

ASMP Amendments & ATXWBR Phase 4 Public Comment Summary

January 27, 2023 - March 20, 2023

1. ASMP Public Comment Summary
2. Sidewalks, Crossings, and Shared Streets Plan Public Comment Summary
3. Urban Trails Plan Public Comment Summary
4. Bicycle Plan Public Comment Summary
5. Letter and Email Communication

ASMP Public Comments

This document includes all public comments received during the amendment process to update the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP) to reflect changes from the ATX Walk Bike Roll plans. Public Comment began on Monday, March 27, 2023 when the final draft of the revised ASMP was released.

Theme	Count
Methodology	2
Project Feedback	68
Roadway Element	5

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
1	ASMP Inbox	<p>To ATD,</p> <p>I just received the email below.</p> <p>From what I understand of this email, the ASMP amendments will be a separate process from the ATXWBR updates. Content in the ATXWBR plan updates may or may not have parallel content in the ASMP amendments, but they will need to be consistent with each other before being adopted. New changes (e.g. based on feedback received through 3/20/23) to the three draft ATXWBR plans will be made during the same period as new changes to the ASMP amendments. Please let me know if I am understanding this correctly.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Thanks, [NAME]! I think that answers my questions regarding the ASMP amendment process.</p>	Methodology
2	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello, City of Austin folks!</p> <p>I'm [NAME], the president of the Highland Neighborhood Association executive board. Our neighbors recently met and hoped we could submit feedback on the City's Annual Mobility Plan for 2023, and the ATX Walk Bike Roll amendments to the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP).</p> <p>I believe the public comment period may already have closed, but we're hoping you're able to incorporate our feedback going forward. I've attached a PDF letter with recommendations and ideas from our neighbors.</p> <p>If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to reach out — the HNA board can be reached at boardmembers@highlandneighborhood.org.</p> <p>Cheers,</p>	Methodology
3	ASMP Inbox	<p>Please try to complete this extension, and get funding. This is a vital extension to improve access between all of the businesses, homes and apartments on Southwest Parkway over to 290 and vice versa.</p> <p>Currently everyone is having to go through the very clogged intersection of William Cannon, and 290 or Southwest Parkway, mopac, and 290. The only alternative is to cut through on Boston Lane which also is very congested.</p> <p>It's a nightmare. It's only going to get worse. The Industrial Oaks extension will significantly reduce congestion, and more importantly will improve access for first responders, police, firemen, EMS, to the entire Southwest Parkway corridor. Thank you.</p>	Project Feedback
4	ASMP Inbox	<p>Dear Sirs:</p> <p>Several months ago, my neighborhood previously negatively commented on the proposed ASMP map that would have imposed an 84 foot right-of-way along Harris Ave., and I was informed that the proposed change had been removed from the map. Today, [NAME] copied me on an email indicating that Harris Ave. is again being considered for use changes.</p> <p>I want to know why, as neighborhood association president, I was not given any notice of this proposed change by the city? This street has safety issues because Lee Elementary School is located along it, the sidewalks are incomplete, and there are pedestrian safety issues already with both vehicle and bicycle traffic.</p> <p>I looked up the map https://austin.maps.arcgis.com/apps/instant/basic/index.html?appid=3f0395a183074bde8e5c3b1b31a4f721 but can't make heads or tails of it, (in part because I am legally blind), but I doubt that most citizens could either.</p> <p>I would appreciate a reply from you at your earliest convenience about what input my neighborhood can (and is supposed to) have on this matter. I see that there is a comment deadline of April 25, 2023, but have no idea what I and my neighbors would be commenting on.</p>	Roadway Element

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
5	ASMP Inbox	<p>Thank you very much for the prompt reply. I hope I'm on all the notification lists now! I would appreciate an opportunity to speak with someone from your staff to be sure that I understand the full implications of any future "bicycle facility" or "plan" adoption.</p> <p>As for the missing sidewalk, my last stroll (which was awhile ago) indicated that the sidewalk on the north side of Harris Ave. had not been completed all the way to Red River St. so that people have to walk in the street.</p> <p>And as a side note, I've often wondered why the city doesn't have full sidewalks along 32nd St. between Red River St. and Duval St. since it is a heavily used street by pedestrians.</p>	Roadway Element
6	ASMP Inbox	<p>If I'm reading the summary correctly, any mention of future recognition of bike lanes would include this potential definition—and hence, physical construction even if a road remains a Level 1 street--</p> <p>"...Protected bike lane (protected lane, cycle track): A protected bicycle lane is an exclusive bike facility that combines the user experience of a separated path with the on-street infrastructure of a conventional bike lane. A protected bicycle lane is physically separated from motorized traffic and distinct from the sidewalk. Protected bicycle lanes have different forms but all share common elements—they provide space that is intended to be exclusively or primarily used for bicycles and are separated from motor vehicle travel lanes, parking lanes, and sidewalks. In situations where on-street parking is allowed protected bicycle lanes are located to the curb-side of the parking (in contrast to conventional bicycle lanes)."</p> <p>Harris Ave. doesn't have room for additional demarcated pathways. Given the limited width of the street and the amount of distinct, significant, traffic uses it accommodates on a daily basis, (cars, bicycles, pedestrians) should my neighbors comment to your department now (before the April 25th deadline)?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Roadway Element
7	ASMP Inbox	<p>Somehow I didn't get the message sent to [NAME]—and yesterday I got bogged down in other issues when I did get it. Please let me know when I might speak to someone on your staff about Harris Ave. I am available this afternoon.</p>	Roadway Element
8	ASMP Inbox	<p>I know it might be due to fiscal concerns instead of "neighborhood feedback," but I, a resident of the Hancock neighborhood and frequent user of Harris Ave, am quite upset at the decision to not construct a protected bicycle lane.</p> <p>Please do not substitute the views of the vocal minority for the silent majority that elected Zo Qadri.</p> <p>It was stated that "Harris Ave. doesn't have room for additional demarcated [bicycle] pathways," but there's somehow room for not only one, but TWO sides of free SUV parking restricted to the residents of million dollar homes, subsidized by everyone who can't afford a car. 🙄</p> <p>I'm very unhappy that the city "captured" this feedback and will retain BOTH rows of taxpayer-funded parking for Austin's wealthiest residents instead of protecting bicyclists from death and serious injury.</p>	Roadway Element

