Bicycle Plan and Urban Trail Plan Board and Commission Feedback Tracking

ID	Plan	Proposed By	Page Number	Type	Change Proposed	Staff Response	Staff Response Notes
1	Bicycle Plan	Zoning and Platting Commission			The City of Austin Zoning and Platting Commission encourages the City Council to recommend that the Bicycle Plans consider the feedback of directly affected stakeholders when determining a bike route…	Already included (no change)	See Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section Project Development and Public Engagement
2	Bicycle Plan	Zoning and Platting Commission			The City of Austin Zoning and Platting Commission encourages the City Council to recommend that the Bicycle Plans consider the feedback of directly affected stakeholders when determining a bike route and then creating a process to evaluate the impact and safety of the route after it has been installed	Staff supports elements of this change	See new language in Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section Project Development and Public Engagement: "The evaluation of projects and programmatic approaches can take many forms. As standard practice, the City monitors and makes adjustments as necessary to all mobility systems and projects. In some cases, before and after studies are conducted to better understand a particular project or broader programmatic approaches which can be a useful tool to further build public trust."
3	Bicycle Plan	Zoning and Platting Commission			Requests that existing bicycle use patterns such as schools' bike trains be prioritized in developing All Ages and Abilities routes	Staff supports this change	Added **bold** to following text in Ch2 Bicycle System, section Project Prioritization: "The project selection process is discussed later in this section that accounts for other nuanced factors the model cannot address such as localized connectivity needs, coordination opportunities, **supportive programming**, feasibility, outcomes of public engagement and finer grained cost assessments." and Ch2, section Project Selection: High priority project candidates will be further screened at a high level for feasibility, detailed connectivity considerations, street slopes, ability to address barriers along routes**, opportunity for supportive programming,** cost benefit of the project, and coordination opportunities.
4	Bicycle Plan	Zoning and Platting Commission			Asks that the Bike Plans enumerate and follow best practices in Improving Austin's All Ages and Abilities network as established by NACTO and model cities such as Seattle	Already included (no change)	NACTO guides for the selection and design of bicycle facilities is referenced numerous times throughout the document. Best practices. The City of Seattle has been added to the list along with other North American and International cities leading in best practice all ages and abilities bicycle network buildout.
5	Bicycle Plan	Zoning and Platting Commission			Special attention be placed on determining minimum road widths for adding a bike lane, maximum slopes for All Ages and Abilities intersections, engineering bollards that are safe for cyclists and developing criteria for the installation of speed humps.	Staff does not support this change	Design standards for road widths and bicycle lanes is covered in the Transportation Criteria Manual (TCM). The introduction of the TCM states explicitly that there will be constrained environments beyond the scope of the TCM that require flexible design, additional engineering to best balance and meet mobility needs and goals of the public. Excerpt from introduction of the TCM: "The criteria presented in the TCM provide a foundation or starting point for engineering design decisions. It is the intent of the TCM to be used by City staff and private sector street design professionals in applying a consistent approach to street design, particularly for new streets and right-of-way planning. The TCM is also intended to provide guidance for street design in constrained right-of-way with flexible design criteria to fit existing situations that make the preferred design unobtainable. In the redesign of existing streets, additional engineering design work and public engagement may result in design

Bicycle Plan and Urban Trail Plan Board and Commission Feedback Tracking

ID	Plan	Proposed By	Page Number	Type	Change Proposed	Staff Response	Staff Response Notes
6	Bicycle Plan	Zoning and Platting Commission			Special attention be placed on determining minimum road widths for adding a bike lane, maximum slopes for All Ages and Abilities intersections, engineering bollards that are safe for cyclists and developing criteria for the installation of speed humps.	Staff supports elements of this change	Added slope as a factor in project selection but do not recommend making a maximum slope since opportunity for connectivity, safety, or safe street or barrier crossings might necessitate the use of steeper sloped streets where the opportunity for safe connectivity exists. Ch2 Bicycle System, section Project Selection: High priority project candidates will be further screened at a high level for feasibility, detailed connectivity considerations, street slopes, ability to address barriers along routes, opportunity for supportive programming, cost benefit of the project, and coordination opportunities.
