's commitment to Title VI of the federal Civil Rights Act

6.2 Affordability

No recommendations from PC

6.3 Accessibility

No recommendations from PC

6.4 Public Interaction

No recommendations from PC

7. Implementing Our Plan

7.1 Data

No recommendations from PC

7.2 Collaboration

A. PC Recommendation by Comm. McGraw

Passed 11-0

Notes: Instructional amendment.

Section: Instruction to incorporate changes throughout this subchapter.

Text (text of instruction):

Establish the city's commitment to Title VI of the federal Civil Rights Act

7.3 Financial Strategies

No recommendations from PC

7.4 Action Table

No recommendations from PC

Appendices

A. Acronyms and Glossary

B. Street Network Table and Map

A. PC Recommendation by Comm. Thompson

Passed 9-1

Notes: Instructional amendment.

Section: Instruction to incorporate changes throughout the Street Network Table and Map.

Text (text of instruction):

The road connection through Muni is changed to a two-lane road with bike/pedestrian way.

B. PC Recommendation by Comm. Anderson & Kenny

Passed 10-0

Notes: Instructional amendment.

Section: Instruction to incorporate changes throughout the Street Network Table and Map.

Text (text of instruction):

Remove SH45 (all segments) from the Street Network Table and Map. Create an action item (3.2 Supplying Our Infrastructure / Roadway System) that the city will oppose the expansion of SH45 by state or regional transportation agencies.

C. Maps

D. List of Attached Plans

E. Chapter 380 Strategies