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
9	ASMP Inbox	<p>I am writing as both a neighborhood resident as well as a parent of a student at St. Andrews Middle School regarding the traffic changes along 31st street which have only made the street MORE dangerous to pedestrians, bicycles and vehicles. The past few months have illustrated that there is simply not enough room for both a separated bike/pedestrian lane and two-way traffic. Not a day goes by where I don't have to drive over the pads into the bike/pedestrian lane just to be able to safely pass a car coming from another direction. When cars are parked in the current designated areas, to leave driveway 2 I have to do an elaborate 5 point turn to go left without hitting the parked car, which requires me to back towards the sidewalk crossing where kids are often walking, and if cars are coming from both directions there is no way to safely get by.</p> <p>As a neighborhood resident, I do appreciate the idea behind a bike/pedestrian lane linking the Shoal Creek trail, but the reality is that the number of close calls I have seen with cars trying to navigate this new setup far outweighs the very infrequent pedestrian or biker I will see on 31st St. having a designated lane. And there is a sidewalk available across the street! Which leaves me to wonder, is this change hurting more than it helps? I think it is. During arrival and especially dismissal, we have many children leaving on foot at the same time, and the tight spacing between cars has made it very unsafe when kids try to cross the street. Often you cannot simply cannot see them. Yes, they should all be crossing at the crosswalk on 34th street, but they are kids and they see their parents' car and they run toward it. There was far greater visibility before. I agree with the following proposed suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Pedestrians should be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) --Convert 31st Street back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st removing all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before. --Cyclists should be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail <p>Thank you for taking the time to read this letter.</p>	Project Feedback
10	ASMP Inbox	<p>I have noticed firsthand what I believe to be unsafe conditions along 31st street between Lamar and Shoal Creek.</p> <p>I suggest that a new, improved, all-abilities sidewalk be built on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead for access and to remove pedestrians from the street/bike lanes.</p> <p>I also recommend that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists and vehicles with 2-way traffic. This would remove all physical barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as previously existed.</p> <p>Thank you for your service and leadership on these important initiatives for our city.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
11	ASMP Inbox	<p>To our dear city planners and council members,</p> <p>We are writing you today to share direct, personal feedback with respect to the changes to 31st Street that have occurred over the past ~2 years as a result of the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan. Our family is frequently driving (multiple times per day) on 31st street as a function of our 3 children attending the lower and middle schools at St. Andrew's Episcopal School, so we are very well versed with the issue.</p> <p>To open, I would like for you to know that we live in 78703 and are active members of the community surrounding the area in question. We are active users of the incredible system of bicycle lanes and walking trails and paths that have been generously invested in all across the city. Thus, this note comes to you with a strong bias in favor of safe bicycle and pedestrian pathways. Sadly, however, the design of these particular changes being trialed on 31st street are simply flawed and have served to deliver quite the opposite: they are actually more dangerous to children, cyclists and motorists than what previously existed on the street. Please consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 31st street is narrow to begin with and has an incredible amount of vehicular traffic related to the schools and the surrounding medical system - Adding the bicycle lane in the way it was done has essentially served to turn 31st street into a one-way street, without actually converting it into a proper one-way street - Thus, you now have a heavy amount of 2-way traffic attempting to traverse a street that is now fundamentally too narrow for 2 cars - As a result, this means you frequently have cars jumping the bicycle lane barrier and driving in the bicycle lane itself so as to pass the street. I've personally witnessed several near-misses of cars hitting bicycles (and have heard of actual incursions) - In addition to the greatly increased risk of car-bicycle accidents, this narrow passageway has also greatly heightened the risk of car-car accidents - Finally, and most importantly, the stress and distraction of trying to navigate this passageway has also materially increased the risk to nearby pedestrians, which are largely children. <p>Thankfully, the leadership at St. Andrew's has made a handful of proposals that I believe will help the city achieve its mobility goals in a way that is safe to children, bicyclist and motorists alike:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. Convert 31st street back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. Cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail <p>Thank you for your consideration and service to our city. Please do not hesitate to contact me personally to discuss further.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
12	ASMP Inbox	<p>I wanted to provide feedback to our Austin City Council members and City Planners about the street and traffic changes along 31st Street.</p> <p>The recent street and traffic flow changes have been a source of frustration for many of us.</p> <p>Below is a list recommendations for the area...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail 	Project Feedback
13	ASMP Inbox	<p>To the Austin City Counsel:</p> <p>We are concerned parents with children at St. Andrews School in Austin, on the 31st Street campus. St. Andrews notified us that the council is considering what to do about the dangerous bike lane addition on 31st Street near the school. The city's addition of solid lane markers on 31st Street to create a new bike lane on the Shoal Creek side of the school (redundant to the parallel bike lane that already follows Shoal Creek a short distance away) has been a disaster. The hard barriers have narrowed a very busy, two-way street into a narrow, one-car-wide danger zone right next to a school. Cars are always parked on this street and the solid-barrier bike lane the city installed has made this street extremely hazardous. We also believe that, since the city now has formal notice of this problem, it could face liability for any injuries that occur due to this unsafe situation. We strongly urge the council to remove the large raised "bumps" that were installed here to clear enough space for two cars to pass each other going opposite directions before someone gets hurt or killed due to these obstacles. Thank you for your courtesy regarding this important safety problem</p>	Project Feedback
14	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello - I am a parent of children at St. Andrew's. I also live in the neighborhood, on Gaston Ave. I love my ability to walk in the neighborhood and do so regularly. There are plenty of However, I have witnessed on several occasions adults getting into verbal and almost physical altercations on 31st St. because of the most egregious traffic situation.</p> <p>I just witnessed an obstinate driver who would not back up a car's length of room to help get our school bus through. He simply would not do it because he was angry at the situation, so there he sat in his car, along with the bus full of kids, being completely unreasonable. After 10 minutes of creating more traffic, he finally did the sane and right thing. This is just one example out of MANY.</p> <p>There is simply not enough room for all that you'd like to achieve in that stretch of the road and make it safe. Not only do we not have the luxury of a school zone, but now we have a situation that is a cross between bumper cars and a battle zone. It's absurd.</p> <p>There are alternate places to walk and bike and still have access to the Shoal Creek Trail. Cyclists specifically can use bike lanes on Lamar to 34th St. Walkers and Joggers can use the existing sidewalk on the north side of 31st St, especially if you add a pedestrian crossing at the Trailhead.</p> <p>31st St. causes headaches for everyone who drives on it. It's a small stretch of road but is the main thoroughfare for our school. You are endangering the lives of children by keeping the situation as is. You have destroyed home values for all who live on the street. I implore you to use logic and reasoning to solve this situation and return the street to what it was before the bumps and bike lane were put in. The insanity has got to stop.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
15	ASMP Inbox	<p>To whom it should concern:</p> <p>I am a teacher at St Andrew's and have been very concerned about the changes on our street. I feel like it makes it incredibly dangerous for our students. Cars often have to divert into the bike lane, parking is very limited, and drivers are distracted by oncoming traffic. We are creating a dangerous environment for children and drivers in order to accommodate a limited amount of bikers that could use the regular lanes.</p> <p>Below are the recommendations from our school that seem reasonable.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail 	Project Feedback
16	ASMP Inbox	<p>Good evening,</p> <p>I have three kids at St. Andrew's and the 31st traffic and parking is a nightmare. Besides being extremely frustrating, it is also very dangerous. We have had many close encounters with other cars as well as kids trying to get in/out of their cars. So many of us have been very upset by the current plan and the interference it has caused everyone, especially during drop off and pick up times. Please consider the following in place of the existing dangerous and chaotic plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Project Feedback
17	ASMP Inbox	<p>Dear Austin City Council Members and Planners,</p> <p>I am writing to provide my feedback and thoughts on the 31st Street traffic flow and would like to convey my concern and experience with the safety and disruption of this street. I want to first thank you all for your work on these issues regarding our city and how to improve traffic flow.</p> <p>I am a parent of two children at Saint Andrews School and I am at the school with frequency each week. Since the change to 31st street several years ago, traffic flow and safety have been significantly compromised. Many children (at times, including my own) ride bikes to school and this street is a huge mess at all hours of the day (to include weekends). The street is simply not wide enough to have a dedicated lane for cyclists and it should be converted back to a shared lane for cyclists and vehicles on 31st Street. The barriers should be removed and the lane can be used for bicycle and vehicle traffic as it had before. Cyclists should have a dedicated lane on 34th Street that connects to the Shoal Creek Trail.</p> <p>I ask that you seriously consider this change and put it into effect as soon as possible to relieve the congestion in this area and to improve the safety of our community. The current situation is inefficient and more importantly, dangerous.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
18	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is [NAME] and I am teacher at St. Andrew's Episcopal School on 31st st and Lamar. I have a few pieces of feedback regarding this very challenging street in front of our school. The first piece of feedback is a request for the removal of two hour parking and ticketing for all of 31st st. People parking there are primarily TEACHERS and DOCTORS who are simply trying to help people in our community, and I have received at least three parking tickets for trying just doing my own job. We are land locked and limited on parking due to restrictions of nature by the city, and the least that could be done is to stop ticketing teachers and doctors. Regarding the flow of traffic, please consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail <p>Personally, this is a topic that is stressful enough for me to change how I vote etc. Please consider.</p>	Project Feedback
19	ASMP Inbox	<p>Dear City Leaders,</p> <p>I am writing to you to express my concern about the traffic patterns on 31st Street and Shoal Creek. I have a unique perspective to this strip of road. My Family lived right where 31st Street and Shoal Creek meet from 1980 until 2004. My parent then moved across the street on 31st until 2012. I also have worked at St. Andrew's Episcopal School since 2007. The current traffic situation in not safe for bikers, drivers, or pedestrians. And with so many school-aged children, both at St. Andrew's and Brykerwood, traversing 31st Street, I think the City needs to seriously reconsider how this street is laid out.</p> <p>Bikers rarely use the extra-wide bike path. Cars have to play chicken with each other when driving down 31st Street and must merge into the bike path. The parking situation has led to multiple accidents. Due to the unsafe conditions, I hope you consider the following proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail <p>Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely,</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
20	ASMP Inbox	<p>Dear City Council Members Alter and Quadri and City Planning Committee,</p> <p>I hope y'all are doing well! My name is [NAME]. I work at St. Andrew's Episcopal School as the [POSITION]. We recently worked with Mayor Pro Tem Ellis on getting our seventh graders acquainted with how the city works - it was a great experience. We appreciate all you do, and in particular, we appreciate the opportunity to provide some feedback on the traffic patterns on 31st Street.</p> <p>The street changes implemented a couple of years ago - specifically, the broadening of the bike/pedestrian lane and the addition of posts to protect it - made for dangerous traffic situations at school. The widened bike/walk lane narrowed the street by three or so feet, drastically limiting visibility. Now, pulling in and out of our driveways feels like rolling the dice. You're just hoping the people driving down the street are familiar enough with the situation that they'll be going slow. This is manageably stressful for faculty, but what doesn't feel manageable is the worry we have for our students. We serve elementary and middle school students. Most of them are little and still impulsive. We watch over them closely, but we're all nervous for the day a child may try to cross the street to get into a parents' car and not be seen by a vehicle driving on 31st Street who can't see around the curve ahead.</p> <p>I do appreciate the communal and environmental benefits of better access for bikers and walkers, but I wish there was a way to offer them that didn't compromise ours and our students' safety. All of this is to say that we would be deeply grateful for a safer traffic situation. Specifically, here are my hopes for 31st street:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widen the street again by separating bike and pedestrian traffic. • For pedestrians, install an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st and a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead. • For bikers, paint back the previous bike and traffic lanes and remove the posts. • Another idea would be to divert Shoal Creek bike traffic along 34th and Lamar instead of 31st. <p>Thank you so much for your time and consideration. We really appreciate this chance to share our experience.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
21	ASMP Inbox	<p>Dear City Planners and City Council Members,</p> <p>As someone who frequently drives along Shoal Creek Blvd/31st Street between 34th and Lamar, I'm writing to share my opinion on the recent changes to the road design and traffic flow. A few years ago, the city distributed an artist's rendering of the proposed barricaded, bike-only lane that would run most of the length of that stretch of road. After chuckling a little at the drawing's absurd notion that the bike lane could somehow coexist alongside the two-lane traffic and curbside parking, I remember feeling a sense of panic that this poorly-conceptualized plan would actually be implemented. And, as it turns out, my panic was justified; the plan came to fruition and the result was every bit as terrible as I thought it might be.</p> <p>Now that most of the road is down to effectively one driving lane, the traffic congestion is often unbearable during peak hours. I encourage you to try and drive down 31st/Shoal Creek Blvd during school pick-up or drop-off on a day when the landscape crews are there with their trucks and trailers. There have been legitimate stand-offs between these trucks and school traffic, all squeezed into a chokepoint between the bike lane and a row of parked cars. Many Lamar-bound drivers have discovered that the best way to avoid a stand-off like this is to just plow through the barricade and veer into the bike lane. This traffic design, presumably conceived for the purpose of prioritizing bike and pedestrian traffic over vehicle traffic, actually makes the situation MORE dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists, not to mention the hundreds of children who are at the school every day. My kids ride their bikes along the Shoal Creek Trail to school most mornings, taking it from 38th Street to the intersection of 34th and Shoal Creek Blvd. It's a safe, easy ride along the Shoal Creek Trail for them. However, I'd be a little nervous if they tried to ride in the Shoal Creek/31st bike-only lane during heavy traffic.</p> <p>The obvious solutions to this problem are: 1) convert Shoal Creek Blvd/31st back to a shared lane for cyclists and remove the barriers, 2) Direct 34th to Lamar cyclists to use bike lanes that tie into the Shoal Creek Trail, and 3) direct pedestrians to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st, with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic.</p> <p>These solutions would serve all users of this important thoroughfare. I implore you, please do the sensible, right thing, not just the politically expedient thing.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
22	ASMP Inbox	<p>Dear Council Members and Planners,</p> <p>I am writing to share my feedback about the traffic changes on 31st street, in hopes of contributing constructively to your planning for the improved mobility of our city. I would like to begin by saying that I am a strong supporter of our city leaders' efforts to make our city more walkable/bikeable and increase options for public transportation. I understand that this is a complex issue with many competing needs and concerns, and appreciate all of the hard work and creativity that has gone into this vision and action to improve our transportation infrastructure.</p> <p>I feel strongly that the recent changes made to 31st St. are not a sensible solution, and hope that we can explore other options. I spend a lot of time on this street. I have led various camps and activities for children along the Shoal Creek greenbelt and Seiders Springs area, I have worked at St. Andrew's Episcopal School for 14 years, and my children attend school at St. Andrew's. I have also lived in Allandale for 14 years, and I personally use the Shoal Creek hike and bike trail several times a week for running, walking, and biking with my family. The current configuration of a protected bike lane, street parking, and two-way traffic is unsafe for everyone. The street is not wide enough for all three. I have witnessed cars having to back up hundreds of yards because there is not room for cars can't pass one another. During busy times, the street often has stopped traffic, which is a serious safety concern because the school and parks become inaccessible for emergency vehicles. On countless occasions, I have witnessed cars driving into the bike lane in order to allow a car coming from the opposite direction to pass, which is a safety hazard for bicyclists and pedestrians who believe they are fully protected in the bike lane. I am also aware of several incidences of parked cars being damaged.</p> <p>I know that the school has offered to cooperate with the building of a sidewalk on the north side of Shoal Creek, which seems like a much more reasonable (and safer) solution for pedestrians. Bicyclists can share the road on 31st as they did before, use the path through the Shoal Creek greenbelt, or be diverted to Lamar via 31st St.</p> <p>As I said, I am very supportive of measures to increase the safety, efficiency, and ease of walking and biking in our city, but I think the recent changes on 31st St. are not the best solution.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration,</p>	Project Feedback
23	ASMP Inbox	<p>Dear City Planners,</p> <p>I am a teacher at St. Andrew's School on 31st Street, and I am writing to express my concerns regarding the current street plan. The bike lane is so wide that cars must pull to the side to let others pass. This would be risky on any street, but this is a school zone where there are constantly school children walking, as well as pedestrians and bikers. In fact, there are parts of the street where cars MUST pull into the bike/pedestrian lane to let a car pass!</p> <p>You will hear from other families directly, but there have been several crashes on this road and several parked vehicles have been damaged. This road MUST be one-way if we continue to use this bike lane. Personally, I feel that there should be some kind of "school zone" signage as well.</p> <p>I regularly cannot find parking at work, I have been ticketed on the street, my mirror has been hit, and I have almost been hit by a car walking into school. Being a teacher is hard enough. Please rethink this street before someone is seriously hurt.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter,</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
24	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hi, My children attend St. Andrew's Episcopal School. The changes to 31st street made by the city have negatively impacted our ability to safely navigate the area.</p> <p>Currently, there is not enough space for all that use the road: cars, bicyclists, and pedestrians. The cars travel in both directions, and even though it is a 2 way street there is not enough space for both cars. This often leads to one car having to pull over into the bike lane to let the other car pass. This is not safe for the bikers, the pedestrians that also use the bike lane for walking, the cars, or anyone in the area. Most cyclists I have spoken with now avoid this area because of the dangerous bike lanes.</p> <p>We would like to see the following changes made to this area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic). 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st. 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
25	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello! I would like to provide some personal feedback and experiences with the changes that have been made to parking, traffic, bicycle lanes, and pedestrian traffic in the Shoals Creek area. I am a parent of a student at St. Andrew's Episcopal School and my spouse works close by in Austin, often driving our daughters to and from school. We have been sending our children to St. Andrew's since 2018 and have seen how the changes made have impacted our lives.</p> <p>As a parent who needs to drop off and pick up my children at St. Andrew's as well as park and enter the school for events, the changes made to Shoal Creek Blvd and 31st Street have greatly negatively impacted our lives and have made this area much more dangerous for everyone. The additional restrictions on parking, the white bumps in the road, and signage put in place to allow pedestrians to walk on the street and the lack of additional signage needed for cyclists have made this area much more dangerous and less useable overall. It has become an area meant for all, but safe for none.</p> <p>Because of trying to make this area work for everyone, there is now not enough space for anyone. It is impossible for this road to be a two-way street for cars, with parking and a pedestrian lane IN THE STREET. We simply do not all fit. It's a game of Jenga anytime you try to drive down the road which is absolutely necessary if you have a middle school student as this is the one and only way to drop off our middle schoolers. I try my best to avoid busy times, and having to drive down the length of the street, only accessing what I must with my car, still, I find this to be perilous. I regularly see other cars on the North side of 31st Street drive up and over the white bumps into the pedestrian lane to avoid oncoming traffic.</p> <p>In addition, I have seen dangerous activity by cyclists in the area crossing 34th Street coming from the Seider Springs Greenbelt and heading North up Shoals Creek Blvd. Specifically, I've encountered cyclists who approach and do not stop or slow down coming into the intersection of Seider Springs Greenbelt/Shoals Creek Blvd/34th Street and almost get hit by cars who had stopped then proceeded and did not see the speeding cyclist that did not stop at all. You need to put a stop sign for the cyclists at this intersection and signage to ensure they stop and look before proceeding. It is quite dangerous for a cyclist to approach this intersection and assume all cars are stopped and not slow down, look, or stop before proceeding. In this circumstance, I strongly believe the cyclist should treat this as a 4-way traffic stop to ensure everyone's safety. Please see my photo of this area below to understand what I am proposing.</p> <p>In addition, I fully support the recommendations that are being made by St. Andrew's Episcopal which include the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail <p>I would be happy to answer any questions you have about my thoughts and provide further feedback if necessary. I realize that you are trying to find solutions for everyone in this instance and I urge you to take the St. Andrew's community's thoughts on this very seriously as we are the largest community, and the most frequent users.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration,</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
26	ASMP Inbox	<p>Dear council members & support staff,</p> <p>I am a parent of a middle schooler at St. Andrew's and I would like to provide you with my feedback regarding the traffic changes on 31st street. Prior to the installation of the bike lane and barriers on 31st street, parking and driving on the street was challenging at best. With the protected lanes as they are now, the street feels significantly more dangerous to everyone but those in the protected lane. The road is now so narrow that frequent bottlenecks occur, and not just during school drop-off and pick up. Drivers using 31st/Shoal Creek to cut through to/from Lamar often get impatient with school traffic and try to cut around.</p> <p>With the number of students, parents, and teachers who go back and forth throughout the day, I am concerned about a serious accident occurring. Driving around the curve near St. Andrew's Chapel is perilous because people come around the blind curve way too fast. I've narrowly avoided being side-swiped by someone not paying attention more times than I can count.</p> <p>While I understand the need to make to improve the flow and also transportation safer for pedestrians and cyclist in our city, it seems to me like the traffic pattern as it is right now is deeply flawed and unsafe. Please consider altering the mobility plan and remove the protected bike lane for the overall safety of everyone who uses 31st and Shoal Creek. With the creek trail and Lamar nearby, it appears that there are many other options that might be safer and also make traffic flow better.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>	Project Feedback
27	ASMP Inbox	<p>Good Morning,</p> <p>As both a neighborhood resident and a parent of two children who attend St. Andrew's lower school, I am writing to provide feedback about 31st street traffic.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail <p>Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
