

## Vision & Goals

1. 1.1.0 (b): why is the language, “Use green infrastructure to protect environmentally sensitive areas and integrate nature into the city,” different from the language in Imagine Austin?

Staff response: This is the language in the current TCM from rule adoption in 2014, staff is open to suggestions to better match Imagine Austin.

## Pedestrian Facilities

1. 4.1.1 (B): Is 80” sufficient for a vertical clearance considering standard male heights in the US?

Staff response: 80 inches is the vertical clearance in ADA and PROWAG and TAS, however we did update this vertical clearance to 8 feet in the latest draft.

2. 4.1.1 (C): Does this ensure that there are no windy/circuitous sidewalks unless unavoidable?

Staff response: Additional criteria and language has been added to Section 4.1.3 in latest draft: "Meandering paths should avoid sharp turns or transitions and gradually transition no more than 1 ft. off path per 5 ft. of sidewalk length and maintain a straight section no less than the width of the sidewalk between transitions, where able".

3. 4.1.3: Any approval of flexible design standards must ensure that accessibility for users with mobility impairments is prioritized. Can this be added to provide clarity?

Staff response: This is covered by PROWAG and TAS standard requirements, of which the TCM requires users to follow.

4. 4.1.6: Can staff clarify what “depending on site conditions” means here?

Staff response: This language was removed in the latest draft and section 4.1.6 changed to reflect director approval in addition to sidewalk ordinance and LDC requirements.

5. 4.2.2 Table 4-1: Is 1200’ appropriate for Level 2 and 3 streets that are not on the Transit Priority Network? This includes streets such as E 6<sup>th</sup> and E 12<sup>th</sup>.

Staff response: This has been changed in the latest draft to reflect 600 feet.

6. 4.2.2 (A): Can staff explain how this applies to crossings?

Staff response: This can be used as justification to require a crossing if the distance between crossings exceeds Table 4-1.

7. General: Where are the guidelines for locating bus stops and shelters, including the cross-sections for such facilities with pedestrian facilities.

Staff response: These are located in Section 6 and are included in the pedestrian zone.

# Comprehensive Transportation Review

1. 10.2.0 (D) Why are other strategies to reduce VMT or automobile usage not included in this, such as parking reductions combined with other strategies, locating developments in proximity to transit etc.? How is this section different from 10.3.4.2?

**Staff response:** This section has been revised in the most recent draft and aligns with the Street Impact Fee ordinance.

2. 10.2.1 Figure 10-1: Can staff explain the thought behind reduced submittal requirements for “developments expected to generate 300-2,000 trips AND that take access to local streets?”

**Staff response:** This is to align the current process in the LDC for Neighborhood Traffic Analysis (NTAs).

3. 10.3.4.2 (E): Why is it not required that measures from (D)(1) account for at least 10% of the TDM Plan points?

**Staff response:** Not all sites will be able to mix uses or be located in proximity to transit to achieve 10%; the TDM plans will be reviewed on a more context sensitive level.

4. 10.3.5.1 (A)(a): Can staff clarify whether this means that unless development is mixed-use, it cannot get points for being in proximity to transit?

**Staff response:** This does not imply that it is a requirement to be mixed use in order to get points for transit proximity location.

5. 10.3.5.1: Why are Bike Priority Corridors not mentioned here as in 10.3.4.2 (D)(1)?

**Staff response:** The latest draft does not reference bicycle priority corridors to align with the Street Impact Fee policy.

6. 10.4.4: How does this section align with the Street Impact Fee?

**Staff response:** The latest draft includes Street Impact Fee information and illustrates how all mitigation requirements work together.

## Street Cross Sections

1. **Can we be provided examples of streets at each level and lane capacity?** These should be carrying the optimum level of traffic and built out to expected zoning, but do not necessarily need to be built out to cross section standards (although documenting where it falls short). For example, “The 1400 block of North Main Street is an example of a 4-lane Level 4 Street. It averages 95% of optimal capacity during peak periods. Lane widths are .5 ft narrower than draft TCM standards and there is no buffer between the road and the sidewalk.”  
**Staff response:** The street levels and typologies correspond with the ultimate state of the majority of streets as shown in the ASMP Street Network Table; the TCM is intended to be used for new streets as well as a starting point for retrofits with flexible design standards. As we work through final internal review, staff is happy to provide more updated examples to the commission.
2. How is “constrained” determined? Example possible concerns:

- a. Why would there be parallel parking on a constrained Level 3 street, instead of providing more width for the bikeway and sidewalk?
- b. Why would there be an 11.5' motor lane on a Level 2 street non-transit corridor, instead of a 10' motor lane with the recommended sidewalk and bikeway widths?
- c. Why would there be a narrow buffer between the bikeway and motor lanes, instead of removing a motor lane?

Staff response: Updated language in the most recent TCM draft clarifies that “constrained” is only when the required right-of-way per the ASMP is not adequate to fit all recommended dimensions. Constrained is not intended to be used for new streets, but rather on retrofit situations of streets in coordination with staff review.

Why are there no designs for cross sections without motor vehicle travel lanes? Are there criteria for Passeos, Pedestrian Plazas, Bike Plazas, etc.?