7	Bicycle Plan	Zoning and Platting Commission			Special attention be placed on determining minimum road widths for adding a bike lane, maximum slopes for All Ages and Abilities intersections, engineering bollards that are safe for cyclists and developing criteria for the installation of speed humps.	Already included (no change)	The range of bikeway physical protection types is included in Ch 2 Bicycle System, section Bicycle Lane Barriers that discusses quick build and full build approaches. Criteria for the installation of speed humps or bumps for Neighborhood Bikeways is covered in Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section Bicycle Network Best Practices, subsection Neighborhood Bikeways and Shared Streets which includes target speeds and volumes that are based on NACTO best practices. The City's Speed Management Program has related but independent criteria and prioritization for the installation of speed humps, bumps, and other speed management devices for the purpose of overall street safety https://www.austintexas.gov/department/speed-management
8	All plans / ASMP	Zoning and Platting Commission			The collection of planning documents demonstrates effective and equitably distributed active transportation infrastructure throughout the City, requiring installation as redevelopment and reconstruction occurs	Already included (no change)	
9	All plans / ASMP	Zoning and Platting Commission			Contain Key Performance Indicators for the provision of encouragement and educational programming to create a cultural shift that teaches our community to take advantage of existing and planned active transportation infrastructure	Already included (no change)	
10	All plans / ASMP	Zoning and Platting Commission			Include the provision of adequate maintenance and lighting so as to permit safe and comfortable use of the existing and planned active transportation infrastructure.	Already included (no change)	
11	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			Direct the City Manager to allocate consistent funding for the Bicycle Plan from the general city budget, as is done for motor vehicle infrastructure.	Staff supports this change	Added additional clarity **(in bold)** in Chapter 4 Implementation, section PUBLIC INVESTMENT INDICATOR, TARGETS AND ACTIONS IN REVIEW "4.7.4 - Seek diverse funding sources to implement the Plan **4.7.4d - Allocate consistent funding for the Bicycle Plan from the general city budget, as is done for motor vehicle infrastructure.** 4.7.5 - Provide consistent and on-going funding for the maintenance of bicycle transportation, such as protected bicycle lanes barriers and surfaces, painted bicycle lane sweeping, and bicycle lane markings and sign maintenance. Funding for this should be within the City's operating budget."

Bicycle Plan and Urban Trail Plan Board and Commission Feedback Tracking							
ID	Plan	Proposed By	Page Number	Type	Change Proposed	Staff Response	Staff Response Notes
12	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to the prioritization and completion of the All Ages and Abilities (AAA) Network: ● Provide a single authoritative planned map of the AAA network, that is easily accessible and regularly updated	Already included (no change)	Clarified in Ch2 Bicycle System, section AAA Bicycle Priority Network Recommendation that the online map is the authoritative version.
12	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to the prioritization and completion of the All Ages and Abilities (AAA) Network: ● Provide timely updates to popular navigation apps in order to serve users of the network where they are likely to look for directions	Staff supports this change	Added action item "Provide timely updates of infrastructure changes to popular navigation apps and services so people can reliably find the safest and best route."
12	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to the prioritization and completion of the All Ages and Abilities (AAA) Network: ● Allocate resources, and define a plan to incrementally upgrade existing infrastructure of the All Ages and Abilities Network to comport with the NACTO design standards, especially critical corridors with high usage	Staff supports this change	Added clarifying text to Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section A PHASED APPROACH: QUICK BUILD VS. FULL BUILD QUALITY "Austin utilizes national, international, and local best practices and design standards to design to meet our All Ages and Abilities and 8-80 design goals as discussed in the section Network Performance Criteria, Designing for All Ages and Abilities in this chapter. If any parts of the existing network do not meet these standards and best practices, they will be prioritized for upgrade to meet these standards. Prioritization will consider corridors with high use and other competing priorities to develop new network connectivity."