28	ASMP Inbox	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>I am an employee at St. Andrew's Episcopal School located on W 31st St. There is very limited parking for the school and the street parking along W 31st St is extremely valuable to the employees and members of the school community.</p> <p>Since the walk/bike lane was added, it reduced the number of lanes from 1 to 2, decreased the number of parking spots available, and increased traffic on the road. This change has resulted in increasingly unsafe conditions for the people and their vehicles of the St. Andrew's community who daily park and drive there, including families and children.</p> <p>Three examples of how the conditions are unsafe are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When parked on the street, my car was hit by another vehicle, denting and scratching it. I understand that there has been an increase in vehicle damage from street parking since the decrease in lanes. 2. I received an emergency phone call from my husband and needed to leave work early. Unfortunately, dismissal was about to begin in 10 minutes and parents were lined up down W 31st St. I could not leave my parking spot as I was blocked in by the vehicles and was forced to wait. The parents saw that I was trying to leave and attempted to make space but there was nowhere for them to go either, which is also a safety risk for them and for potential emergency vehicles that might need to get through. 3. One morning on my way to work, I had the right of way as another vehicle and me approached a section where there were parked cars on the side. The other vehicle speedily continued to drive straight toward me, forcing me to brake. We were at a standstill. I could not move because there were cars behind me and to my right. The driver began honking at me and throwing their hands up in the air. Eventually, the driver backed up, into the 3-way stop intersection, almost hitting a parked car. <p>All of these incidents, while not uncommon to driving and parking in general, could have been avoided had the street remained a 2 lane road.</p> <p>For the betterment of the community, I recommend:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st St. (removing all barriers and having a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail <p>Thank you for your consideration and attention to this matter.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
29	ASMP Inbox	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the dangerous road conditions on 31st Street. The limited road spacing has made it unsafe for drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians, and we urge the city to take action to address this issue.</p> <p>We request that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st, with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead. This would separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic, making it safer for all users.</p> <p>Additionally, we ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st. This would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before. Cyclists should be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail.</p> <p>We understand that this may require some changes to the existing infrastructure, but we believe that it is necessary to ensure the safety of everyone who uses this road. We urge the city to prioritize these changes and take immediate action to address the unsafe conditions on 31st Street.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p>	Project Feedback
30	ASMP Inbox	<p>As you consider what to do with 31st Street, please make the removal of the barriers a top priority.</p> <p>Narrowing 31st to what is now essentially a 1 way road with 2 way traffic is massively dangerous.</p> <p>I drive this road daily and am frequently forced to drive in the "protected" bike/walk area of the street to avoid head on collisions.</p> <p>31st is simply not wide enough to handle a dedicated & separate bike/pedestrian traffic lane.</p> <p>Please remove all barriers and go back to the former painted lanes for bike & vehicle traffic like it was before the failed experiment of installing the barriers.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Project Feedback
31	ASMP Inbox	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>I am a parent with children attending St. Andrew's. I love the initiatives the city has undertaken to make Austin more pedestrian and bike friendly. However, I feel that many of the changes near 31st street have made things more dangerous for pedestrians and drivers. The barriers that were erected for the walking/bike lane are exceptionally wide and make it difficult for any cars to pass since other cars are parked on the street, which then means they pull over the barriers into the ped/bike lane. I think 34th street would be a better place to set flow most of the biking traffic. There are too many people and cars from school to make 31st street the safest bike route for the majority of traffic.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
32	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hi, My children attend St. Andrew's Episcopal School. The changes to 31st street made by the city have negatively impacted our ability to safely navigate the area.</p> <p>Currently, there is not enough space for all that use the road: cars, bicyclists, and pedestrians. The cars travel in both directions, and even though it is a 2 way street there is not enough space for both cars. This often leads to one car having to pull over into the bike lane to let the other car pass. This is not safe for the bikers, the pedestrians that also use the bike lane for walking, the cars, or anyone in the area. Most cyclists I have spoken with now avoid this area because of the dangerous bike lanes.</p> <p>We would like to see the following changes made to this area: 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic). 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st. 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>	Project Feedback
33	ASMP Inbox	<p>To Whom it May Concern,</p> <p>My name is [NAME], and I'm writing regarding recent changes to traffic flow on and around 31st street and North Lamar. I am an employee of St. Andrew's Episcopal School, and have been directly affected by the changes to bike lanes, pedestrian walkways and the available width for cars on 31st street and the feeder streets to it.</p> <p>Personally, I have on more than one occasion seen fire trucks get stuck on 31st street with not enough room to come down the street, or turn onto Wabash toward Bailey Lane. Also, I am consistently nearly avoiding collisions on 31st street since the change went into effect. It's nerve racking to drive on the road because it's curved, and with reduced width there is little to no visibility as you drive along the curve. It can be scary!</p> <p>The items that I'd like to request consideration of are:</p> <p>1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration, and please feel free to contact me for any other details or feedback.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
34	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hi Council members,</p> <p>I feel compelled to give my feedback as I almost had a head-on collision with a car approaching me with my child in the car on 31st this past week. The street is not wide enough for 2 cars to pass and the other car did not slow down or give space to pass safely. I have never understood the bicycle lane project on this street as it doesn't allow for 2 cars to pass safely in a child zone, the ratio of cyclists to cars is disproportionately lower, and the ratio of space dedicated for cyclists to cars is disproportionately higher even though there are very few cyclists and many cars going in both directions. How did your planners warrant 2 lanes for such few cyclists and 1 lane for vehicle traffic with no safe two-way passage? In my 3 years of driving my child to school and volunteering, I have only ever seen 2 cyclists using the dedicated 2 bike lanes. 2. two. At a minimum for immediate safety concerns, the road should be changed to reduce the bike lane to 1 and not 2 passing lanes so head-on collisions are avoided when cars are passing. The City should convert 31st St back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as in the past). The current situation makes no sense, is poor design and Bluebonnet Ln is a far better design for road and bike design.</p> <p>For maximum safety (which should be your plan design), the cyclists should be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail. Also, pedestrians should be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic).</p> <p>Thank your for addressing these safety concerns and making improvements and changes with maximum safety outcomes as soon as possible.</p>	Project Feedback
35	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello All,</p> <p>I write to you to share my feedback as a parent of St. Andrews school and consequently a frequent car-user on this street.</p> <p>While I love seeing bikes and pedestrians using this street, the current configuration is untenable for vehicle mobility and has unintended consequences of making school children less safe by causing unsafe driving. Where the protected bike lane is, there is not room to turn onto 31st without making a three point turn. There is also gridlock when there are cars waiting to pass each other as well as cars exiting this driveway. This is not a safe driving condition. From my observation, there is not a high enough volume of foot/bike traffic on this street to justify such priority being given.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) • We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) • We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail 	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
36	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hi - Writing for you in your official capacity as a constituent with some feedback on the street and traffic changes along 31st Street as part of the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan. The changes along shoal creek blvd have made it into a chaotic and terrible situation to put it mildly.</p> <p>I would like to request that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail. 	Project Feedback
37	ASMP Inbox	<p>Please consider the following when reviewing 31st street.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail 	Project Feedback
38	ASMP Inbox	<p>Good morning, My 3 young sons attend St. Andrew's on 31st St. I have one in the middle school and two in the lower school, so we have been on this campus before the current traffic changes and now with the current situation. The current situation is a total mess! It is dangerous and terrifying. We went from a very workable street to a total mess. I've seen several kids on bikes almost get hit by cars because frustrated drivers are veering into the bike lanes and then speeding. The road is now a one way street basically but with 2 way traffic. During carpool, it is a miracle if you don't get hit by a car trying to squeeze past you. Please fix this mess you made! If you haven't seen the situation, you should drive through at 3:30 pm on a weekday afternoon. Just try not to hit a child or another car!</p> <p>I believe that the changes St. Andrew's is suggesting are sound and would help a lot. They are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail 	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
39	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am hopeful that the city will finally take a closer look at the serious safety concerns presented by the poorly conceived decision to try and install a bike lane on an already small two way street, causing serious congestion for all who use this street. 31st Street, particularly the portion that goes around the St. Andrew's campus, has caused accidents and even more close calls, often involving young students. There are rarely any bikers/walkers/runners in the actual bike lane itself, and yet it takes up almost half of the street.</p> <p>The frustrating part of this is that there are simple solutions that will achieve a higher level of safety for everyone who wants to use the street:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pedestrians could be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) • the City could convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) • cyclists could be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail <p>I am hopeful the city will put more careful consideration into this safety concern it has created.</p> <p>Thanks for listening,</p>	Project Feedback
40	ASMP Inbox	<p>As a matter of public safety for cars, pedestrians, and cyclists, and as a parent of school children in this area, I'd like to strongly voice my support for the following recommendations for 31st St:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail 	Project Feedback
41	ASMP Inbox	<p>As a resident of Bryker Woods, parent of two children at St. Andrew's, and an avid Shoal Creek runner, I would like to kindly submit the below three (3) suggestions for your consideration.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Project Feedback
42	ASMP Inbox	<p>I am writing as a citizen who drives on 31st Street at least twice daily. With current bike lane it is VERY DANGEROUS as cars have to drive over the bumps and are bottlenecked from 34th to Lamar. My requests are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail 	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
43	ASMP Inbox	<p>To Whom it may concern,</p> <p>As a 10 year resident of Bryker Woods, a mom of two children at St. Andrew's, and a family who uses Shoal Creek for running and biking, I would like to kindly submit the below three (3) suggestions for your consideration.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail <p>The past several years with the current proposed layout have been incredibly difficult, and not safe for either vehicles or pedestrians. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Project Feedback
44	ASMP Inbox	<p>I wanted to share some feedback on the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan, specifically on the recent changes to 31st street/Shoal Creek Blvd between Lamar and 34th street.</p> <p>I am both a frequent pedestrian user and a frequent driver on this street. As I shared a couple of years ago when the new bike/pedestrian lane was put into place, the street was never heavily trafficked enough to warrant the lane. I *never* felt unsafe or mowed down by cars.</p> <p>Today, as it stands, both cars and people - often children - are constantly battling for safe space on that road. Traffic backs up at one poorly parked car. The school kids needing to cross the street are like Frogger characters. It's not good!</p> <p>My specific feedback suggestions would be:</p> <p>That pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic)</p> <p>That the City convert 31s Street back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st - remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as before.</p> <p>That cyclings be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>	Project Feedback
45	ASMP Inbox	<p>I wanted to share some feedback on the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan, specifically on the recent changes to 31st street/Shoal Creek Blvd between Lamar and 34th street.</p> <p>I am both a frequent pedestrian user and a frequent driver on this street. As I shared a couple of years ago when the new bike/pedestrian lane was put into place, the street was never heavily trafficked enough to warrant the lane. I *never* felt unsafe or mowed down by cars.</p> <p>Today, as it stands, both cars and people - often children - are constantly battling for safe space on that road. Traffic backs up at one poorly parked car. The school kids needing to cross the street are like Frogger characters. It's not good!</p> <p>My specific feedback suggestions would be:</p> <p>That pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic)</p> <p>That the City convert 31s Street back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st - remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as before.</p> <p>That cyclings be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
46	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hi there:</p> <p>I wanted to share some feedback on the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan, specifically on the recent changes to 31st street/Shoal Creek Blvd between Lamar and 34th street.</p> <p>I am both a frequent pedestrian user and a frequent driver on this street. I have absolutely never felt unsafe when on foot prior to the bike lane being put in. However, I DO feel unsafe with the current situation. This 2 way street is clearly not wide enough for 2 cars. It makes people adjust their cars in traffic in such a way that makes me feel unsafe. At points I have watched people back all the way down the street to allow people to pass. While this is a happening, there are also children and parents crossing to cars. This is a school zone first and foremost. I understand that it is not a state funded public school, but I truly do not understand how the safety of these children and families is not a priority. I don't feel that this would happen at a public school. Our children are the priority.</p> <p>Today, as it stands, both cars and people - often children - are constantly battling for safe space on that road. Traffic backs up at one car that is actually parked in a dedicated parking spot, yet only one car can fit down the 2 lane street. The school kids needing to cross the street are playing a bad game of chicken. It's not a good situation! I really fear someone is going to get seriously hurt. I have seen severely close calls myself.</p> <p>My specific feedback suggestions would be:</p> <p>That pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic)</p> <p>That the City convert 31s Street back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st - remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as before.</p> <p>That cyclings be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
47	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hi there:</p> <p>I wanted to share some feedback on the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan, specifically on the recent changes to 31st street/Shoal Creek Blvd between Lamar and 34th street.</p> <p>I am both a frequent pedestrian user and a frequent driver on this street. As I shared a couple of years ago when the new bike/pedestrian lane was put into place, the street was never heavily trafficked enough to warrant the lane. I *never* felt unsafe or mowed down by cars.</p> <p>Today, as it stands, both cars and people - often children - are constantly battling for safe space on that road. Traffic backs up at one poorly parked car. The school kids needing to cross the street are like Frogger characters. It's not good!</p> <p>My specific feedback suggestions would be:</p> <p>That pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic)</p> <p>That the City convert 31s Street back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st - remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as before.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
48	ASMP Inbox	<p>I wanted to share some feedback on the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan, specifically on the recent changes to 31st street/Shoal Creek Blvd between Lamar and 34th street.</p> <p>I am both a frequent pedestrian user and a frequent driver on this street. As I shared a couple of years ago when the new bike/pedestrian lane was put into place, the street was never heavily trafficked enough to warrant the lane. I *never* felt unsafe or mowed down by cars.</p> <p>Today, as it stands, both cars and people - mostly children - are constantly battling for safe space on that road. Traffic backs up at one poorly parked car. The school kids needing to cross the street are like Frogger characters. It's not good!</p> <p>Additionally, given the narrowness of the road, there is no ability for two way traffic. Inevitably, traffic jams occur and someone ends up backing up the entire road to unclog the jam while kids are running back and forth with limited visibility.</p> <p>My specific feedback suggestions would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) - That the City convert 31s Street back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st - remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as before. - That parking not be allowable on both sides of the street. The street is too narrow. While there are some sections of the street that have No Parking signs, other sections allow it thus creating these narrow path ways that two-way traffic cannot navigate. - That cyclings be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail. <p>Thank you!</p>	Project Feedback
49	ASMP Inbox	<p>The Austin Strategic Mobility Plan disruptions that have been implemented along 31st Street have resulted in changes to traffic patterns on this section of street that I and my entire family use multiple times daily. It is a significant source of frustration, as the changes do not have any positive impact and have resulted in serious safety issues for drivers, pedestrians and bikers alike.</p> <p>My elementary age children attend school at St. Andrew's and it is no longer safe for them to walk or ride their bicycles in this area. The traffic situation resulting from the modifications on 31st Street are extremely disappointing, as we would love for them to be able to ride bikes to school, but it is just no longer safe or feasible.</p> <p>We agree with the school on the following recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail <p>Please make the necessary changes to remedy this situation, I'm sure the plan was well thought out and may have made sense on paper; but if you attempt to drive down 31st Street during a moderate or high traffic time, you will see that having only enough room for one car where traffic is supposed to flow both directions is impossible, it simply does not work.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
50	ASMP Inbox	<p>Good evening. My name is [NAME]. I am a regular user of Shoal Creek and a parent to a student at St. Andrew's. Having access to safe mobility options is important to me. During the past two years or so, I have had several near misses as I try to drive or run down 31st Street near St. Andrew's. I have had near misses with vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists.</p> <p>Recently, my car was struck by a cyclist as it was parked on 31st Street. My review mirror was shattered (see attached picture). The cyclist was riding in the street so as to avoid pedestrians who were walking along the street trail. Fortunately, he was uninjured. Compared to other near misses I have witnessed, I am surprised that I've not been involved in a more serious accident.</p> <p>As a runner on the trail, I feel the street is not safe to share between pedestrians and cyclists in its current format. After discussing this issue with St. Andrew's, I am supportive of their efforts to put pedestrian traffic on the sidewalk and have a narrower lane that is dedicated for bikes only. There is a beautiful sidewalk under oak trees that feels much safer to me. With a pedestrian crossing at the southern trailhead, flow and safety would be much improved. I feel that separating pedestrians from cyclists and reducing the width of the cycling lane (or sharing the roadway with vehicles) would improve conditions and safety for cyclists, pedestrians, and drivers.</p> <p>Thank you so much for considering my input. Have a wonderful evening.</p>	Project Feedback
51	ASMP Inbox	<p>I wanted to share some feedback on the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan, specifically on the recent changes to 31st street/Shoal Creek Blvd between Lamar and 34th street.</p> <p>I've lived in this neighborhood for 15 years, and have often used that road for running, both before and after my children also started going to school at St. Andrew's, which shares the road. The situation has gotten MUCH worse due to the installation of the running lane/barriers. Because cars park there as well, and part of the street is blocked off for running/walking, there just isn't room for two cars anymore. And as a result, many of those cars end up veering into the running lane at the last minute. It's dangerous, and much more so than it used to be when there was simply more space for two cars to pass. As a parent driver, I honestly just don't go on the street anymore at all because it's always a disaster. You are stopping, reversing, dodging into the running lane – there just isn't enough room for what the city is trying to do.</p> <p>My specific feedback suggestions would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) • That the City convert 31st Street back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st - remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as before. • That cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail. <p>Thank you!</p>	Project Feedback
52	ASMP Inbox	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I have real safety concerns on the direction of traffic on 31st street. What little parking we have now has made it unsafe to get in and out of your cars during the day or crossing the street.</p> <p>We need the traffic pattern back the way it was before. Convert 31st street back to a shared lane for cyclists.</p> <p>Maybe divert cyclists along Lamar to 34th street to use bike lanes to Shoal Creek Trail.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
53	ASMP Inbox	I am writing to express concerns regarding the dedicated bike lane at 1112 West 31st Street and the congestion on this road. The street has become quite narrow and on more than one occasion, I have personally had a few close calls with oncoming traffic as there is no space for two cars to pass safely. My biggest concern, however, is the numerous cyclists who do NOT use the dedicated bike lane. In fact, they generally cycle in the middle of the street! This is a busy street and, in my humble opinion, traffic flowed better and was safer prior to the installment of a designated bike lane.	Project Feedback
54	ASMP Inbox	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to reach out regarding changes on 31st street and St. Andrew's Episcopal School.</p> <p>A recent incident occurred around 2:50pm on Wednesday, April 19th involving a St. Andrew's school bus and a local driver. The incident happened at St. Andrew's Middle School on Shoal Creek. A driver had turned off 34th street onto Shoal Creek and was headed just past the Middle School where the two lanes funnel into one lane. The driver of the vehicle pulled in front of the school bus that was headed North on Shoal Creek. This blocked the bus to a stand still, along with additional parents picking up their kids and normal traffic flow. The Golf coach asked the gentleman if he could back up just a little so the bus could get by. The driver said he would NOT and just sat there. Myself and another coach on separate occasions asked the driver if he wouldn't mind backing up a very short distance so the bus could get by. Because of his defiance he deliberately held up traffic not only for the school bus but parents as well who were picking up their kids. This created an intense safety/traffic concern of road rage. Once we were finally able to back our school bus up with cooperation from parents we were able to position the bus to proceed down Shoal Creek. While this was taking place the driver of concern made a simple U-Turn and headed down Shoal Creek to 34th Street. All of this could have been easily prevented had Shoal Creek not been funneled into one lane. This has caused tremendous safety issues and concerns by the narrowing of Shoal Creek. St. Andrews has offered numerous proposals to help open Shoal Creek back to 2 lanes. This has been a major safety and traffic concern. If police, EMS, Fire Trucks were needing access to 31st street they would have been blocked. Our schools need all the safety measures they can get. Please take a close look at 31st street. We are willing to help and offer constructive solutions to benefit all parties such as listed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclist be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail 	Project Feedback
55	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hi there,</p> <p>I wanted to take an opportunity to share some feedback about 31st Street traffic and parking next to St. Andrew's Episcopal School. I'm a teacher at the school so I witness some of the challenges every day. Thank you for taking the time to solicit feedback from your community!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) • We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) • We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail 	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
