ATXWBR and ASMP Amendments Board and Commission Recommendations							
ID	Plan	Section	Proposed By	Page Number	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 features outside of the scope of this manual. Highly constrained scenarios may vary from minimums or maximums presented in this manual with approval of the applicable director or their designee."
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.

ATXWBR and ASMP Amendments Board and Commission Recommendations							
ID	Plan	Section	Proposed By	Page Number	Change Proposed	Staff Response	Staff Response Notes
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."
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.
13	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."
14	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."
15	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.

ATXWBR and ASMP Amendments Board and Commission Recommendations							
ID	Plan	Section	Proposed By	Page Number	Change Proposed	Staff Response	Staff Response Notes
16	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.
17	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
18	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"
19	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
20	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
21	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
22	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
23	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."
24	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).

ATXWBR and ASMP Amendments Board and Commission Recommendations							
ID	Plan	Section	Proposed By	Page Number	Change Proposed	Staff Response	Staff Response Notes
25	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. "
26	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."
27	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"
28	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. "
29	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."

ATXWBR and ASMP Amendments Board and Commission Recommendations							
ID	Plan	Section	Proposed By	Page Number	Change Proposed	Staff Response	Staff Response Notes
30	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. "
31	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."
32	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."
33	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."
34	Urban Trails Plan	Appendices	Planning Commission	Starting at 102 and 174	Align the language on rails with trails in Appendix G.1 with the language in Appendix E.	Staff supports this change	Staff updated the plan's appendices to align language per this recommendation.
35	Austin Strategic Mobility Plan	Pedestrian network Policy I - Complete the Pedestrian Network	Planning Commission	82	Clarify that sidewalks remain the gold standard that the City wants to work towards, while acknowledging the need for immediate strategies to fill gaps considering resource constraints. In addition, set guidelines for assessing busy residential streets and low traffic volume streets, and develop other possible indicators that may warrant pedestrian and shared use path infrastructure. Text Change: In the short term, t~~T~~he City will continue to build sidewalks along roadways that demand them, such as arterial and collector streets, busy residential streets, and in commercial districts, while facilities like shared streets will be implemented only on low traffic volume local streets. The City ultimately remains committed to building out a complete sidewalk system.	Staff supports elements of this change	Staff supports the intent of this recommendation and is committed to building out the planned sidewalk system identified in the Sidewalks, Shared Streets, and Crossings Plan and additional sidewalks where shared streets are determined to not be effective/appropriate. ASMP Amendment ID-8 has been revised as follows: The City is committed ~~will continue~~ to building sidewalks along roadways that demand them, such as arterial and collector streets, busy residential streets, ~~and~~ in commercial districts, and in areas where higher intensity development is approved~~, while facilities like S~~shared streets will be implemented only on low traffic volume local streets with consideration to speed, volume, crashes, rates of walking and bicycling, and social impacts.