12	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to the prioritization and completion of the All Ages and Abilities (AAA) Network: ● Prioritize projects that solve critical connectivity needs, especially those that facilitate connecting the AAA network safely across TxDOT right of way (e.g. I-35, MoPac, SH 71), or in places where connectivity is limited by rail or natural obstacles (e.g. Oltorf Rd)	Already included (no change)	This is a significant part of the prioritization model discussed in Chapter 2, section Project Prioritization as well as programmatic project selection described in section Project Selection.
13	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to the evaluation and measurement of success of the AAA network: ● Better differentiate (i.e. in maps) elements of the AAA network that meet the highest criteria of design and safety from lower-quality or older infrastructure, and consider more difficult to achieve performance metrics such as the number of fully protected and separated miles of bicycle infrastructure	Staff supports this change	Clarified and added to Chapter 2, section Bicycle Network Strategies and Actions in Review, Strategy 2.1 Indicators and Targets: -Track the percent of the completed AAA Bicycle Priority Network that is at full build quality (permanent bikeway physical protections, protected intersections, and quality bus stops integrated with protected bicycle lanes) -Complete the following bicycle infrastructure at full build quality annually (new or upgrade): 5 miles protected bike lanes, 5 protected intersections, 10 bus stops.
13	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to the evaluation and measurement of success of the AAA network: ● Enact granular measurement of success at the bikeway level, rather than at city or district levels, to identify critical bikeways that may be amenable to further improvements	Staff supports this change	Added to Chapter 2, section Bicycle Network Strategies and Actions in Review, an action item as follows: Evaluate bicycle infrastructure use, safety, and needs to inform prioritization for improvements and full build quality upgrades
13	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to the evaluation and measurement of success of the AAA network: Revise the performance metrics in Chapter 5 (“Measuring Success”) to measure the effectiveness of promoting higher usage rates among BIPOC and low-income populations, rather than simply miles of bike lanes constructed that potentially serve those populations	Staff supports this change	Added action item in Chapter 5 Measuring Success: "Measure the effectiveness of promoting higher bicycle use including use rates among BIPOC, low-income populations, and varying geographies"

Bicycle Plan and Urban Trail Plan Board and Commission Feedback Tracking							
ID	Plan	Proposed By	Page Number	Type	Change Proposed	Staff Response	Staff Response Notes
14	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to Neighborhood Bikeways—which received criticisms from the BAC in previous sessions due to their lower safety and comfort standards: ● Consider removing parking and implementing other low-cost safety improvements across any neighborhood bikeway that is featured on the AAA map	Staff does not support this change	Neighborhood Bikeways are a critical strategy for AAA Bicycle Network building. Implementation of these types of facilities is still much less mature in Austin than protected bicycle lanes so we are still learning how to best design them. We follow national best practices and performance targets for Neighborhood Bikeways covered in Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section Bicycle Network Toolbox, Neighborhood Bikeway and Shared Streets
14	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to Neighborhood Bikeways—which received criticisms from the BAC in previous sessions due to their lower safety and comfort standards: ● Reduce speed limits on Neighborhood Bikeways to 10 mph, similar to the target speed for a Level 0 Street	Staff does not support this change	National best practices is to use a target speed of 20MPH (see chart from NACTO in section Bicycle Facility Type Selection Criteria by Motor Vehicle Speed, Volume, and Contextual Factors), which is what this plan recommends in Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section Bicycle Network Toolbox, Neighborhood Bikeway and Shared Streets
14	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to Neighborhood Bikeways—which received criticisms from the BAC in previous sessions due to their lower safety and comfort standards: ● Adopt best practices for Neighborhood Bikeways from peer cities such as Portland, and aim to limit auto trips to 1,000 auto trips per day. The plan should direct the City to implement calming measures, lower speed limits, or find diversions when auto traffic volumes are above 1,500 auto trips per day	Already included (no change)	This matches what the plan recommends for motor vehicle volume thresholds and management approaches (see chart from NACTO in section Bicycle Facility Type Selection Criteria by Motor Vehicle Speed, Volume, and Contextual Factors), and recommendations in Chapter 2 Bicycle System, sections Bicycle Network Toolbox and Components of the AAA Bicycle Priority Network