56	ASMP Inbox	<p>Dear Council Member Alison Alter, Council Member Zo Qadri, and the ASMP team,</p> <p>I am a resident of the Rosedale neighborhood and a parent at St. Andrew's Lower School. Ever since moving to Rosedale, I have ridden my bike several times a week. It is exhilarating—everything I've ever wanted out of life in Austin. Still, it is intimidating to be a bike rider in this city of big and bigger cars, especially when I'm riding with my children. I request the following to be considered:</p> <p>Lamar I propose a dedicated bike lane up and down Lamar Avenue, with barriers similar to those that are now on parts of Congress Avenue and Congress Bridge. That would change Lamar for the better in so many ways—providing a safe space for bikes and, in turn, encouraging more pedestrian activity by providing a healthy barrier between cars and sidewalks.</p> <p>31st Street I'm passing along cut-and-paste comments from the school. I agree this street needs to be widened and its bike lane changed. Due to the curve in the narrow road, near-accidents happen daily. There's a lot to pay attention to here—children crossing, soccer balls landing in the street, bikers and pedestrians—making the confusion around driving potentially more dangerous.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail <p>Thank you very much for your time and consideration!</p>	Project Feedback
57	ASMP Inbox	<p>The following recommendations are being presented to better the traffic flow on 31st Street/Shoal Creek in central Austin:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail <p>Thank you for your consideration of these recommendations.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
58	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is [NAME], [POSITION]s at St. Andrew's Episcopal School, at 1112 West 31st Street. I am writing mainly in the context of our summer camp programs, which I organize.</p> <p>I wish to express my feedback about the changes that have occurred along 31st Street/Shoal Creek Blvd, in the last few years that negatively impact our school and traffic flows in the area. The protected bike lane barriers and changes in parking have created unnecessary traffic issues as the two-way street is reduced to be too narrow for vehicles to pass in opposite directions without one pulling to the side. This causes frequent traffic issues, especially during high volume periods of morning drop off and afternoon pickup, when traffic is queuing at any of the three driveways used by our school population. Additionally, during the summer camp program there is midday pickup and drop off as well, so the traffic issues are felt twice as often daily.</p> <p>To separate bike and pedestrian traffic, peds should be directed to the sidewalk on the north side of 31st, and 31st Street should be changed back to a shared lane for cyclists without barriers, and eliminate the parking on the south side.</p> <p>Thank you for listening.</p>	Project Feedback
59	ASMP Inbox	<p>I understand that the City is seeking citizen input regarding mobility along 31st street, an area with multiple competing interests. My perspective is as a parent of a child who attends St. Andrew's School, adjacent to the area of concern.</p> <p>I find that the most recent changes made by the City on this corridor, while well-intentioned, have had the result of decreasing safety for the children who attend the school and have created an unsafe situation with two-way traffic in a space that is far too narrow to accommodate two vehicular lanes.</p> <p>As a solution, I would ask that you strongly consider removing the dedicated bicycle lane and allowing bicycles and vehicles to share the same lanes, as they did before. This would allow unimpeded bidirectional traffic flow, as opposed to the current situation, in which vehicles are often forced to wait their turn to pass at choke points, analogous to the way vehicles in each direction wait their turn to cross a one-lane bridge.</p> <p>Furthermore, cyclists could preferentially be re-routed via signage, should they choose, to the dedicated bicycle lanes on Lamar to 34th St., with access to the Shoal Creek Trail.</p> <p>Finally, especially given the heavy foot traffic of children in this area, I would urge you to consider directing pedestrians to an improved sidewalk on the north side of 31st St.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
60	ASMP Inbox	<p>I currently work at St. Andrew's Lower School in the Admissions Office. Not only has my commute been affected due to the expanded pedestrian-bike lane but helping parents find parking and navigating to St. Andrew's in the course is proving more difficult by said pedestrian-bike lane.</p> <p>In the morning due to how narrow this road is I have almost been hit head-on because visibility is low when coming around a bend. In some cases, it is because there is a cyclist in front of me using the road because they are trying to avoid cyclists that are in the pedestrian-bike lane. I think this will be avoided if pedestrians are moved to an expanded sidewalk in front of St. Andrew's. Sometimes I am stuck on the road because there is nowhere to go to avoid the oncoming car that you have to drive over the barriers into the pedestrian-bike lane.</p> <p>In my admissions work parents have trouble finding parking and 31st Street is not safe as an option because the pedestrian-bike lane has narrowed the road and in some cases, we are afraid parents' cars will get hit by other vehicles. It is such a safety hazard to have such a wide pedestrian-bike lane.</p> <p>Is it possible for the safety of those who use the road frequently for you to make some changes?</p> <p>Please redirect pedestrians to the sidewalk with safe crossing to shoal creek, while narrowing the bike lane so it only accommodates cyclists.</p> <p>Please remove the barriers because they pose a hazard to people and vehicles.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
61	ASMP Inbox	<p>Dear City Planners & City Council Members,</p> <p>I have worked at St Andrew's School for 28 years and have never seen the traffic as awful as it is now. The bikers do not stay in their designated land and ride down the middle of 31st Street. Before the bike land was added, the pedestrians and bikers did fine along 31st Street.</p> <p>A few of my experiences -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -A few bike riders got agitated when I wouldn't move over while they were riding down the middle of the street. - Driving around the corner where the street turns into Shoal Creek is a bad blind spot. I have almost had numerous head-on collisions with aggressive drivers. At the curve of Shoal Creek if there are cars parked on the south side you can't let anyone pass or pass yourself. You're stuck. - This bike lane is dangerous because first responders in fire trucks or any other big vehicle cannot get down the road. - We had an eighteen wheeler truck come down the street to make a delivery and got stuck - Turning right on 31st street from Lamar is dangerous coming down around the curve. Cars drive fast and you can't get over to move out of the way for oncoming traffic. - Folks walking their dogs and going for a jog don't use the bike lane either. They walk and run on our sidewalk along the school. <p>Can you please consider one or all three of these recommendations?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail <p>Thank you for taking the time to read my email.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
62	ASMP Inbox	<p>I understand that the City is seeking citizen input regarding mobility along 31st Street, an area with multiple competing interests. My perspective is as a parent of a child who attends St. Andrew's School, adjacent to the area of concern.</p> <p>I find that the most recent changes made by the City on this corridor, while well-intentioned, have had the result of decreasing safety for the children who attend the school and have created an unsafe situation with two-way traffic in a space that is far too narrow to accommodate two vehicular lanes.</p> <p>As a solution, I would ask that you strongly consider removing the dedicated bicycle lane and allowing bicycles and vehicles to share the same lanes, as they did before. This would allow unimpeded bidirectional traffic flow, as opposed to the current situation, in which vehicles are often forced to wait their turn to pass at choke points, analogous to the way vehicles in each direction wait their turn to cross a one-lane bridge.</p> <p>Furthermore, cyclists could preferentially be re-routed via signage, should they choose, to the dedicated bicycle lanes on Lamar to 34th St., with access to the Shoal Creek Trail.</p> <p>Finally, especially given the heavy foot traffic of children in this area, I would urge you to consider directing pedestrians to an improved, accessible sidewalk on the north side of 31st St. with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to keep bike and pedestrian traffic separate).</p>	Project Feedback
63	ASMP Inbox	<p>City Planners,</p> <p>My name is [NAME] and I currently serve as the [POSITION] at St. Andrew's Episcopal School. I spend the majority of my time at 1112 West 31st St. and have been working in this capacity for the last five years. I also live in Brentwood, and often commute south to work by bike.</p> <p>The recent changes and current structure to the flow of traffic along 31st St. have been a logistical nightmare for our athletics department, transportation department, and school community as a whole. I've personally witnessed numerous near accidents involving children and young adults that are directly related to the current infrastructure. We're unnecessarily putting the lives of young people in jeopardy.</p> <p>Additionally, athletics hosts lots of external stakeholders that may not be familiar with our campus. For example, we hosted over 200 5th-8th grade basketball games in conjunction with public, private, charter, and club teams in the greater Austin area. The current setup not only endangers the St. Andrew's community, but plenty of people outside of our community as well.</p> <p>I ask that you consider the following solutions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pedestrians should be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the northside of 31st St with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic). 2. The City should convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as before). 3. Cyclists should be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail <p>Thank you for considering these solutions to a fixable, yet important cause.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
64	ASMP Inbox	<p>ASMP and City Council Members,</p> <p>I am writing to encourage you to make the changes to 31st St traffic proposed by St. Andrew's School (SAS). As a parent of SAS students on the 31st St campus since 2014, I have witnessed (and been an unwilling participant in) the utter chaos 31st St has become since the City added the barriered bike lane and odd parking situation. Forcing a barriered bike lane, two-way traffic, Shoal Creek pedestrians, and strangely designated street parking to share an approximately 30ft wide road is dangerous and untenable. Adding to that, adjacent Seton Medical Center construction has pushed many Medical Center employees and visitors onto 31st St, particularly for parking.</p> <p>I invite you to visit 31st St between 3:00-3:30pm on a weekday during the school year for a glimpse of peak pandemonium. Every single day I see a vehicle reversing down the street because there is no room for two cars to pass each other next to the barriered bike lane. Last year, my side mirror was swiped completely off by a passing vehicle. The current set up is, at its best, confusing, inconvenient and stressful for users of all types. At its worst, I fear it is a bad accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>Please consider adopting the following suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail 	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
65	ASMP Inbox	<p>Dear Austin City Planners,</p> <p>Along with other parents at St. Andrew's Episcopal School, I am writing to ask for modification of the current 31st Street mobility plan. The combined bike/pedestrian/vehicle plan transformed 31st Street from a quiet school street to a dangerous thoroughway where students, teachers and parents narrowly escape being hit by cars, construction trucks, and school buses.</p> <p>With the severe narrowing of the street, teachers and parents cannot exit their cars safely without the fear of getting hit. Students cannot safely cross the street to meet their parents' cars after school. Instead, passenger AND commercial vehicles jockey for rare gaps in parked cars to allow opposing traffic to pass. Our school's street has become a dangerous game of Frogger. Most parents refer to the street as a "death trap." The ASMP may have had the best of intentions, but it simply does not work in this context.</p> <p>Just last week, a line of 4 vehicles (1 large construction truck, 1 F-350 and 2 SUVs) had to reverse at the same time to allow a line of opposing vehicles (including a school bus) to squeeze eastward on 31st Street just as school was dismissed at 3:30pm. If a student had stepped behind this backward-moving line of vehicles, it could have been disastrous. This situation is a daily occurrence. I anticipate it will worsen as construction at the nearby Seton women's health tower continues. The construction is already resulting in large heavy-equipment vehicles getting lost on our school's quiet street and Seton employees parking on 31st Street (often illegally), providing even less room for passing cars.</p> <p>The St. Andrew's community will all attest to the fact that what works on paper is a disaster in reality. Therefore, I join the St. Andrew's community in asking that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The City remove the barriers on 31st Street and restore the painted line for shared bike and vehicle traffic; o Cyclists are diverted along Lamar to 34th Street to use the already-existing bike lanes that connect with Shoal Creek Trail; and o Pedestrians be directed to the improved north side of 31st Street. <p>Thank you for your time and consideration of this matter. Please take this issue seriously as children and teachers are depending on you.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
66	ASMP Inbox	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I wanted to write and express my concern for the changes in the traffic patterns on 31st street. It is very difficult to drive in either direction on 31st street because of the cars parked along each side of the now very narrow road.</p> <p>We have had to call 911 on more than one occasion for an emergency at the school and the emergency vehicles could not safely make it down 31st street to get the the part of the campus where they were needed. This is NOT acceptable. The lives and safety of our children and our employees are our main concern.</p> <p>I work in the business office at St. Andrew's and have to coordinate delivery of any supplies we may need. Large delivery trucks cannot safely make it up and down our street. We have had 18 wheelers take out tree limbs and barley escape hitting parked cars while trying to make deliveries. Our school busses also have a VERY difficult time safely driving up and down 31st street. It usually ends up in someone having to back up to get out of the way.</p> <p>While standing out front of our school one day waiting on a delivery truck that was having problems getting to the front of the school, a car drove by the front driveway, rolled down their window, and proceeded to cruse me out because of the "bumps" they had to drive over to pass oncoming traffic. They told me to "remove the F@*%# bumps" (like we put them there). I did not appreciate the extremely foul language I had to hear and was thankful there were no children out front at the time to hear that sort of language.</p> <p>Our parents, employees, delivery drivers and neighbors are very frustrated with this situation and would like to see changes made.</p> <p>These are the changes we would like to recommend:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail 	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
67	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello,</p> <p>As a parent of a child who attends the St. Andrew's 31st street campus I have seen first hand the dangerous situation created by the painted bike lane and barriers along 31st street.</p> <p>The painted lane and barriers, with cars parked along, essentially create a one lane street along portions of 31st. When two cars enter 31st street from opposite directions encounter each other it becomes a very difficult situation. When multiple cars enter the situation it pure chaos with confusion and eventually cars backing up long distances.</p> <p>Bikers, runners and walkers are hard to see with all the cars parked along the painted lane and barrier. I have seen drivers have to slam on their brakes many times to avoid pedestrians they cannot see because of the parked cars.</p> <p>It is ridiculous that this painted lane and barriers were placed in front of a school with high traffic in the first place. Please remedy this situation before a serious injury occurs.</p> <p>We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic).</p> <p>We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before).</p> <p>We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail.</p>	Project Feedback
68	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I'm writing about the safety issues that have arisen since putting a bike lane on Shoal Creek/31st Street. Being that there's a school on that street has caused some dangerous situations. There's not enough room anymore for two cars to pass at times, and I've seen an "almost head-on collision" there. I'm hoping maybe putting a sidewalk on the north side of 31st Street could be one solution.</p> <p>Thank you so much for considering!</p>	Project Feedback
69	ASMP Inbox	<p>I have lived in Austin 22 years and go almost daily to the area around 31st Street. The changes made on 31st in the last 4 years have been a disaster. A two-way street has been reduced to a single lane resulting in cars "playing chicken" to get through and clipping each other as they pass. There is a school along this street and this traffic congestion makes it extremely dangerous for the children and families accessing the school. The traffic situation has only intensified with the major hospital construction project across the street. To top it off, very few cyclists actually use the bike line.</p> <p>I understand the school along 31st Street has made the following recommendations and I support them:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. That the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. That cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail <p>Thank in advance for your consideration.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
70	ASMP Inbox	<p>Thank you for accepting feedback with regard to the ASMP. My daughter is a student at the St. Andrew's Episcopal School lower campus and the recent street and traffic flow changes have presented challenges for the school community as well as the surrounding neighborhood. These changes are compounded by the new construction occurring on the neighboring medical campus. I think with the growth and development of our school and campus these issues should be addressed sooner rather than later so I appreciate you reviewing and considering this information.</p> <p>I have reviewing the proposals/suggestions the school has presented and am in agreement with their vision for alignment between the school and neighborhood regarding traffic and parking needs. The school has proposed the following changes and I am in agreement with these proposals and I urge you to consider these thoughtful changes from the folks that are frequenting these streets each day:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail <p>Again, I know your job is not easy and you are balancing the needs, wants and desires of many. I can assure you the school and school community has the mindset of doing what is best for the most people in our community and continuing the use and enjoyment of our city.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
71	ASMP Inbox	<p>I wanted to share some thoughts and possible solutions in regards to Shoal Creek Blvd/West 31st which borders the backside of our school, St. Andrew's Episcopal.</p> <p>1) It was certainly a thoughtful and biker friendly idea to build a wide bike path that runs nearly the length of this "short" stretch of road. The problem is that the road itself was narrow to begin with so it was the right idea but for the wrong application.</p> <p>2) The road is extremely narrow for two vehicles especially with the stretch of parking that borders the bike lane. It presents a safety issue because there are blind spots as you drive around the curvatures of the road while parked vehicles block visibility. Vehicles end up having to swerve into the bike lane to let oncoming vehicles pass. It's a mess and it's amplified by the fact that we have hundreds of children riding with their parents to and from school.</p> <p>3) Please don't do a one-way...the traffic will back up onto Lamar and Wabash during pick-up. It's an important artery to our Kinder building, Middle School building, and school parking lot that is across from Bailey Park.</p> <p>4) I believe the compromise is pushing pedestrian traffic to the sidewalk and utilizing the full width of the road as much as possible without compromising street parking which is crucial and needed. Yes, this is the way it was but it's obvious that changes made have not worked.</p> <p>5) Here's the most surprising factor that I have realized since the change was made on Shoal Creek/W. 31st...the "bike lane" is used by a heavy majority of pedestrians. Bikers are few and far between. I witness this every morning and afternoon and during the day when I'm outside on our field for PE. Pedestrians don't need a double wide path and bicyclists slowing down to pass each other is a small compromise on what is a small stretch of road.</p> <p>6) In addition to the aforementioned, please take a look at the email [NAME], wrote and emailed to you. That incident alone was a direct result of the narrow road. There was definitely a presence of danger due to the undpredictablity of the person with "road rage". Luckily cooler heads prevailed and the situation de-escalated.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and leadership!</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
72	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello, I am writing to share feedback on the 31st St. Traffic changes. I have lived in Austin for 18 years and certainly understand the need for changes as the city grows. We have been a family enrolled at Saint Andrews for the past seven years. As a mom I have been back-and-forth to the school multiple times per day and at various times need to use the 31st St. to pick up and drop off my kids. I have been yelled at and cursed at by drivers in cars simply trying to pass through at pick up and dropoff times. These are folks trying to get to where they need to go but unfortunately got stuck in the backlog of traffic that is now secondary to the new bike lane changes. It is not fair to the families whose kids go to St Andrew's and it is not fair to the Austin residence just trying to pass through. It is absolutely impossible for two cars to pass on the current one lane road. It is dangerous and frustrating and to be frank I have rarely seen bikes in the bike lane most of the day and I have been on 31st St. multiple times throughout the days over the last few years.</p> <p>I humbly request that we make this area safer for our kids, our families, pedestrians, and bikers by doing the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail 	Project Feedback
73	ASMP Inbox	<p>To our council representatives as well as the committee supporting the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan:</p> <p>I encourage you to evaluate the decision that put barriers and widened the bike and pedestrian lane so that 25% of the road (7' of 28') is not available to automobiles. When you factor in the parking lane, more than half the road (15' of the 28') is unavailable to the automobiles traveling on the street. This has caused daily issues in terms of moving traffic safely and smoothly around our school campus. Frustrated drivers are not people we want behind the wheel of an automobile, especially when they are traveling around an elementary school campus. Please consider removing the barriers and painted lanes and return this street as it was before. I've been teaching and coaching at this elementary school for 41 years and it's difficult to see the daily issues we have due to this change. There are already sidewalks available to pedestrians and I would think that diverting cyclists along Lamar to 34th street to then access the Shoal Creek Trail would be advantageous to all. We know decisions can be tough and there are many factors that need to be taken into account when making these decisions. Please consider making the proposed changes that would greatly benefit the life of our school, our school families and the community that travels this area. Thanks so much for your consideration and I'm available by phone should you wish to discuss this matter.</p>	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
74	ASMP Inbox	<p>Dear Council Member Qadri,</p> <p>I understand that you are considering amendments to the Austin Strategic Mobility Plan based on updates to the Bicycle, Urban Trails and Sidewalk Plans (ATXWalkBikeRoll). The section of the Heritage Neighborhood Trail on 31st St, East of Lamar Blvd, that connects to the Pilot Project on W 31st St/Shoal Creek Blvd is extremely steep going into Lamar Blvd. The Heritage Trail and the Pilot Project lanes on W 31st St/Shoal Creek Blvd are intended to be for “all ages and all abilities”, but I believe that the safety issue has been ignored during the planning process.</p> <p>I live in Bryker Woods (West of Lamar Blvd). I first commented to city staff on the Pilot Project on W 31st St/Shoal Creek Blvd when it was first implemented. The issues I had then, I still have today:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Narrowing of the street for vehicular traffic made two-way traffic difficult and more dangerous, something I observed on the first day of the Pilot Project. The bollards and button barriers, and parallel parked cars don't make me, as someone who has walked the Pilot Project several times, feel any safer. Some bicyclists fail to give pedestrians a warning that they are approaching from the rear, startling pedestrians—a potential for a cyclist/pedestrian collision. There is a stretch of the Pilot Project that is lined along the curb with Spanish Dagger plants. Someone could be seriously injured, or killed, falling on those plants. Having two bike lanes is not much of an improvement over the single bike lane we had before the Pilot Project. I have observed bicyclists weaving in and out of the bike lanes to avoid pedestrians, or avoiding the bike lanes entirely to ride on the street. 2) Part of the Pilot Project route runs right through a grove of trees on the Shoal Creek greenbelt eroding a dirt “cow path” from the entry point into the greenbelt to W 34th St. t This has compacted the soil in the critical root zone of the trees. There is an open, grassy area South of this grove that could be used for a shorter path that could connect with the existing concrete trail, but staff has shown no interest in changing their plan. As our climate warms, the shade trees provide is very important. We really need to protect and maintain our urban forest, especially in our greenbelts and parks. 3) The planning process was seriously flawed if the neighbors on W 31st Street and St. Andrews School have had to work diligently with city staff after the Pilot Project was implemented. The timing of the Pilot Project implementation (when school was not in session) also raises questions about the planning process. <p>I support the recommendations my neighbors on W 31st St. and St. Andrews School have made to city staff and hope that you will too:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To improve safety, we ask that pedestrians be directed to an expanded version of the existing sidewalk on the north side of W 31st Street, with pedestrian crossings at each of the Shoal Creek Trailheads. On-street pedestrian traffic (with dogs on leashes, strollers, etc.) often conflicts with bicycle traffic, forcing cyclists in and out of the drive lane. 2. We ask that the City revert back to the original shared lane for cyclists on W 31st (this would remove bollards and button barriers, and revert to a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as existed before) 3. We ask that emphasis be placed on encouraging cyclists to utilize the existing bike lanes on the north and south sides of W 34th Street which also tie into the Shoal Creek Trail 	Project Feedback