ATXWBR and ASMP Amendments Board and Commission Recommendations							
ID	Plan	Section	Proposed By	Page Number	Change Proposed	Staff Response	Staff Response Notes
36	Sidewalks, Crossings, and Shared Streets Plan	Sidewalks	Planning Commission	Starting pg 29	Texas Accessibility Standards should be used to set the minimum sidewalk width for level 1 streets and up.	Staff does not oppose	The Transportation Criteria Manual (TCM) was updated in December 2021 and already reflects this change. The TCM sets the minimum sidewalk width at 5 feet which exceeds the TAS minimum of 3 feet. The minimum width for two passing wheelchairs is 60 inches (5 feet). The TCM further states that sidewalks shall be constructed in accordance with City standards and in accordance with the current edition of PROWAG and TAS, and whenever these standards are in conflict, the strictest requirements shall apply.
37	Austin Strategic Mobility Plan; Urban Trails Plan; Sidewalks, Crossings, and Shared Streets Plan	Throughout document	Planning Commission		Consider adding guidance or outline a process to develop guidelines on the design impact on bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure given the proliferation of autonomous vehicles to ensure community safety and ease of use.	Staff supports elements of this change	The ASMP already reflects this change but additional actions have been included in the Urban Trails Plan and Sidewalks, Crossings, and Shared Streets Plan. This issue is already included in the ASMP under Safety Culture Policy 4 (Recognize the expanding needs of different users and modes on the transportation network - Consider how the transportation network is designed, constructed, and operated based on the speed and vulnerability of different users) and Action Items 128, 132, and 133 (Automated driving outreach - Coordinate outreach and education programs on automated driving vehicles with other public and private organizations.| Automated driving research - Support local and regional research analyzing the potential for self-parking vehicles, driverless vehicles, and other future car models.| Automated driving coordination - Work with leading cities and organizations to help craft automated driving vehicle policies and practices in accordance with Imagine Austin and other City plans.). State law prevents Texas cities from regulating automated vehicles, however, the City will continue to coordinate and monitor for guidance to develop infrastructure according to best practice. See pages 21 and 50 in the Urban Trails Plan and pages 64 and 65 in the Sidewalks, Crossings, and Shared Streets Plan.
38	Austin Strategic Mobility Plan		Planning Commission		Work with Austin Fire Department to reconsider lane width to better improve safety for bicyclist, pedestrians, and other users.	Staff does not oppose	The ASMP and Transportation Criteria Manual (TCM) already reflect this change. Staff supports continuing ongoing interdepartmental discussions regarding travel lane width requirements. This issue is already included in the ASMP under Safety Culture Policy 3 (Optimize public safety priorities - Manage public safety needs supported by the transportation network including street safety, emergency response, flood risk, disaster resiliency, and public health to minimize the risk of injury and death) and Action Item 15 (Fire code street width requirements - Evaluate street clear width requirement in the fire code for emergency vehicle access to optimize safety for all street uses.). Significant coordination occurred with AFD during the update of the Transportation Criteria Manual (TCM), adopted in December 2021. AFD signed off and agreed to new street design standards that go below the locally amended International Fire Code. These updated standards went into effect in June 2022.
39	Bicycle Plan	Throughout document	Planning Commission	NA	Clarify that standards and best practices learnt from the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) and others will be updated as those standards are revised over time.	Staff supports this change	Clarified in Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section Planning, Design, and Best Practices Resources that we use latest available versions: "The City of Austin uses the best and latest available versions of national and international design guidance to inform bicycle infrastructure planning, design, and best practice resources including but not limited to the following resources. " More information on key guidance documents follows this text preface including guidance by National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO), the Dutch CROW Manuals, and Association of State Highway and Transportation Official's (AASHTO) gudance A corresponding action is included in section BICYCLE NETWORK STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS IN REVIEW, Action Item 2.1.4g

ATXWBR and ASMP Amendments Board and Commission Recommendations							
ID	Plan	Section	Proposed By	Page Number	Change Proposed	Staff Response	Staff Response Notes
40	Bicycle Plan	Protected Bicycle Lane Barriers - Quick Build Bike Lane Barriers	Planning Commission	77	Separate medium build bike lane barriers into their own subsection and clarify where it might be appropriate to employ such techniques and how they could be utilized as an intermediate step towards full build.	Staff supports this change	Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section A PHASED APPROACH: QUICK BUILD VS. FULL BUILD QUALITY a subsection Medium Build Bike Lane Barriers has been added with the following text: "Medium build techniques that increase bike lane quality without while still having negligible impacts to street drainage are an important tool to increase the scale of higher quality network buildout. Medium build techniques could utilize parking stops, larger concrete buttons, or Zikla or other similar barriers, or on-street parking. This plan establishes a goal to build 5 miles of medium-build protected bicycle lanes a year. "
41	Bicycle Plan	A Phased Approach: Quick Build vs. Full Build Quality (text and chart)	Planning Commission	75-77	Identify goals for quick build and medium build strategies that allow for tracking over time to measure success, similar to those for full build strategies.	Staff supports this change	In Chapter 2 section BICYCLE NETWORK STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS IN REVIEW: Added clarifying text to existing indicator / target for full AAA Network buildout targets so the per year mileage goals is transparent (bold text is new). "Complete 380 miles of the All Ages and Abilities Bicycle Priority Network by the end of 2026; 480 miles by the end of 2029; and 660 miles by the end of 2033. **This translates to 35 miles of AAA Network buildout per year between 2023 and 2026 and 40 miles per year between 2027 and 2033. These goals are for the full AAA Network including quick, medium, and full build quality.**" Added a new indicator / target for medium build "Complete 5 miles of protected bicycle lanes at medium build quality. Track cumulatively over time over time meeting the following targets by 2033: 52 miles of protected bicycle lanes (2 existing miles)"
42	Bicycle Plan	Prioritization and Project Selection for the AAA Bicycle Priority Network - Project Prioritization (text and map)	Planning Commission	69-74	Add a requirement to provide an annual update regarding ongoing prioritization efforts, highlighting the prioritization of different segments, upcoming projects, and overall timelines for a full build-out of the system.	Staff supports this change	In Chapter 2, section BICYCLE NETWORK STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS IN REVIEW Added an action item "2.1.4e – Provide at minimum annual updates on prioritization, upcoming projects, and overall timelines for a full build-out of the system."
43	Bicycle Plan	A Phased Approach: Quick Build vs. Full Build Quality (text and chart)	Planning Commission	75-77	Define and clarify the differences between the "Protected Intersection Full" and "Protected Intersection Partial" strategies	Staff supports this change	This has been clarified in new text in Appendix B, section COST ESTIMATE OF AAA BICYCLE PRIORTY NETWORK FULL-BUILD QUALITY GOALS where thse term were used.
44	Bicycle Plan	A Phased Approach: Quick Build vs. Full Build Quality (text and chart) and Appendix - Definitions	Planning Commission	75-77 and 176	Improve the standards for Neighborhood Bikeways to ensure that they are fully supportive of AAA goals	Already included (no change)	The plan already calls for neighborhood bikeways to meet stringent national best practices based on NACTO guidance.
45	Bicycle Plan	A Phased Approach: Quick Build vs. Full Build Quality (text and chart)	Planning Commission	75-77	Assess existing Neighborhood Bikeways to ensure that they align with AAA standards and based on these standards whether they can be included as a part of the AAA network as fully built out sections.	Staff supports this change	In Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section COMPONENTS OF THE AAA BICYCLE PRIORITY NETWORK, subsection NEIGHBORHOOD BIKEWAYS AND SHARED STREETS added the following text "Ensure that all neighborhood bikeways meet stringent national best practice performance requirements. Assess existing Neighborhood Bikeways; if performance requirements are not met make necessary changes. " A corresponding action item has been added in section BICYCLE NETWORK STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS IN REVIEW, Action Item 2.1.4h
46	Bicycle Plan	Bicycle Network Toolbox - Urban Trails and Shared Use Paths or other relevant section	Planning Commission	46	Follow minimum width and other standards from American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and other national guidelines for Shared Use Paths to ensure ease of use and safety.	Staff supports this change	Text has been added to Chapter 2 Biycle System, section ALL AGES AND ABILITIES DESIGN PARAMETERS, subsection Design Width "Minimum width and other standards from American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) shall be adhered to for Shared Use Paths to ensure ease of use and safety."