14	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to Neighborhood Bikeways—which received criticisms from the BAC in previous sessions due to their lower safety and comfort standards: ● Consider installing traffic diverters that allow bicycle and pedestrian traffic, but restrict through motor vehicle traffic, such as diagonal diverters and half closures	Already included (no change)	Clarified use of diversion in Chapter 2 Bicycle System, sections Bicycle Network Toolbox and Components of the AAA Bicycle Priority Network
15	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to shared bicycle and pedestrian intersections: ● Increase the minimum thresholds of width required to intermix pedestrians and bicycle traffic— especially at crowded protected intersections— to minimize discomfort for pedestrians and cyclists and reduce the probability of bicycle-pedestrian conflict	Staff supports elements of this change	Added language to this effect but do not support design specificity and minimum width thresholds in this document but rather using best practice design guidance. Added this language in Chapter 2 Bicycle System, Components of the AAA Bicycle Priority Network, Urban Trails and Shared Use Paths: "Shared use paths should only be used where pedestrian densities and conflicts are expected to be low; including along trails, along streets, and at intersections. If pedestrian densities are medium or higher separate protected bicycle lanes and sidewalks should be used and protected intersection designs at intersections. Wider paths should be used when there is more anticipated use." "Shared use path design should adhere to best practices latest version of the AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities and the Transportation Criteria Manual."
15	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to shared bicycle and pedestrian intersections: ● If width is not sufficient for shared pedestrian / bicycle intersection, prefer on street bicycle lanes with curb protections (e.g. Berkman Dr and Zach Scott St)	Already included (no change)	The plan articulates that shared use paths are typically last resort along streets and that protected bicycle lanes are the default with the exception of high speed roadways (e.g. frontage roads and TXDOT highways).

Bicycle Plan and Urban Trail Plan Board and Commission Feedback Tracking							
ID	Plan	Proposed By	Page Number	Type	Change Proposed	Staff Response	Staff Response Notes
15	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to shared bicycle and pedestrian intersections: ● Wherever possible, maintain straight lines for cyclists (avoiding sharp turns) and clear demarcation of separation between cyclists and pedestrians and identify existing protected intersections that don't meet such standards (e.g. Manor Rd)	Staff supports this change	Added clarifying language in Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section Network Performance Criteria, Human Factors Design Parameters "Bicycle Facility Clear Envelope: The design speed and width combine to form a clear envelope for the safe and comfortable operation of bicycles and scooters. Utility poles and other obstructions shall not intrude on this clear envelope and should either be navigated around or relocated as needed." AND "Separation Between Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities: Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities should remain separated using protected bicycle lanes, protected intersections, or dual track trails. This supports higher bicycle and walking use levels and reduces conflict between these user groups that travel at different speeds. It is only appropriate to combine bicycle and pedestrian use into a shared use path where current and future use is expected to be low, or design constraints are present that this is the only viable way to separate bicycle users from motor vehicle traffic. Bicycle and pedestrian users are permitted to be mixed in Shared Street environments designed to have very low motor vehicle speed and volume. "
15	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to shared bicycle and pedestrian intersections: ● Avoid encroachments onto shared protected infrastructure (e.g. utility poles), and if not possible to remove ensure shared path is sufficiently wide to avoid obstacles	Staff supports this change	Added clarifying language in Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section Network Performance Criteria, Human Factors Design Parameters "Bicycle Facility Clear Envelope: The design speed and width combine to form a clear envelope for the safe and comfortable operation of bicycles and scooters. Utility poles and other obstructions shall not intrude on this clear envelope and should either be navigated around or relocated as needed."