ID #	Source	Comment	Theme
75	ASMP Inbox	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am concerned that the modifications made to the street have caused confusion and have not helped the safety of motorists, pedestrians, or cyclists. I do have two students that attend school on this street and it is an awkward and dangerous situation. I respectfully request your consideration of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We ask that pedestrians be directed to an improved, all-abilities sidewalk on the north side of 31st with a pedestrian crossing at the Shoal Creek Trailhead (to separate bike traffic and pedestrian traffic) 2. We ask that the City convert 31st back to a shared lane for cyclists on 31st (this would remove all barriers and have a painted lane for bike and vehicle traffic as we had before) 3. We ask that cyclists be diverted along Lamar to 34th to use bike lanes that tie into Shoal Creek Trail 	Project Feedback

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON SIDEWALKS, CROSSINGS AND SHARED STREETS DRAFT PLAN

This document includes all public comments received on the Draft Sidewalks, Crossings, and Shared Streets Plan between January 27, 2023 and March 20, 2023 on [Public Input](#).

Theme	Count	Action
Funding	3	Noted; revised language in key strategy 1 and action item 5a
Trees/shade	9	Noted
Design	8	Noted
Shared Street	24	Noted
Equity/EAZ	3	Noted
Crossings	28	Noted; location specific comments forwarded to appropriate CoA staff
Bikeways	2	Noted
Safety	6	Noted; location specific comments forwarded to appropriate CoA staff
Connectivity	2	Noted; added action items to Strategy 2
Terminology	7	Noted; revised language
Construction	1	Noted
Methodology/process	3	Noted
Outside plan's scope	2	Noted
Maintenance	1	Noted
Plan legibility	1	Noted
Implementation	2	Noted
Map information	1	Updated all maps

Comment ID	Type	Comment	Page
377	Other	CM Qadri - there is no "u" in his name.	2
399	Suggestion	This would be a great takeaway from the project, even if nothing else was implemented!	6
527	Concern	One benefit that could be added to planned sidewalks is the addition of local trees alongside the sidewalk. Walking down a hot asphalt street is difficult enough. It is made easier by a sidewalk, but when those sidewalks are completely uncovered and there's no shade OR trees reducing the heat island effect in the entire neighborhood, most people aren't going to walk if they can help it. One way in which underserved communities have particularly struggled with redlining is by very few trees alongside neighborhood roads, which reduce the overall temperature.	6
725	Suggestion	Additional strategy: minimize construction duration through the use of cost savings measures such as extended work hours, multiple crews, and crews operating 365 days a year	6
430	Concern	This entire document and the planning contained within is obsolete. Nowhere is there any mention or accommodation for micro-mobility (e-bike/trike/scooter). This form of transportation is rapidly becoming a mainstay. INRIX rates Austin 21st nationally and calculates 45% of our urban trips can be satisfied by this mobility. ANY plan dealing with non automobile mobility MUST make this exploding segment a centerpiece. The trails proposed would mix 28mph powered vehicles with small children learning to ride a bike, pedestrians, mothers with strollers, etc. Failing to plan for this is a recipe for disaster.	8
631	Suggestion	data-driven only survey will not include intersectionality and different experiences people have on those pedestrian crossings. There needs to be a qualitative approach too	9
728	Suggestion	Shared streets should be more than just an alternative to sidewalks, they should be areas in which pedestrian and human activity is prioritized. Or add Play Streets as its own category. Streets where kids play, that function as a makeshift gathering place, or are otherwise places in and of themselves, should be Shared Streets. Think Speedway through campus or 6th Street during the weekend. Or what Rainey Street should be.	9
896	Concern	The 800 lb gorilla for shared streets is the big push to eliminate parking requirements in residential areas. That push would eliminate the requirement for garages and/or driveways at homes, which frees up space to build a bigger dwelling unit(s). However, eliminating or reducing onsite parking puts those residents' cars on the same streets being considered for pedestrian sharing. Where cars line both sides of the street, pedestrians and vehicles compete for the center lane. That situation is the opposite of "walkability". Austin will have to choose between shared streets and elimination of parking requirements. Residential streets are simply too narrow to accommodate both concepts.	9
526	Question	My neighborhood - east of St. Johns in the Coronado Hills area - is not included as a Focus EAZ although there are very few sidewalks and the population is highly mixed racial.	12

736	Suggestion	This policy should inform the TCM and subdivision code, it should require all new subdivisions be gridded. See Jane Jacob's: https://thegreatestgrid.mcny.org/greatest-grid/sidewalks/327	15
914	Concern	Look at all this planning but no action	17
614	Suggestion	This sidewalk plan should outline appropriate sidewalk widths and placement for different contexts. The current standard of 5', while an improvement over 4', is insufficient. No sidewalk should have a pedestrian clear zone of less than 6'. In commercial and mixed use areas, the pedestrian clear zone should be no less than 8'. Austin should build their own sidewalk design standards for public projects based on peer cities like Portland and Seattle which are doing a much better job at achieving the kind of goals around road safety, walkability, and mode share that Austin is working toward.	21
615	Suggestion	It is critical that this sidewalk plan identify design standards that ensure that public sidewalk project are of a high-quality and aligned with Austin's vision as a walkable community. This requires that the design of public sidewalk projects is done in a way that properly balances ROW constraints with pedestrian safety and comfort. This prioritization approach should be formalized as requirements of the general permits given to engineers and contractors that build these projects. These prioritization requirements should start by meeting the same standards that are required of private commercial development including planting zone. Before eliminating a planting zone or narrowing the pedestrian clear zone, reduce the distance between the sidewalk and edge of ROW to 3-6", narrow travel lanes, eliminating parking lanes. If the ROW is so constrained that none of these reductions are sufficient, reduce the planting zone but ensure there is never less than 2' of buffer zone between the pedestrian clear width and the road bed, in accordance with NACTO guidelines. If this is impossible, acquire public access easements from abutting properties.	21
659	Suggestion	Direct quotation of community member is published in page 33 of this report mentioning about the importance of street tree but the Sidewalk section does not discuss Street tree at all. The plan should add a paragraph talking about street trees in 2.1 Sidewalk section.	21
895	Suggestion	All sidewalks should be at least 5' wide to allow people to walk side by side, especially the infirm and young. Some people need physical assistance.	21
480	Suggestion	I strongly support shared streets and prefer them to sidewalks. Shared streets should be planned in new developments as well as older ones. New developments tend to have wide streets that encourage higher speeds and make it difficult to cross. Shared streets are better for all non-vehicle modes and create a more pleasant atmosphere for the neighborhood.	23
656	Suggestion	It would be relevant to consider how street parking affects these safe streets. And, in consideration of parking being free and taking up space on safe streets, considering sidewalks in these areas is another solid alternative.	23
732	Suggestion	Shared streets should be more than only an alternative for pedestrian access, they should be applicable to many/most parts of the city.	23
759	Suggestion	New developments should be able to incorporate Shared Streets elements. It's not only safer but more fiscally responsible regarding longterm asphalt maintenance costs and total impervious cover.	23

898	Concern	<p>The 800 lb gorilla for shared streets is the big push to eliminate parking requirements in residential areas. That push would eliminate the requirement for garages and/or driveways at homes, which frees up space to build a bigger dwelling unit(s).</p> <p>However, eliminating or reducing onsite parking puts those residents' cars on the same streets being considered for pedestrian sharing. Where cars line both sides of the street, pedestrians and vehicles compete for the center lane. That situation is the opposite of "walkability". Austin will have to choose between shared streets and elimination of parking requirements. Residential streets are simply too narrow to accommodate both concepts.</p>	23
915	Suggestion	The use of steel bollards could be used to convert a street into a true shared street	23
917	Suggestion	<p>1) pick a low-traffic street</p> <p>2) put (real) bollards or planters up at one (arbitrary) point on every block of this street- allowing parking, but prohibiting auto thru traffic for any real distance</p> <p>3) bike freeway for the cost of maybe 300 bollards / installation</p>	23
918	Suggestion	I mean fuck could you actually block a street with the flexposts? It would be funny to try	23
737	Suggestion	Streets with sidewalks, or with multifamily, deserve to look like this as well.	24
58	Question	the white pole curb extensions are pretty unattractive... can't imagine hundreds of miles of these all over the city. what's the cost difference between these and planted extensions--and how will the city decide which streets get which type of treatment?	26
215	Suggestion	I like the idea of moving these to permanent with planted curb extensions. Portland's skinny streets project does that with great success. I am seeing some free right turns, for example 38th and Shoal Creek Blvd., have been removed and planted. This helps keep traffic speeds reasonable, reduces impervious cover, and allows stormwater to get back into the ground. Plus, they are green and growing instead of move pavement. Would love to see these continue and shared streets use this kind of treatment.	26
350	Concern	<p>There is no way I would want these Shared Streets on my street, or anywhere in the inner part of my neighborhood. It's unattractive and it removes places to park. It focuses drivers on what is ahead of them when faced with an oncoming car instead of watching the whole road for kids playing or entering the road from the sides. It makes it harder for cars to pass and causes traffic to back up, especially when trucks block the road.</p> <p>Please focus your efforts on improving and maintaining sidewalks on larger roads. Basically any road that has a yellow line down the middle probably needs help, but these inner city roads are mostly fine as is.</p> <p>I have a lot of experience walking in my neighborhood. I walked about 1600 miles to and from my kids elementary school over 8 years, and I currently walk a three mile route 1-3 times a week. I've never come close to an incident with cars. My only problems are when trying to cross larger roads during commuter traffic time.</p> <p>Please don't waste money on this concept.</p>	26

380	Concern	<p>The curb extensions along this path do not appear to be big enough to slow down traffic. They also aren't built to the plan that y'all have online. It says that these are supposed to narrow the street to 14' but as built these narrow the street to 22' which just doesn't feel small enough to slow down vehicles.</p> <p>Overall the rebuild is a significant downgrade from the temporary ones that still exist south of 51st and doesn't actually feel safe enough to walk on or take little kids biking on especially at night. It would be great to see a permanent version of the temporary ones, perhaps put garden boxes where the Jersey Barriers are a flex post where the barrel is.</p>	26
609	Concern	<p>I think the concept of using shared streets for this purpose is a wonderful idea. However, as the shared street pilot projects were installed, it is more similar to standard traffic calming efforts in other cities. This is not a proper substitute for sidewalks. To make this approach effective, there will need to be more done to make driving on these streets less convenient. Controlling turning movements, hardening gateways, and real chicanes that require drivers to change direction would be helpful. Additionally, plastic bollards are not durable or strong enough. Even for tactical projects, we should be using concrete planters, jersey barriers, curbs, and other more permanent objects.</p>	26
908	Concern	<p>How many of these "refuge areas" are needed per block or per 100 feet? Is there a traffic engineering standard? If so, does it account for the amount of traffic on that particular street? If a neighborhood becomes denser with residents, are additional refuge areas added? Also, those refuge areas displace parking, which bucks the trend of many city planners who advocate elimination of residential parking requirements for homes, which would park those residents' vehicles on the street. I'm not against the concept of refuge areas, but it doesn't seem fully baked yet.</p>	26
919	Concern	<p>The problem with this picture is that you've left 100% of the ROW for cars ffs</p>	26
920	Question	<p>This design bravely inquires "What if we changed nothing at all?"</p>	26
26	Question	<p>how does COA take in to account neighborhoods that were annexed (like Lost Creek in District 8) that have a lot of sidewalk gaps and areas that need attention regarding sidewalk, pedestrian and street safety? Historically this particular neighborhood has been forgotten by COA, both in terms of projects and GIS mapping updates due to its location.</p>	27
129	Concern	<p>It shouldn't be how many locations have access, but rather how many _people_. Your calculation by parcel heavily overweights toward people who have more land, that is, toward single-family homes and away from multifamily. The equity piece of that is that the sorts of people who have historically had better access to resources control more land, as well as having more access to private vehicles.</p>	28
625	Suggestion	<p>Physical access to a grocery store does not mean that that store will be of good quality or economically accessible for everyone. It would be great to include the type of stores. Additionally, I am curious what "other food" stores entail. Fast foods or corner stores may be included as other but they don't provide good quality nutrition.</p>	28
657	Other	<p>I appreciate how this addresses the everlasting question in austin: how much of our streets prioritize vehicles as opposed to pedestrians/cyclists/runners/others? And, it allows for a restructuring of that prioritization en masse.</p>	29

740	Suggestion	Shared streets and sidewalks are about mobility, but can be more. The public right of way is the public realm. Right of way is a route through which goods and people flow through, but in 'neighborhoods' the speed of that flow should be deprioritized. Neighborhoods, in this context, means anywhere in the city that people live, work, and play. Not just single family neighborhoods.	29
911	Concern	How will the candidate streets for the shared street program be zoned so that future land development on those streets does not overwhelm the required vacant street space with parked cars which is needed to make shared streets work?	29
894	Other	<p>I love the Shared Streets! I live on the Avenue G Healthy Street. I spent a semester in Mexico and a year in Spain and experienced the community gathering fostered by plazas. The Healthy Street was like a long public plaza. I met so many neighbors, kids and dogs I would have never met. The Healthy Street true fostered community and it was amazing.</p> <p>Way more people walk down the street than drive down the street, at least in my neighborhood. I spent a great deal of time on the streets (painting them) and experienced that, during the day, the vehicles on the street were mainly service vehicles: delivery trucks, construction trucks and trash trucks.</p> <p>To safely implement the Shared Streets program, I believe that some attention should be paid to streets that cross the Shared Streets. I painted at intersections to slow drivers down. I witnessed drivers unknowingly blowing through the intersections on the Healthy Street, not because they were jerks, but because they were unaware.</p> <p>Recently, when I was painting in Brentwood, I came to realize that often people (drivers) initially didn't really see the signs and other indicators that they were on a Shared Street. I think the paintings helped with that.</p>	30
381	Suggestion	I really support implementing Shared Streets instead of sidewalks but only if they are actually safe for pedestrians which would be a 5-10 mph speed for cars. It would be great to do this and can be done with the temp layout from Ave G Healthy Street with Jersey Barriers and Barrels. I don't think the new designs on Ave G and H 51st to 56th isn't sufficient enough, though that roundabout is a god send. Thank you for that.	32
921	Concern	You're telling me the per mile cost of some halfassed flexposts is a quarter million dollars?	32
219	Suggestion	Would be helpful if we had more CIP funding for sidewalks in the budget. We have traditionally relied on bond money, which requires voter approval. It seems like it would be smart to align our transportation budget with the policies and goals of the ASMP, which would mean actually budgeting for sidewalks, shared streets, and safe crossings.	33
426	Other	Agreed!	33
610	Suggestion	100% agreed. All sidewalk projects should include street trees at 30'o.c. between the sidewalk and the roadbed. At the very least, public sidewalk projects should be providing a planting zone in this location for future street trees to be planted.	33
662	Other	This is an excellent quotation, it reflect our concern	33
611	Concern	I agree. No sidewalk should be installed with the pedestrian clear zone abutting the curb, especially where no parking lane exists. These designs are uncomfortable and unsafe.	34