ATXWBR and ASMP Amendments Board and Commission Recommendations							
ID	**Plan**	**Section**	**Proposed By**	**Page Number**	**Change Proposed**	**Staff Response**	**Staff Response Notes**
47	Bicycle Plan	Throughout document	Planning Commission		Consider adding guidance or outline a process to develop guidelines on the design impact on bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure given the proliferation of autonomous vehicles to ensure community safety and ease of use.	Staff supports this change	Included atonomous vehicles related resources in Chapter 1 Introduction, section ELECTRIC BIKES, SCOOTERS, MICROMOBILITY DEVICES, ATONOMOUS VEHICLES, AND MOBILITY SERVICES "Autonomous vehicles are an important emerging technology that could have profound impacts to street safety, opportunities to rebalance use of the right of way, greater mobility choices and even our land patterns. Done well, the proliferation of autonomous vehicles could have enormous positive benefits supporting our established mobility and city-wide goals or it could undermine them. The National Association of City Transportation Officials provides excellent policy guidance resources on this topic (link included in document). Action items related to autonomous vehicles can be found in Chapter 2 Bicycle System, section Bicycle Network Strategies and Actions in Review." section BICYCLE NETWORK STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS IN REVIEW 2.1.13 – Anticipate and proactively plan for the coming proliferation of autonomous vehicles. 2.1.13a – Establish policies and practices related to autonomous vehicles that support established mobility, safety, and city-wide goals to prevent these goals from being undermined. 2.1.13b – Follow the best practice design guidance available that addresses safety related to automated vehicles and recommended design measures to protect vulnerable users (e.g. people who travel by foot, bicycle, scooter) in the design of bikeways and streets.
48	Bicycle Plan		Planning Commission		Work with Austin Fire Department to reconsider lane width to better improve safety for bicyclist, pedestrians, and other users.	Staff does not oppose	The ASMP and Transportation Criteria Manual (TCM) are the most appropriate documents and already speak to lane widths. It is beyond the scope of the Bicycle Plan to speak to comprehensive street widths and all roadways uses. Staff supports continuing ongoing interdepartmental discussions regarding travel lane width requirements including potential modification / removal of standing amendements to the international fire code related to minimum clear width of streets. See above entery for ASMP for more details.