16	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to the bikeway toolkit: ● Avoid the use of chip seal resurfacing from the toolkit, especially in protected lanes where gravel settlement is not speed up by motor vehicle traffic (e.g. East 5th street). If it's not possible to avoid chip seal, develop a standard to avoid loose cheap seal, such as selecting a finer-grained gravel, or using mechanical means to smooth the surface	Staff supports this change	Clarified in Chapter 2 Bicycle System, Bicycle Facility Maintenance, Pavement Surface and Bicycle Facility Maintenance in Review Sections "2.5.1c – Develop standards to ensure that pavement maintenance types and processes are safe and comfortable for people on bikes and scooters including using finer seal coat rock for bicycle facilities and ensuring that any loose rock during the cure period is promptly removed"
16	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to the bikeway toolkit: ● Avoid usage of slip lanes for vehicle traffic when they intersect with a AAA bikeway (e.g. slip lane of Cherrywood Ln at Manor Rd)	Staff supports this change	Added detail about this in Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section All Ages and Abilities Design Parameters "Intersection Design: The default intersection design in Austin is the Protected Intersection per the Transportation Criteria Manual. If turn volumes warrant a right turn lane the protected intersection should be designed to accommodate a leading bicycle and pedestrian interval followed by a flashing yellow arrow for right turning vehicle traffic. If a sharp intersection angle and control vehicle movement necessitates separating the right turn movement, it shall be designed as a smart right (raised crossing preferred) as opposed to a free-flowing slip lane. If smart right turn lanes are used, care must be taken that appropriate bicycle and pedestrian facility geometry is used as part of the design which may affect ROW needs. "

Bicycle Plan and Urban Trail Plan Board and Commission Feedback Tracking							
ID	Plan	Proposed By	Page Number	Type	Change Proposed	Staff Response	Staff Response Notes
16	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to the bikeway toolkit: ● Remove the use of diagonal back-in parking where they may conflict with bicycle lanes (e.g. Congress Ave, Dean Keeton St) ● Consider the usage of parallel parking protected bicycle lanes in places where there is no protected bike lane, and parking will not be removed (e.g. Congress Ave)	Staff supports this change	Added detail about this in Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section All Ages and Abilities Design Parameters, On-street Parking Design "**On-street Parking Design** Vehicular maneuvers in and out of parking spaces should not conflict with bicycle facilities as it creates a hazard to people riding in the bicycle lane. All parking should be designed as floating parking, where the parking is in-between the vehicle lane and bicycle lane, so vehicle maneuvers are outside of the bicycle facility. The default parking configuration should be parallel parking since it provides better visibility between people riding bicycles and scooters and drivers. While parallel parking is preferred, where diagonal parking is necessary, back-in angle parking shall be used because of improved safety for all roadway users. Older street designs that have angle parking maneuvers that conflict with unprotected bicycle lanes should be retrofitted with parallel floating parking."
16	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to the bikeway toolkit: ● If chicanes or curves are used for traffic calming, ensure that bicycle lanes continue on a straightward trajectory, or include physical barriers to prevent collisions between motor vehicles and bicycle (e.g. E.M. Franklin Ave)	Staff supports this change	Added detail about this in Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section All Ages and Abilities Design Parameters, Traffic Calming and Bike Lane Design "Traffic Calming and Bike Lane Design When motor vehicle traffic calming elements are used in combination with bicycle lanes and protected bicycle lanes, care should be taken to not degrade the quality of adjacent bicycle facility. Speed bumps and humps should be places in a way that they affect the motor vehicle lanes but not the bicycle lanes as they can be a hazard to people on bikes and scooters, particularly in low light conditions. Traffic chicanes should also be design in such a way that motor vehicle traffic is horizontally deflected while the bicycle facility can proceed straight. This prevents inappropriate and unsafe motor vehicle encroachment into bicycle facilities. "
16	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to the bikeway toolkit: ● Avoid switching from a two way bikeway to one way bikeway—to avoid motor vehicle interactions— and instead consider removing parking or other obstacles to continue bikeways separately in each direction (e.g. Barton Skyway, and Shoal Creek north of Foster)	Staff supports this change	Added detail about this in Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section Bicycle Network Design Principals, [Principal] Directness"... Shifts between on-way and two-way bicycle facilities that force unnecessary street crossings should also be limited."