658	Concern	Additionally, those streets w/ no bike lanes and those with unprotected bike lanes (unprotected here means anything less than an elevated curb dividing cyclists/vehicles) are usually quite busy & heavily populated by cars w/limited regulation for speed.	34
343	Concern	Redfield Ln 78758 - Super high traffic (cars & walkers) cut through street with no side walks or speed bumps. It's a very dangerous and narrow path with cars parked on the street	35
612	Suggestion	Sidewalk projects should include funding for street trees. The City should use a certain % their parks fee to fund street trees in our public ROWs. Acquiring new land for parks in older, built-out neighborhoods is unlikely and very expensive. Our streets are our most prevalent and equitably distributed public spaces. We need funding to make these spaces shaded and comfortable to walk, bike, roll and be social with our neighbors.	35
661	Suggestion	Austin Water and Austin Energy are two utilities whose daily works can impact sidewalk development, the Plan should include section discussing role and how these organization can participate and contribute to the success of the Plan. This involvement will complement the Plan's Overarching Strategy Number 3 mentioned in page 62: "Collaborate with public and private partners using a Complete Streets approach to improving the pedestrian network.	36
613	Concern	I like the idea of using shared streets for this purpose. However, these lightweight materials are not often not durable and should be seen as temporary installations. These installation will need regular maintenance and all materials are likely to need replacement in a short period of time. I am afraid that if lightweight materials are used they will either become a continuous maintenance liability or be left to fall into disrepair and become ineffective. These kind of temporary projects are not an effective substitute for a sidewalk project.	38
341	Question	We need street names identified as is done for both the rban trails and bike facilities. Will the city do this?	41
552	Suggestion	Funding for sidewalk improvement and rehabilitation should be prioritized over funding for bike lanes or urban trails. That is because sidewalks can be used by all or almost all residents and are essential for safety. A much smaller percentage of the community uses bikes or other devices like scooters. Proportionally too much money has been spent on facilities for them versus meeting the needs of pedestrians. I support moving money from bike lanes or other areas of the city budget to fund more of the needs for pedestrians.	41
813	Suggestion	No shared streets please. These are a recipe for disaster. Please just build the sidewalks or take a lane of parking for walking and biking and add physical barriers to prevent needless injuries or deaths. There is always money for the City Council's pet projects and never money to mobility right. The half-measure of shared streets will never bring us closer than halfway to mobility and safety goals.	42
922	Concern	Even in the downtown areas all the signals are not timed for pedestrians. Abject failure on this front.	43
130	Suggestion	Yall need to be counting on TxDOT's "shared use paths", too, not just along surface streets.	45
416	Suggestion	Anyone who has to bike or walk along Cameron Road wouldn't be surprised that it's a High Injury Network. This street needs to go through a rigorous road diet. Adding protected crossings at lights and better bike lanes would be a game changer for all the new apartments opening up here.	45

809	Concern	The concentration of HIN in downtown is unsurprising. I walk to most daily necessities and take the bus to work, and every other day I have a near-miss from an inattentive or aggressive driver failing to give way. There seems to be little appetite in city administration for road diets and traffic calming measures in downtown, and we're far from the only area that needs it.	45
810	Suggestion	East 51st is extremely dangerous. It needs more signalized crossings and updates to the existing infrastructure. The Lancaster intersection is particularly dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.	45
51	Suggestion	I would encourage the City to design these pinch points so that cyclists and drivers are not forced to merge into the same space while passing through the pedestrian crossing. On higher speed roads, it is not comfortable at all to have to merge and share space with a driver. IMO it would be better to have cyclists ramp up onto the SUP/sidewalk at the crossing.	47
216	Suggestion	It would be great to see this type of crossing prioritized outside of school zones as well. These would be great in areas with very high pedestrian activity, including downtown and in TOD zones along MetroRapid lines.	47
382	Suggestion	Please add more of these and as big as the ones on Airport and Lamar. Those are amazing and should be required on slip lanes and would be great on arterial to residential intersections like Guad to 21st that have a lot of pedestrian traffic	47
417	Suggestion	It's hard to overstate how necessary these are. The new ones on the Airport/Koenig intersection have made cycling through there so much safer. Raised crossings should be the default for any area with a slip lane.	47
418	Suggestion	These are great to have to slow down cars coming from a faster road to what should be a slower road. I'd love to see them at the intersection of Broadmoor/Cameron near where I live.	47
419	Concern	These seem great in theory, but they rarely feel useful as a pedestrian. Cars rarely ever stop even with those signs telling them that they need to. I don't exactly feel any safer waiting on the island so more likely than not I have to wait for the road to be clear on both sides anyways. Look at the ones on Shoal Creek and Berkman to see how easily they are ignored by drivers.	47
427	Suggestion	These are great! But on busier streets (like Crossing Pl) they force cyclists to share the lane with cars. Instead, it would be great for bikes to be able to ramp up onto the sidewalk/SUP.	47
607	Suggestion	Raised crossings are very effective. However, the standard raised crossing should be wider, forcing drivers to slow down before their front bumper is at the crossing. Raised crossings should also be used on side street crossings where local streets intersect with collector and arterials. This would protect pedestrians walking along these major streets and force vehicles turning from higher-speed, higher-volume roadways to slow down before entering a lower-speed roadway.	47
608	Suggestion	Curb extensions seem more effective at slowing vehicles than crossing islands. Given the cost advantages, perhaps these should be prioritized over crossing islands.	47
742	Concern	speed bumps should be added before every ped/bike crossing on any streets greater than level 1. Prioritize speed bump treatment near schools and near TXDOT facilities.	47

744	Concern	Slip lanes should be removed by default. Analysis for slip lane removal should never consider level of service or congestion. Design speed for slip lanes should be <10 mph, where needed to accommodate large vehicle turns.	47
746	Concern	All way stops should be more greatly utilized as a low-cost/high-benefit/quick-build tactic at crossings. Austin's various policy documents warrant new all way stops similar to the city-wide speed limit reductions. A focus on safety and increasing pedestrian comfort would take all way stop decision making, veto power, outside a single person's responsibility.	47
749	Other	This cost figure seems low.	47
420	Suggestion	These are great! The ones on the Boggy Creek cycling/walking trail seem to perform exceptionally. There's something about the rapid flashing lights that actually gets drivers to slow down. Would love to see more of these implemented around town.	48
616	Suggestion	These crossings would be much safer if they included a raised crossing wide enough that it forced drivers to slow down at least 15-30' before the crossing.	48
627	Suggestion	These to be very well lit. Most of the underpasses at I-35 right now are not safe as they have very narrow sidewalks and are very poorly lit up. Having a grade separation is great only if it will be designed to be safe (well-lit up and with a lot of overhead space) at all times of the day.	48
628	Concern	These are great. However, they can bring more danger to the pedestrians when the buttons stop working and a pedestrian needs to cross over on red light. Additionally, many push buttons on frontage roads are often posted in places where a pedestrian needs to step into the road to be able to cross - which is very dangerous when the cars are passing them at a great speed. These need to be done well in order to be helpful to pedestrians.	48
654	Suggestion	As part of intersection signal improvements, pedestrian crossing buttons "beg buttons" should be removed and the signal should be programmed to automatically signal for pedestrian crossings. Intersections where green lights are only triggered by vehicle sensors in the roadway perform poorly for pedestrians and bicyclists.	48
745	Question	LPIs should be default city-wide. Especially on high-crash roadways. Intersection analysis should not consider quantity of pedestrian crossings.	48
811	Other	I absolutely agree. Especially in areas that are touted as walkable like Mueller, it's shocking that the signals aren't automatic.	48
924	Suggestion	Guys it's ACTUALLY FREE to time the signals for peds and bikes too	48
926	Concern	This is just another one of those parts of the report where it's like "Well obviously they're not serious about this"	48
421	Suggestion	These have been one of my favorite updates to our cycling network of late! Please do this as often as we can	49
747	Suggestion	More concrete.	50
748	Suggestion	This, everywhere in the city.	50
617	Suggestion	Please include raised crossings at these intersections	52
927	Concern	Make your roadways such that they are safe to cross at any point, at or away from the intersection. ATD frequently makes the road wider at the intersection, increasing the flux, but also increasing the amount of time it takes a pedestrian to cross the street	53

32	Suggestion	Need protected crossing along Airport (at 46th at a minimum, more to connect in to neighborhoods on either side would be ideal; a crossway at 48th with a bridge over the Metrorail would be perfect). Given increased development along the Airport corridor from 46th up to Koenig, more access and ease of crossing is critical.	54
131	Concern	Brownie Dr should be on this map, for the width and the LOTS of school children, as well as the speeding next to the interstate.	54
403	Suggestion	This area is a TOD and current transit center. It's unsafe to cross in any direction from the transit center in its current design. I also saw a fatal injury at the intersection of W Anderson and the 183 frontage road at this crossing. It's currently poorly designed for all types of traffic -- foot, bike, and car.	54
404	Other	(This is referring to 183 and Lamar crossing, N Lamar transit center, the bubble appeared out of place).	54
132	Suggestion	This must include all K-12 schools, not just district schools.	55
133	Concern	The equity issue here is that people whose experience has been that they don't count are less likely to call 311 or a council office.	55
134	Concern	Don't say "citizen" unless you literally mean US citizen.	55
218	Concern	I understand the equity concern. However, safety should be the #1 priority in evaluating the priority of installing crossing infrastructure. Reducing traffic injuries and deaths should be the goal of this project.	55
629	Suggestion	The equity factor definitely needs to include the safety factor as well. We need an overall reduction in road speed to make it safer for everyone, and especially those in that include pedestrian health and safety status. I would not be able to maintain my health by walking and being out more if I didn't have adequate sidewalks and if I didn't feel safe walking on the streets.	55
812	Suggestion	Just as a suggestion for vizualization, when you have maps like this where there's a high concentration of shorter lengths of streets, an inset that shows areas in greater-detail would be very helpful.	56
618	Concern	If high-quality sidewalk design standards are not enforced on public projects, and these projects are focused in more vulnerable communities, vulnerable communities will have low quality sidewalks. It is important that high-quality sidewalk and public realm design is codified for public projects so that the benefits of walkable environments can be realized in vulnerable communities.	63
135	Suggestion	"Citywide" should also include parks and other city land where they are used _as a transportation route_. Maybe that part of the plan is implemented by PARD etc, but the _plan_ should be consistent across the whole pedestrian experience.	64
136	Suggestion	Also school bus stops	64
624	Suggestion	Create a sidewalk design criteria for public sidewalk projects that prioritizes pedestrians. Start by requiring public sidewalk projects meet the same standards that are required of private commercial development including pedestrian clear zone and planting zone widths. Before eliminating a planting zone or narrowing the pedestrian clear zone, reduce the distance between the sidewalk and edge of ROW to 6", narrow travel lanes, eliminating parking lanes. If the ROW is so constrained that none of these reductions are sufficient, reduce the planting zone but ensure there is never less than 2' of buffer zone between the pedestrian clear width and the road bed, in accordance with NACTO guidelines. If this is impossible, acquire public access easements from abutting properties.	64

660	Suggestion	The strategy need to add street tree as a critical factor to the strategy because of obvious benefits that street trees provide including protect pedestrian from moving traffic, provide shade, create a sense of safe environment for walking. More importantly, street trees also contribute to business activity on two side of the streets. The important of street tree is reflected in the "What we heard about shade and lighting" right after this page	64
137	Suggestion	Somewhere in here is also CPTED. Part of safety for pedestrians is crime safety. Do they feel like someone could jump out and get them? Are they boxed in somewhere narrow? If they needed to tell 911 where they are, do they have information to do that? Go ahead now and include that in the recommendations about updaing codes and design criteria.	65
531	Other	On the other hand, ARR is trying to get budget for strategies to do more tree trimming to make sure their vehicles have clear safe access to trash bins, just like AE gets to trim around wires. Work with them, but also yall may need to be thinking about ways to get shade other than planting trees and seeing if they grow where we wish they would.	65
619	Concern	This is too vague. Please ensure street trees are planted on ever public sidewalk project between the sidewalk and the roadbed. Street trees effectively provide shade and a substantial evaporative cooling and is more effective for pedestrian comfort and mitigating urban heat island effect than "shade" alone. The placement of a street tree between the sidewalk and the roadbed is also critical for pedestrian safety and comfort. In this location, they act as a barrier between pedestrians and moving vehicles, and research shows that street trees help to slow traffic to safer speeds.	65
620	Suggestion	Also require street trees planted in the planting zone with all new development. Also, make sidewalk and street tree requirements apply to major renovations and changes of use. I think the sidewalk fee-in-lieu program should be eliminated	65
630	Suggestion	Street trees should be included in the plans as they do not only provide the very needed shade but also provide a buffer between cars and non-motorized users. Trees have also an effect on road speed as people in cars are more likely to slow down on a road that has more canopy coverage. If a sidewalk is shaded and protected, people are more likely to use it and feel safer to do so. This can increase the City's goal to increase non-motorized commutes.	65
138	Concern	and charters, parochial schools, etc. The equity aspect is that charter students are more likely not to be white, and locations of charter schools are more likely to be in socially vulnerable parts of the city.	66
139	Suggestion	"sidewalk and crossing projects"? So you're not saying improvement twice, but also to be clear that it might include maintenance or rehab projects.	66
532	Suggestion	Add an action item for opening up bike/ped connectivity for apartment complexes where they already touch right-of-way. Work with owners/managers to assure CPTED for gates and access procedures, painless installation, and incentives. These "short segments" are high impact as far as getting people straight to existing bike/ped/ADA infrastructure, vs a longer, unsafer, and more unpleasant route with the cars out the driveway. Esp look where a direct connection and a walking school bus would save the schools the cost of a real bus on a currently hazardous route.	66

649	Suggestion	If a Complete Streets approach will be a guiding framework for this plan, Austin should consider updating the City's 2014 Complete Streets policy to incorporate some of the newer standards and best practices established by Smart Growth America and the National Complete Streets Coalition like prioritizing vulnerable users and solutions that account for equity.	66
751	Concern	COA policy should be to re-route IH35 outside the city. COA policy should be to minimize the frequency and number of highway entrances and on-ramps inside the city.	66
752	Concern	Council and staff should focus on minimizing permitting timelines. Right of Way should not limit construction during peak automobile usage periods.	66
24	Concern	How is the lack of sidewalk on the north side of the US290/Ben White Service Road between Mopac and Westgate not on this map? There are multiple bus stops, clear desire paths, a neighborhood with no connectivity (Barton View), and planned pedestrian improvements on the east and west side of this stretch of roadway, but it doesn't even make the map? This sidewalk NEEDS to be a part of this plan.	67
140	Concern	If you're going to ask people to do this, you have to write down what they say, and don't come back later and make them tell you again. And again and again.	67
141	Suggestion	Also here CPTED and crime safety, not just transportation infrastructure safety. Which doesn't necessarily mean invite an APD DR to walk along. It means design professionals and design standards to take experiences and anecdotes from the walkability audit and other input, to make a better pedestrian system. Some of that will probably be infrastructure, but some of it might be other tools - cameras, "crossing guard" guides, or maybe community reflections about when people feel unsafe, and why.	67
142	Suggestion	Be careful about who you're identifying as affected stakeholders ("neighborhoods"). The people who use a sidewalk or street as a transportation route is more people than who lives there.	68
621	Concern	Obstructions of the pedestrian clear zone are a design issue created because planting zones were not included in the sidewalk. Where planting zones exist, they provide a location for parked scooters, trash receptacles, bulk pickup, bike parking, signs, street lights, traffic signals, utility equipment, etc. By building sidewalks with out a planting zone, these public sidewalk projects are creating these conflicts by not providing the appropriate space for the standard functions of the ROW.	68
623	Concern	The sidewalk system is for everyone. It is important that pedestrians are prioritized in the design of our sidewalk network regardless of the opinions of immediate neighbors. In many cases neighbors care because they use the sidewalks near their homes. However, especially when the design is immediately impacting their frontage, individual property owners may have an opinion that is self interested and resistant to change rather than prioritizing the broader community.	68
754	Suggestion	Transportation User Fee should not allow opt-out for car-free households. Conversely, TUP should fund bike/ped/transit maintenance in accordance with ASMP goals.	68
755	Suggestion	Council should remove requirement/"suggestion" for adjacent property owners to maintain landscaping and trees within the public right of way. The public right of way is public realm and should be maintained by the public.	68

761	Concern	<p>New development should not be held hostage by "traffic impact analysis". Improvements to the public realm, for public benefit, should be paid primarily by the public.</p> <p>Right of way dedication should not be piece meal. Council should reject piece meal dedications, that's a fundamentally broken way of building a transportation system.</p>	69
-----	---------	---	----

General Comments received between January 27, 2023 and March 20, 2023 on [Public Input](#)

Excellent plan! Keep up the great work and do everything in your power to accelerate implementation, including holding space open for lighter, quicker, cheaper materials as appropriate, including anything that will slow motor vehicle speeds and decrease motor vehicle volumes. These important multivariable issues (as identified in all three of these plans) facing our city and society, in general, need us all to move forward with a sense of urgency. As many trips as possible must shift to active, ultra-low to no-emission modes of travel. The Sidewalk and Shared Streets network provides a unique opportunity to address historical inequities and make our communities safer. For the shared streets putting in modal filters to decrease the volume of motor vehicles and employing proven travel-calming strategies to lower motor vehicles to non-lethal levels (ideally 15-20 mph) is essential. For the crossings, motor vehicle approach speeds simply must be lowered and, whenever possible, consider continuous elevated crossings (look to Cambridge, MA for benchmark examples of cheaper quick build options)
I like the overall idea, and plan, but as I mentioned in my questions/comments above, I am concerned that my neighborhood, Lost Creek in District 8 which was annexed by COA is being left out due to the annexation, and location despite the need for new/repairs on deteriorating sidewalks and sidewalk gaps. this neighborhood is a large population center and should be looked at and considered.
I have nothing but praise for the sidewalk projects. My community is benefiting from much needed sidewalks. However, having wide sidewalks are useless if people are still forced to walk in the street or bike lane because people block the sidewalks with their cars. I have to walk almost two blocks of improved wide sidewalks in the street every day because every single homeowner on the block refuses to use their garages. Instead driveways are packed with so many cars that block the sidewalk and bike paths. This is a major accessibility issue and safety issue when people are forced to walk in the street. Please enforce and regularly patrol parking violators.
Where can I find an interactive map to see impacted streets similar to the Urban Trail docs? Thank you!
Hey Austin Public Works, it seems like the only comments I can make on that map are Agree/Disagree. Is there no way to actually type in a comment on a particular street segment?
Looks like an excellent start. I hope that considerations given to those areas that are now being built or expanded as 'high-density housing' in the Austin area. This is the 1st city I've lived where there are a lot of large apartment complexes without sidewalks or safe crossings, or even access to a nearby park. Much appreciated.
Regarding the pilot program or future shared street plan for AVENUE H and the surrounding streets, I am totally against these methods (i.e. the white plastic posts up and down the street). This makes the neighborhood VERY UNATTRACTIVE in and otherwise friendly, beautiful neighborhood.
These "plans" degrade the mobility 98% of our citizens depend upon and take us backward. How does this make any sense? Public transit is a non starter for those with children, diverse destinations, time constraints and ambulatory issues; it is an expensive, failing distraction. We should be focused on Micro Mobility infrastructure that can satisfy almost half of our urban mobility. These plans are obsolete and ignore the transition to a new mobility that will require delineated space for pedestrians, bicycles and electric powered personal MicroMobility vehicles that operate at speed/velocity unsafe for the former two, in the same space.
Get it built. I am not interested in art projects. Also, I am confused by the equity metrics. Put the infrastructure where there is the greatest need for improvements.
This entire document and the planning contained within is obsolete, just like the bicycle plan (2014). Nowhere is there any mention or accommodation for micro-mobility (e-bike/trike/scooter). This form of transportation is rapidly becoming a mainstay. INRIX rates Austin 21st nationally and calculates 45% of our urban trips can be satisfied by this mobility. ANY plan dealing with non automobile mobility MUST make this exploding segment a centerpiece. The trails proposed would mix 28mph powered vehicles with small children learning to ride a bike, pedestrians, mothers with strollers, etc. Failing to plan for this is a recipe for disaster.
=
More money should be spent on Sidewalks and Crossings as these benefit everyone.