Staff response: The draft TCM does include recommendations in Section 3.8.0 for shared streets, however it does not include criteria for the Passeos, Pedestrian Plazas, or Bike Plazas. As these types of environments become more commonplace here in Austin, the TCM can be updated to reflect local design criteria.

Why are the lane widths greater than all of the standards listed as guiding documents?

Staff response: Austin is unique in that outside lanes must accommodate a gutter pan of 1-1/2 feet, of which is typically not used for vehicle travel (this collects water run-off, debris, etc.), while outside lanes are designed to accommodate future transit conversions of an effective lane width of 11 feet.

Why is the bikeway clear width for Level 2 less than Levels 3 & 4. Wouldn't the width be based on level of bike demand and not on level of motor demand? (Motor demand includes more trips over 5 miles which tend to use Level 3 and 4, while bike demand more includes trips under 5 miles which will more likely use Level 2 streets than motors (proportionally). Same for sidewalk widths.

Staff response: A balanced approach was taken on Level 2 streets to not create excessively wide right-of-way widths while providing adequate clear widths for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Why are two-way bicycle lanes so common when most standards say they should be avoided?

For example, from the Bikeway Selection Guide...

“On two-way streets, one-way separated bike lanes on each side of the street are typically preferred over a two-way separated bike lane or side path on one side of the street.

In circumstances where destinations are concentrated along one side of a street, the bikeway is connecting to other two-way bikeways, or where the bikeway is located on a one-way street for motor vehicle travel, the provision of a two-way separated bike lane may be desirable as wrong-way bicycling is likely in a one-way bike lane configuration.”

This doesn't mention "more efficient" as a guiding principle and seems to indicate that it is appropriate only when users would likely use the existing infrastructure in the wrong direction. Is Austin placing efficiency over safety?

Staff response: The standards put forth in the updated TCM are for one-way raised bicycle facilities on both sides of the street, which is the preferred method. Two-way bicycle facilities would typically only be developed in retrofit situations where space is constrained and approved by applicable staff to provide needed bicycle infrastructure connections.

## Design Criteria

1. What are the number of people who die or are severely injured in fires every year in Austin? How many of those deaths/injuries does the Fire Department could be avoided if response times were improved?

Staff response: According to the AFD performance measures page, there were 5 unintentional fire deaths reported in FY2016, 1 in FY2017, and 5 in FY2018, 6 in FY2019, and 2 in FY2020. There is no data on severe injuries readily available to report. AFD would have additional data related to response time questions.

2. What are the number of people who die or are severely injured in vehicle crashes every year? How many of those deaths have speed and/or road design listed as a significant factor?

Staff response: The five-year average for people dying in car crashes each year is ~82, and there were 90+ people killed on the roadways in each of the last two years (of that total, ~30 traffic-related fatalities occur per year on City-owned streets). The five-year average for people getting seriously injured in car crashes each year is ~520. ~13% of fatal crashes and ~8% of serious injury and fatal crashes combined have speed documented as a contributing factor. However, there is overwhelming scientific research and many recent reports that state speed is a factor in every crash and should be a primary focus of a safe systems approach across a transportation network. One should also note that officers only document speed on crash reports for certain conditions (they do not take into consideration the road's design speed or whether the posted speed is appropriate for example).

3. How would the new TCM treat the preliminary plan submitted for the recent case for West Bella Fortuna (Case C8J-2020-0013)? This plan seems to have 1/2 of the streets submitted as Cul de Sacs. I thought this was already discouraged in current code, yet developers seem to find a way. What changes would be required under the new TCM?

Staff response: This is something that needs to be addressed in the LDC as it relates to block length and connectivity requirements, which are not addressed in the TCM. The TCM simply will show how to design a cul-de-sac and how they must perform, not if they are (or are not) permitted.

4. 3.4.2.1.1 - Would trees be allowed within the triangle as long as they do not create a continuous obstruction?

Staff response: The latest draft TCM includes an updated figure which minimizes triangle distance and allows a 2-stage stop, which will have minimal impacts on trees.

## Bikeways & Urban Trails

1. Is there anywhere the TCM states that bikeways (and pedestrian connections) should be as straight as practical?  
**Staff response: Straight pedestrian facilities are covered in Section 4.1.3, while Section 5.1.1.1 covers horizontal curves and design speeds for bikeways.**
2. How is a 2' buffer safe for bikes, if for intersections the minimum lateral offset for light poles etc. is 3'?  
**Staff response: This requirement reflects current standards for cyclist operations where the cyclist will primarily operate in the center of the facility.**

## Transit

1. Page 6-10, Table 6-4:- Under what circumstances would a roadway travel lane be removed in order to provide the Tier 1 treatment?  
**Staff response: Given that bicycle lanes are raised and separated as the standard on new streets, this would be only in retrofit situations and determined by applicable staff.**
2. Page 6-10, Table 6-4:- What specific, measurable criteria determine when Tier 2 and Tier 3 are chosen over Tier 1?  
**Staff response: Tier 1 stops would be the standard for new facilities; Tier 2 stops are for retrofit situations or where on-street bicycle lanes are present; and Tier 3 stops are intended for environments where insufficient right-of-way exists and cannot be acquired to accommodate based on ASMP required right-of-way.**