17	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			With respect to Climate Resiliency: ● Increase shade at intersections where cyclists or pedestrians must wait for more than fifteen seconds.	Staff supports this change	Added detail in Chapter 1 Introduction, Climate, Climate Resiliency, Shade, Greening Streets, and Water Management "...shade trees and places to rest are essential parts of active transportation infrastructure and need to be planted in ways that are resilient to more extreme temperatures and droughts. Recommended actions work to remove barriers to implementation, and plant trees for shade along existing infrastructure and new projects and create dedicated team to shade high needs & vulnerability areas. **Particular focus should be given to providing shade a intersections where people have to wait to cross streets as well as providing minimum standard of shade coverage or interval along streets.** Explore public-private partnerships and novel approaches to implement at large scales and lowered costs. Supporting tree health and green street elements that bring nature into the city will require innovative approaches that use natural rainwater for irrigation to reduce costs and improve resilience."

Bicycle Plan and Urban Trail Plan Board and Commission Feedback Tracking							
ID	Plan	Proposed By	Page Number	Type	Change Proposed	Staff Response	Staff Response Notes
17	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Advisory Council			BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that with respect to Climate Resiliency: ● Configure intersection signals so that cyclists and pedestrians are given priority	Staff supports this change	Added detail in Chapter 2 Bicycle Network, section All Ages and Abilities Design Parameters, Signalization at Intersections "Intersection signalization at both full signals and pedestrian hybrid beacons should be safe, comfortable, and minimize delay for people bicycling and walking. This includes using low cycle lengths, leading bicycle and pedestrian intervals, providing adequate crossing time, detection that works and signal timing that is responsive to detection."
18	Bicycle Plan	Planning Commission Working Group Informal Feedback			Distinguish old 400 vs new 800 miles	Staff supports this change	This has been address in the online map and snapshot shown in Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section AAA BICYCLE PRIORITY NETWORK RECOMENDATIONS. A chart has been added to Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section AAA BICYCLE PRIORITY NETWORK RECOMENDATIONS that shows the growth of the network over time starting with the original ~400 miles of the 2014 Plan, the ~300 miles added as part of the 2019 ASMP update, and the additional 600 miles (~800 if including Urban Trails) added through ATXWBR.
19	Bicycle Plan	Planning Commission Working Group Informal Feedback			Clarify definition of AAA is 8-80	Already included (no change)	Already included in Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section Network Performance Criteria, Designing for All Ages and Abilities "DESIGNING FOR ALL AGES AND ABILITIES In alignment with Austin's Complete Streets Policy and best practices all bicycle facilities will be held to the "8-80" test, aimed at creating a network in which both 8-year-olds and 80-year-olds can move about safely and enjoyably. Austin's low-stress network will be designed to perform at a level that accommodates the "Interested but Concerned" portion of the population that tolerates a Level of Traffic Stress 2 (LTS2) (See Chapter 2, Best Practices in Bicycle Network Planning, Building a Complete Bicycle Network to read more about low stress bicycle networks and LTS categories). Where possible, the network will be enhanced to accommodate children by providing a Level of Traffic Stress 1 (LTS1). "
20	Bicycle Plan	Planning Commission Working Group Informal Feedback			Include cost estimates and timeline to get there	Staff supports this change	This has been addressed in Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section AAA BICYCLE PRIORITY NETWORK RECOMMENDATIONS, section AAA BICYCLE PRIORITY NETWORK BUILDOUT GOALS, section COST OF THE AAA BICYCLE PRIORITY NETWORK, and BICYCLE NETWORK STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS IN REVIEW
21	Bicycle Plan	Planning Commission Working Group Informal Feedback			Not having neighborhood bikeways count towards AAA	Staff does not support this change	All ages and abilities in this plan is defined by the 8 to 80 test (see Chapter 2, section Network Performance Criteria, Designing for All Ages and Abilities). Neighborhood Bikeways meet this 8 to 80 test when following NACTO best practice performance criteria (largely rooted in decades long experience from Vancouver and Portland) for speeds and volumes that meet the all ages and abilities test. This plan strictly follows this performance criteria of 20 MPH motor vehicle speed target and motor vehicle volumes between 500 and 1000 vehicles per day discussed in Chapter 2 Bicycle System, sections Neighborhood Bikeways and Shared Streets and section Bicycle Facility Type Selection Criteria by Motor Vehicle Speed, Volume, and Contextual Factors.