As a cyclist and sometime pedestrian I can attest that the main source of "issues" is motorist ignorance of laws and an absolute disregard for cyclist and pedestrian well-being. Perhaps a serious effort at education of motorist and law enforcement focus will help.
I appreciate the effort that goes into this plan and thank you for working to improve Austin! My one concern is that the current shared streets program may not effectively slow car traffic to a level--10 mph or so--that is safe for mixed pedestrian/car usage. I have seen the pilot in North Loop and it is not obvious to me that signage and plastic bollards are really slowing car traffic. Speed bumps and concrete bulb-outs may do the trick. It's an unfortunate fact that most drivers in this city are ignorant of the vulnerability and needs of other road users, and have an aggressive driving style. I have found that you are lucky if one in ten cars stop for you when you are waiting at a crosswalk, a fact which renders them far less effective. Even the lighted crossings such as 31st & Lamar or 31st & Guadalupe are routinely ignored by cars even with two big red lights... It's frightening: at least a third of the time I use such crossings a car will run the red light. These experiences make me dubious of the effect of mere signage, and lead me to believe that only aggressive solutions, such as concrete bulb-outs, chicanes, medians, roundabouts. Things were the driver has no choice but to slow down. Also consider calming in residential neighborhoods by restricting access at intersections in neighborhoods. I actually don't know the vocab for this, but I have seen many of them in other cities, for example 17th St E and E Republican St in Seattle.
+1
It seems premature to immediately plan for the majority of the streets in Austin to become 10 mph Shared Streets before even waiting for the results of the pilot.
Add trees along walking paths. The path on 4th street by Saltillo is unbearable during the summer with no trees or shade. You should start adding trees to existing walking paths before adding new walking paths
<p>I have three main points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If the city is interested in making it feasible to walk where you need to go, the city must update its zoning code to allow for mixed-use neighborhoods and buildings (with a focus on local businesses and smaller office space). Improved walkability and mixed-use zoning go hand in hand. 2. As for the walk itself, I would like to see raised pedestrian crossings. No more sidewalks that dip and therefore yield to cars. Improved traffic signals, fresh paint, and more 90 degree intersections is all good, but those do not provide the physical safety that raised crossings do. Cars get a speed bump and are forced to consider the pedestrians. This will be especially true if the city continues to make stroads out of its destination streets, which are unsafe road types for everyone. 3. It's not a surprise that it's hot where we live. I don't want to walk in hot weather if the sidewalk isn't shaded in some way. Not only does a tree-lined sidewalk help separate people from the cars on the road, but it provides comfort and encourages people to walk even when it's hot.
Great improvements underway in the Copperfield neighborhood (when it comes to sidewalks in particular). Now we will need repairs on Rotherham sidewalks too!
A lot of these are good, but I'd like to see more proactive maintenance on existing crossings. In particular, 4th Street between Nueces and Guadalupe is flat-out dangerous for pedestrians because the pavement buckles above the disused railroad tracks. I know a few people who use wheelchairs who cannot cross at these portions of 4th Street and I've been injured a handful of times tripping over uneven pavement. Reports to 3-1-1 for maintenance get closed because it's "not a pothole" and "in sufficient condition" and I'd like to see maintenance focused on people who aren't drivers. Uneven pavement like that increases stopping distance and is imminently hazardous to everyone—pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers.

The plans (map) seem to leave some streets in limbo. Most streets are shown as either getting complete sidewalks (both sides) or becoming shared streets (and getting that infrastructure). But a few aren't getting either (important routes too).

Specifically, there's the section of Wooten Dr between Mullen and Burrell. This is a high usage route for pedestrians, because of the pedestrian crossing of the railroad tracks leading to the school and the park. Pedestrian traffic from a large portion of the neighborhood is funneled here. It's lucky enough to have sidewalks on one side from 50 years ago, but needs them on both because of the high usage. But it's shown as not getting them, nor is it getting the important shared street traffic calming measures, the worst of both worlds.

+1 to a previous comment re: an enforcement mechanism for people who park over sidewalks. It's a shame to spend all this money and effort on something that is effectually nullified by lack of parking enforcement. To sum up, I have nothing but praise for the sidewalk projects. However, having wide sidewalks are useless if people are still forced to walk in the street or bike lane because people block the sidewalks with their cars. This is a major accessibility issue and safety issue when people are forced to walk in the street. Please enforce and regularly patrol parking violators." I'll add that every time I have tried to raise the issue with someone who is parking over the sidewalk, the person(s) who park over the sidewalk have many a reason why that rule doesn't apply to them and how it's 'not a big deal' for them to block the sidewalk.

I appreciate this plan very much, and the City's commitment to improving the sidewalks and urban trails plan. I especially appreciate the commitment to collect data from the projects and use that data to inform next steps. I also believe in the following areas for improvement:

Prioritize wide sidewalks on all of Austin's High-Injury Network.

Prioritize sidewalks and urban trails that connect to other sidewalks in the network and are close to transit. Don't just build based on location, decide based on context. Sidewalks are useless if they don't connect to a network and do destinations, especially transit.

Install better pedestrian wayfinding signage.

Set vehicle speed reduction goals on shared streets, and use traffic calming measures to implement (not just changing speed limits).

Encourage pilot projects and use collected data to inform more permanent projects. Do more pilot projects with cheap materials like paint, rather than waiting to install permanent projects that are more expensive.

Work with neighbors to integrate placemaking (plants, benches, etc.) in shared streets. Allow residents to do shared streets pilot projects using materials they already have. Allowing residents to manage pilot projects is cheaper and quicker than the City managing all permanent projects.

Install greenery, bioswales, and public art to calm traffic and encourage activation in shared streets. Allow residents opportunities to do this themselves and create the public art.

Implement the Living Streets program.

Not all signalized intersections are suitable crossings (pg 52). There are many signalized intersections that are hostile and dangerous to pedestrians, especially on major arterials and on TxDOT facilities. Please don't treat all signalized intersections as acceptable, and consider quick and easy solutions to improve, such as LPIs.

Pedestrian crossings and sidewalks in the High-Injury Network MUST be combined with traffic calming measures. Better pedestrian facilities will be unusable if traffic is driving at 50-60 mph next to the sidewalk.

Sidewalks need CURBS so cars don't roll over pedestrians. I'm looking at D1, 78723, Rogge Lane. High speed roads need curbs to protect pedestrians from cars.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON URBAN TRAILS DRAFT PLAN

This document includes all public comments received on the Draft Urban Trails Plan between January 27, 2023 and March 20, 2023 on [Public Input](#).

Main themes:

- Edits and label corrections requested for maps
- Clarifying words added to sentences
- Corrections for typos, document design errors, grammatical errors, and citations
- More explicit wording about the importance of accessing nature/recreation
- Clarifications about centering equity
- Comments related to the updated network maps, including connections, crossings or barriers, and prioritization
- Comments related to preferences for trail design features (e.g., surface material, separating bike/ped users, width, grade, lighting, trees/shade, ADA, wayfinding)

Theme	Count	Action
connections	45	Noted; location-specific comments forwarded to appropriate CoA staff
crossings or barriers	35	Noted; location-specific comments forwarded to appropriate CoA staff
prioritization	31	Noted; location-specific comments forwarded to appropriate CoA staff
surface material	18	Noted
new trail	16	Noted; location-specific comments forwarded to appropriate CoA staff
railroads	12	Noted
document design, grammatical corrections, or clarifications	12	Added/updated
dual track, user conflict, or separation	12	Noted; location-specific comments forwarded to appropriate CoA staff
maintenance	12	Noted; location-specific comments forwarded to appropriate CoA staff
wayfinding	12	Noted
trail map updates	11	Noted or updated if appropriate
big loop	11	Noted
width	8	Noted
cost or funding	8	Noted
homelessness	6	Noted
nature	6	Noted
action item	5	Noted
equity - outreach	5	Already done and/or incorporated
grade	5	Noted

Theme	Count	Action
lighting	5	Noted
trees	5	Noted
vegetation	4	Noted
shade	4	Noted
sidewalks	4	Noted; location-specific comments forwarded to appropriate CoA staff
speed	4	Noted
ADA	3	Noted
ASMP	3	Noted
crowding	3	Noted
data	3	Noted
design	3	Noted
missing SUP	3	Added
missing trail	3	Noted; location-specific comments forwarded to appropriate CoA staff
policy	3	Noted

ID	Type	Comment	Page
428	Concern	This entire document and the planning contained within is obsolete, just like the bicycle plan (2014). Nowhere is there any mention or accommodation for micro-mobility (e-bike/trike/scooter). This form of transportation is rapidly becoming a mainstay. INRIX rates Austin 21st nationally and calculates 45% of our urban trips can be satisfied by this mobility form. ANY plan dealing with non automobile mobility, MUST make this exploding segment a centerpiece. The trails proposed would mix 28mph powered vehicles with small children learning to ride a bike, pedestrians, mothers with strollers, etc. Failing to plan for this is a recipe for disaster.	1
355	Concern	As a regular cyclist and walker, I live in the Truman Heights neighborhood and it's extremely dangerous to try to get to the paved bike path of Southern Walnut. We have too many hazards, fast roads and no proper safety route to get there.	2
671	Suggestion	"Quadri" ==> "Qadri"	2
672	Suggestion	It would be helpful for users of the adopted plan to know who the new Urban Trails Program Manager is, e.g. "Incoming Urban Trails Program Manager", though definitely keep Katie Wettick listed here too.	2
190	Concern	A 50/50 modal split will only be possible with significant zoning ordinance changes as well. Shops and entertainment need to be within walking distances housing to make this possible.	5
673	Suggestion	The Plan should also align with the Austin Climate Equity Plan, which has more ambitious modal split goals, and which are defined differently.	5
674	Suggestion	The ASMP also called for wayfinding on 100% of the urban trails system by the end of 2022. This would be a place to reference that ASMP goal as well.	5

472	Suggestion	Nothing is mentioned about land-use adjacent to the trails. the reason the belt line is so successful is all the development around the trails. something should be mentioned about how the trails are "urban" and intersect the urban fabric. Additionally, no mention was given to the natural and green environment and to me that also really defines an urban trail.	6
675	Concern	The photo shows an example of an urban trail designed as a secondary part of transportation system, rather than "in a manner equivalent to other parts of the transportation network" per ASMP Urban Trails Policy 1. The photo shows a straight road, and the trail takes awkward turns to provide a 90° angle as a blind adherence to the MUTCD. Note that ADA does not require 90° angles, but rather speaks to the ability to cross the given street in the shortest distance, which is compatible to non-right-angle crossings (which are generally more suitable for wheelchair users as well). Other examples in Austin urban trails implementation also demonstrate that trails are not constructed "in a manner equivalent to other parts of the transportation network".	6
212	Question	Love this diagram. Where does Safe Routes to School fit in?	9
228	Answer	Safe Routes to School (SRTS) works in close partnership with Urban Trails, Sidewalks, and Bikeways to implement the infrastructure recommended in the SRTS Infrastructure Reports. Urban Trails will often partner with SRTS to help fund short trail connector projects near schools. One example is the Copperfield Connector Trail, currently under construction.	9
434	Suggestion	The most inhospitable places to ride a bike or walk is along highways. Please consider revising plans to include the streets and trail opportunities on those roadways or paths that are parallel and removed from the highway.	9
481	Concern	I don't care for the word "paved" in this sentence. Could an urban trail not be crushed granite? those are typically hard packed and suitable for most bikes. Also, where a pedestrian path is envisioned alongside a paved bike path that will usually not be paved. Is the Butler hike and bike trail not part of the Urban Trail system?	9
533	Suggestion	Super! So include that in the diagram.	9
676	Suggestion	It would be good to note natural surface trails here (which are different from crushed granite trails). They're not mentioned in the body text above either.	9
386	Concern	please, no more paved trails. crushed stone is better on the joints and more ecologically friendly.	10
387	Suggestion	i personally prefer the walking/jogging trail to be non paved/gravel.	10
469	Suggestion	I would suggest adding: "Additionally some urban trails act as a backbone for connecting residential neighborhoods to parks and greenspaces which feature networks of natural-surface trails, which are a destination in themselves."	10
677	Other	Crushed granite trails leave out essential populations, especially those over 65, mobility impaired, those who don't have access to their own bikes but use shared scooters	11
678	Other	It would be helpful to review the implementation of urban trails of the last few years and proposed designs over the next few years for examples of how this policy is not applied. There are many examples where it seems that it was not applied.	11

679	Concern	<p>The draft Equity Framework includes these populations in its Core Factors: a) Black, Hispanic/Latinx, or other person of color (consistent with categories used by the Census Bureau)</p> <p>b) Earning less than 80% of the median household income.</p> <p>I.e. not just race. It would be best to mention that here, even if just briefly.</p> <p>Also the Intersectional Factors would be worth mentioning here in the main document. Some of the Plan's choices may work against the needs of over 65, mobility impaired, and young children populations, and highlighting the list here would help ward that off.</p>	14
680	Other	<p>Years ago, city staff asked community advocates to not speak about race and low income populations, since decision makers would be turned off by these subjects.</p> <p>I'm not asking for this to be mentioned in the plan, but it's worth me providing this comment here for context.</p>	14
213	Other	I appreciate how clear the guiding principles are.	15
534	Other	Part of the point of explicitly including Safe Routes to Schools is to be sure they're under the umbrella of these same guiding principles.	15
535	Concern	The equity analysis map below could just as easily be the concentration of charter schools map. COA can't not do Safe Routes to Schools for charters, but somehow claim to be providing equitable transportation infrastructure.	15
43	Other	<p>The quote on page 17 of the plan is not really accurate. There is an urban trail north of Rundberg which is currently under construction to be extended to northeast Austin. I don't think there is any correlation between demographics and location of urban trails. The longest urban trail (south walnut creek) is located in a lower income area. The north walnut creek trail will connect a higher income area with a lower income area. The Bergstrom Spur (currently in planning) also goes from a higher to lower income area (and passes right by affordable housing). There have been a lot of historical inequities in the development of Austin, but the urban trail program has not been one of them (probably because it is a newer program, and possibly because it is easier to acquire ROW in lower income areas).</p>	17
536	Concern	And how exactly will the low-income folks walled up in apartments whose only way in or out is the interstate access road or another part of the High Injury Network get to that fabulous trail?	17
33	Suggestion	<p>It seems that we live in an increasingly noisy city with increased air traffic as well as street traffic noise. Is it possible to create recreation corridors that buffer noise perception? Positioning trails distant from streets or with dense buffers between streets and trails would seem to help.</p> <p>The other issue is that having walking trails right along busy streets actually doesn't reduce the stress of walking - you might as well be walking on those streets with the sights / sounds / smells of cars intruding on attention. Dense green buffers seem important to protect the visual relaxation of recreation corridors.</p> <p>Dense green buffers are also habitat for birds / wildlife.</p> <p>Can the inclusion of dense green buffers to soften impacts of acoustical and visual impacts of traffic be included in the goals?</p>	19
367	Suggestion	Maybe this is addressed later in the plan, but I would like to see more trails handicapped accessible.	19