Bicycle Plan and Urban Trail Plan Board and Commission Feedback Tracking							
ID	Plan	Proposed By	Page Number	Type	Change Proposed	Staff Response	Staff Response Notes
22	Bicycle Plan	Planning Commission Working Group Informal Feedback			Standards for how we have better barriers. Quick build approaches for better barriers -Mentioned the universe of barriers not just two types -Different bikeways need different treatments	Staff supports this change	Further discussion of the universe of bike lane barriers has been added to Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section A PHASED APPROACH: QUICK BUILD VS. FULL BUILD QUALITY. This includes a chart with 12 barrier types including considerations for each type of barrier (e.g. cost, comfort, operational impacts on other departments etc.).
23	Bicycle Plan	Planning Commission Working Group Informal Feedback			How do painted bike lanes count in AAA	Staff supports this change	This is clarified in Ch2 Bicycle System, section PROTECTED BICYCLE LANES AND PROTECTED INTERSECTIONS "Existing painted only bicycle lanes do not generally count as part of the AAA Bicycle Network. In some cases, wide buffered bicycle lanes on lower speed and volume streets can meet criteria for All Ages and Abilities quality. While legacy painted bicycle lanes still have value the City prioritizes achieving All Ages and Abilities quality on all new projects. "
24	Urban Trails Plan	Planning Commission Working Group Informal Feedback			Buildout time for Tier 1 84 miles (20 years) – feels too long. Some guidance on how we are going navigate the challenges to even meet this timeline.	Staff supports this change	Staff recognize that 84 miles of Tier 1 trails in 20 years is aspirational, but also achievable, if project delivery is accelerated and additional program funding is identified to both build staffing capacity and fund trail planning, design, and construction for project delivery. On page 59 under Funding and Timeline, staff updated the plan text to include: "The ability for the Urban Trails Program to deliver projects on an accelerated timeline is also heavily dependent on increasing internal City of Austin capacity across supporting departments concerning staffing, systems, and the processes for permitting."
25	Urban Trails Plan	Planning Commission Working Group Informal Feedback			Trail easements consideration of width of easements that accommodate trees and drainage	Staff supports elements of this change	Staff supports this in theory but, in practice, there is not a prescribed width of easements called out in the plan for two major reasons: 1) Easements sought during project development by Urban Trails staff are incredibly site and project specific and are evaluated on a project by project basis to balance the needs of the trail against many design constraints and the cost associated with the easement. These include avoiding environmental features, the need to contain potential floodplain or watershed impacts, and the impact to other existing easements, among others. 2) Easements that are requested during development review must be balanced, holistically, with the other requests from Transportation review in regard to rough proportionality and/or with concern to parkland dedication/fee ordinances.
26	Urban Trails Plan	Planning Commission Working Group Informal Feedback			Some reference to the rails to trails policy (federal guidelines). Current draft isn't in line with how rails to trails guidelines work.	Staff supports this change	Staff updated the plan's appendices based on comments from and discussions with the Red Line Parkway Initiative to better reflect current Rails to Trails and Rails with Trails best practice guidelines, including federal policy and guidelines.