405	Suggestion	<p>Would love to see trails better integrated with nearby development. It's great to see trails used for transportation and recreation, but I believe there is an opportunity to have trails be used for access to businesses and homes. This would be no different to a main street which provides transportation but is also a destination.</p> <p>The best example I can think of in Austin is the downtown library, which has a direct entrance and pleasant frontage directly along the Shoal Creek Trail. Lesser examples would include the food truck area at AMLI South Shore directly on a Butler trail spur or 5207 Brodie Lane in Sunset Valley. An example of a missed opportunity might be direct connections to Cidercade or the many apartment complexes adjacent to the North Walnut Creek Trail. Future opportunities include the Statesman redevelopment, Airport Road and the Bergstrom spur line (especially in St Elmo's and just east of I-35).</p>	19
435	Question	Is there a priority order for determining which trail segments should be what size similar to ASMP street network?	19
436	Question	Does this Goal essentially state that decomposed granite should not be used and trees for shading are needed?	19
437	Suggestion	Please be sensitive to the costs and placements of new sidewalks with bond monies or other public monies. Do not put in a sidewalk randomly without consulting with a landowner. Too many times public monies are used for sidewalks and when a property is redeveloped all that sidewalk has to be ripped out and replaced with a code complying sidewalk. A little up front discussion with a landowner can go a long way.	19
479	Answer	To accommodate people walking and biking at different speeds we recommend a minimum of 12 feet width for all urban trails. Additionally, where trail use is high and it is feasible, we will build dual track trails, where bicyclists are on a separate path from people walking. The width of an urban trail, and our ability to build a dual track trail, is largely dependent on space, funding, and/or the environment in which the trail is located.	19
547	Answer	Goal #6 is broader and more complex than these two things. Providing trees for shade is an important part of this goal, but building trails in environmentally sensitive areas requires many considerations. For example, the project team must account for and work to mitigate impacts to flooding, critical environmental features, protected or endangered plants and/or wildlife, etc. Stabilized decomposed granite may be used for new trails where an outside maintenance partner exists and there is a desire for a more natural surface material.	19
681	Suggestion	This would be a good place to add good design, e.g. "sized and designed". A trail can be whatever width, but if it has sharp turns, multiple turns in quick succession, sharp-edge dropoffs, abutting obstacles, circuitous routes, and/or blind turns, then it does not serve its users well. There are recent urban trail implementation examples where poor design decisions were made.	19
368	Suggestion	In general, I would love to see more information when appropriate about the history of a trail and the area near it. And more information about the flora and fauna along a trail. One feature along the Shoal Creek Greenbelt is the marker tree. Knowing the history of that tree -- a tree I always wondered about because of its shape -- enriches my walk along the Greenbelt.	20
412	Concern	Stop spending so much money on consultants and planning and start building	20
682	Concern	Who takes action on this? Does Public Works or Transportation do this, or is this a directive to another department, e.g. Housing?	20
683	Concern	Future Community Ambassador programs should include opportunities to collaborate with local nonprofit leaders. There seems to be an unstated assumption that City staff and their hired consultants are adequate experts in these processes without including other community practitioners. We are doing the Community Ambassadors and the cause of equity a disservice by leaving community practitioners out of the process.	20

28	Concern	Austin should complete all Tier 1 Urban Trails earlier than 2043. Otherwise, many of us will be dead by then. But seriously, this item should be of highest priority - get the trails done sooner than later.	21
34	Concern	Encampments in public parks / recreation corridors are incompatible with safe public use of parks and recreation corridors and should not be tolerated. City needs to create opportunities for housing elsewhere in appropriate locations and NOT permit camping in parks / along trails.	21
369	Suggestion	Involve nearby neighborhood organizations too.	21
370	Question	What is a "trail counter?"	21
378	Answer	Trail counters count the number of people walking or biking on trails to capture trail use volumes and trends. This data can help inform future funding grant applications, quantify the socio-economic and health impact of trails to the surrounding region by combining automated count data with other data sources; and develop a baseline understanding of use trends on trails – including hourly, weekly and seasonal trends.	21
537	Concern	Here's a north austin transportation infrastructure fun fact: When they were building what was then Middle Fiskville Rd/Pflugerville Hwy (now I35), there were volunteer workdays for folks to come BUILD THE ROAD. Apparently it worked because the road got built, but for some reason we no longer count on volunteer road construction and maintenance. If urban trails are infrastructure, don't count on volunteers for them, either.	21
538	Suggestion	Be sure there are clear policies about what data you are counting and storing. There's always tradeoffs of privacy, security, and completeness of data. Put these policies in context with other monitoring like ALPR and geolocating micromobility.	21
684	Suggestion	We essentially have two types of local railways:a) One owned by a transit agency (Capital Metro), and b) One owned by a private company.In practice, we'll really have two sets of guidelines, and trying to develop a single set to cover both situations will do a disservice to each type.(We'll soon have a third type, once the Orange Line and Blue Line are created, since these will presumably be light rail only, and would be governed by the FTA rather than the FRA.)	21
685	Suggestion	Need to add: "Develop practices/policies of acquiring easements from parcel property owners, both private and public."	21
686	Suggestion	Need to add: "Develop land use policy recommendations for trailside development." Developments adjacent to trails should complement trails and they should mutually serve each other.	21
687	Suggestion	This long timeline (20 years) likely reflects the status quo, given staff's current and (default) expected resources. However, in multiple locations in this Plan, this Plan implies that the status quo is *inequitable*. For this and other reasons, the Plan should either propose multiple scenarios (2043 buildout and, e.g. 2033 buildout) or propose only a shorter timeline, e.g. 2033.	21
688	Suggestion	The Plan should acknowledge here or somewhere that City staff previously agreed (per ASMP) to a timeline to have wayfinding on 100% of urban trails by the end of 2022. It's not clear why the commitment stated here is believable, without acknowledging the previous goal and why it was not met.	21
943	Suggestion	Emergency repairs should be completed in just as timely a fashion as emergency road repairs. These are important transportation routes and should be treated as such.	22
35	Concern	Regarding Connectivity, please look at how to moderate the speed / aggression of traffic along MLK Blvd, particularly in area along golf course AND create connectivity between the neighborhood south of MLK and Mueller. Currently, walking on MLK is dangerous, even with the 'bike lanes' and 'sidewalks' that line the street... because there are not always proper curbs / separation from traffic that is often going 50-60mph despite the posted speed limit. The speed of traffic is dangerous even for cars that are slowly to turn into the	23

		MLK neighborhood - pedestrians are at greater risk. PLEASE increase priority on creating safe and pleasant passage for pedestrians and bikes along MLK.	
192	Suggestion	Please consider connectivity to other regional trail systems like Wilco or Violet Crown.	23
529	Suggestion	The existing desire paths through these unofficial rail crossings are clearly frequently used, but not improved. A simple crossing would help connect Bouldin to the S Lamar corridor.	24
530	Suggestion	A connection at Barton Skyway/Lightsey would drastically improve connectivity for both neighborhoods	24
214	Other	In other words, a scarcity of housing in Austin's urban core is pushing many residents to the outskirts of the city.	25
482	Suggestion	Yes! overcoming major barriers is at the core of building out a system wherein active transportation is more convenient than getting in a car. That convenience is paramount to achieving the desired modal shift. Many of the barriers mentioned (creeks, RRs) are also barriers to vehicles, but a properly located ped/bike crossing can make it easier to get from A to B than in a car. To that end, CoA MUST be willing to use condemnation powers for the trail system just as for the road system. Austin has been hyper reluctant to do this in the past. San Antonio would not have built out the Leon Creek trail without eminent domain.	25
539	Suggestion	Which isn't as rapacious as it sounds - most of these are "micro condemnations" like AE does to get extra easement when they upgrade a transmission line. Ten-twenty feet, and maybe they pay to move a sign or a fence post. But if active transportation infrastructure is transportation infrastructure, yall need to use normal infrastructure tools.	25
664	Suggestion	Absolutely! this type of thing is absolutely worth eminent domain usage! Don't be shy when making austin better for residents!	25
689	Suggestion	Could say "cities and counties".	25
690	Concern	Serving transit is essential, but I don't think it's good to reinforce the idea that MetroBike exists only to serve transit. This should be worded differently, in order to avoid that.	25
750	Concern	<p>The existing Red Line Trail and Southern Walnut Creek Trail both have portions close to an active railroad (as close as what is implied in the UPC/ASA Rail Trail evaluation). That railroad also has long freight trains that pass by at fast speeds (40+ mph) for several minutes at a time. There are countless other popular rail-trails across the county with this factor.</p> <p>Note that most of the roadway crossings along the Red Line have been upgraded to have four crossing arms, which is a key part of allowing the trains to cross roadways without using horns.</p> <p>It's not clear here if these factors play a deciding role in this analysis, but for the reasons stated above, these should not be decisive factors to eliminate this project.</p>	25
753	Concern	<p>This is a reason to move this trail to Tier 2 or Tier 3, but not to remove it altogether. This trail should be kept in the Plan.</p> <p>Though reasons are cited, none of them indicate why the trail should be completely removed from the Plan. The reasons stated seem very idiosyncratic.</p>	25
49	Question	Is this half mile as the crow flies or walking? Important to distinguish as sometimes poor street connectivity significantly increases distance to park entrance. Crossing PI is a prime example.	26
223	Answer	This is measured "as the crow flies," and we understand more work is needed to be sure the people within half a mile can safely and efficiently reach existing or proposed nearby trails.	26
193	Suggestion	You are missing one of the bigger trail corridors in the city. The 183A SUP/Brushy Creek Regional Trail. It is as important as the Austin to Manor Trail and more traveled.	27
411	Suggestion	Build out a trail connecting sunset valley to downtown	27

413	Question	When will the bridge in Roy G be fixed?	27
422	Suggestion	I don't believe this portion of Trail G between Airport and Plaza Saltillo currently exists.	27
425	Question	I do not see the long-proposed Zilker Loop (ZL) on the urban trail map. ZL would connect the Violet Crown Trail/Barton Creek Greenbelt to the Butler Trail. There is not currently a connection. I have submitted conceptual plans and cost estimates several times. The ZL is shown in the draft Zilker Vision Plan. Why not in ATX?	27
473	Answer	Watershed Protection Department, Austin Public Works, the Parks and Recreation Department and Austin Water are working together to provide a permanent solution to stabilize the channel embankments, arrest the erosion, and replace the bridge to restore connectivity through Roy G. Guerrero Park. This project is expected to be completed in Summer 2024. More information about the project can be found at: https://www.austintexas.gov/department/roy-g-guerrero-colorado-river-park-channel-and-bridge-repairs	27
691	Suggestion	The "B" should be moved closer to the trail.	27
692	Suggestion	The "I" should be moved closer to the trail.	27
693	Suggestion	The "J" should be moved closer to the trail.	27
694	Suggestion	This is within reach, but won't be completed by the time of plan adoption, so I +1 this comment.	27
695	Suggestion	It's not clear if this "G" is intended to include the Boggy Creek Trail portion of the Red Line Trail, or if this "G" is mislabeling the Southern Walnut Creek Trail. If it's for the Red Line Trail, it should be moved further west.	27
696	Suggestion	The "E" should be moved up a bit so that it doesn't obscure the trail line.	27
697	Suggestion	You can now proudly add the newly completed section of the Northern Walnut Creek Trail under Lamar!	27
698	Question	The names of the trail corridors should be revisited. If that requires City Council to initiate, please confirm that here.	27
703	Suggestion	Add the urban trail section under U.S. 183 connecting to Neils Thompson Drive.	27
724	Suggestion	The portion of the Shoal Creek Trail corridor that is currently protected bike lanes and sidewalks should not be labeled as "Existing Trail". I.e. 39th St. to U.S. 183. This creates confusion on a number of fronts: a) End users are getting confused by what to expect. b) Making the case for upgrades is more difficult to express if the city already cites it as an existing urban trail. c) The metrics for miles of urban trails are not comparable to other cities, and are thus invalid .	27
666	Other	A pedestrian crossing here would be highly beneficial to the adjacent neighborhoods. Unfortunately, Union Pacific RR installed a large chain link fence and "no trespassing" signs to discourage pedestrian crossings. Union Pacific is likely the largest obstacle to creating this path (as well as the Domain to Hyde Park High School trail).	28
667	Other	UPRR installed a chain link fence here to discourage pedestrians.	28
699	Suggestion	This would be a great place for comparisons to other notable U.S. trail cities, and to cities in other countries. We're not endeavoring to lead on urban trails or indicating ambition if we're only comparing our city to other Texas cities. I'm happy to provide some benchmark cities, but I realize this is based on cities that I'm already familiar with.	28

870	Suggestion	Milwood Neighborhood Association and Austin Ridge Riders supported the inclusion of a ped/bike connection via the planned Railroad culvert/bridge replacement approx. 0.5 miles south of the proposed crossing. We understand the railroad is resistant to a ped/bike crossing however this would be much safer than an at grade crossing and cheaper than an overhead crossing.	28
871	Suggestion	To the south of the railroad culvert/bridge west of Dorsett (mention in my previous comment), there is an existing roller-compacted concrete path that follows a sewer line, passing under Duval Road via a culvert, proceeding south to the National instruments property, then turning north, passing under Duval Road via another culvert and connecting to the NWCT in Balcones park. See https://milwoodna.com/the-neighborhood/hiking-trails-near-milwood/ for a map. It is my understanding that Trammel Crow constructed this trail as an amenity for future residents. It is widely used - I and many trail users consider it to be in the public domain (I have used it regularly for nearly 30 years). Please add this as public trail.	28
372	Other	Kinda like our sidewalks -- lots of gaps.	29
373	Concern	From 2014-2022 (original Urban Trails plan) we've averaged 4.25 miles of trail completed per year. With the proposed 232 miles in the new plan, even if we increased output by 50% and completed 6.375 miles per year, this gets finished by ~2060! Please highlight how you plan to expedite trail completion in the face of rising land acquisition costs and extended review/feedback/review/feedback cycles.	29
484	Suggestion	This is an important and underappreciated point: short connections can make a tremendous difference, especially at barriers. They can also (theoretically) be implemented rapidly when compared to longer trail systems.	29
540	Suggestion	explicitly include connectivity from internal circulators of high density apartment complexes, not just culdesacs in low-density areas of the city.	29
700	Question	Are these removals cited in the Appendices too?	29
701	Question	Is the methodology described more elsewhere, other than what is stated here? Is there a reference document for the other community input suggestions that are not part of the draft Plan?	29
23	Concern	Where is the connectivity for people south of the river to get to downtown?	30
31	Suggestion	Need protected bike and pedestrian (completely separate, lights, bridges, etc) of Airport and I -35	30
36	Suggestion	Need safe, protected, separate pedestrian and bike paths along the entire length of MLK, particularly east of Airport where speed of traffic is typically 50-60mph despite posted speed limit of 40mph. Traffic speeds are not safe for vehicles slowing to turn into the MLK neighborhood - pedestrians / bicyclists are incompatible with that kind of traffic with the current sidewalk/bike lane configurations that do not have curb separations from the street in many locations. Please uplevel the prioritization level for these improvements, as MLK is one of the only connections from the neighborhoods south to places north of the golf course as well as east and west of the neighborhood.	30
37	Suggestion	This is a big missed opportunity to connect the Howard Station with the bikeway that already exists on McNeil. As is, it's fairly useless to anyone who isn't brave enough to challenge 60+MPH traffic with no bike lane.	30
67	Concern	Y'all missed the point entirely. The connection is for the people walled up in apartments along the interstate, which almost all the people who live in this area. Yeah, "the neighborhood" - the tiny number of people so fortunate as to own a house and a large lot - mostly has sidewalks and low-volume streets which lead to parks, schools, and bus stops, all built with public money. But the most of everybody is walled up in apartment complexes, some over 90% impervious cover, no playground, no transit access (because Cap Metro can't/won't run access road routes), with gates padlocked from the outside,	30

		blocked from access to adjacent public right of way at Capitol, Florence, and Oertli. If you're not going to make the urban trail along the creek, for some engineering reason, you HAVE to make the short segment connections on existing right of way.	
194	Suggestion	Big hole in connecting the Brushy Creek Regional Trail/183A SUP to the Lakeline Station.	30
200	Answer	Hello, an interactive map of the proposed urban trail network can be found here: http://bit.ly/3kUERdO There are several proposed urban trail routes that could accomplish this goal, including the Barton Corridor parallel to MoPac, the Country Club Creek Trail, and the 183 Shared Use Path, as well as the West Bouldin Creek Trail and Blunn Creek Trail. Please note that urban trails are just one part of the All Ages and Abilities Bicycle Network, which will also provide connectivity for people biking in areas where land to build trails is limited. Protected bike lanes and neighborhood bikeways are discussed in the draft Bicycle Plan, which can be found at: PublicInput.com/ATXBicycle	30
217	Question	On page 29, it says there are 104 miles of proposed sidepaths in this plan. On page 30, it says 126 miles of proposed sidepaths. Which one is correct? Or are these meant to reference different things?	30
221	Suggestion	Connecting this trail to the Walnut Creek trail, without the need to travel on busy Duval, would be extremely valuable for families with kids in the area.	30
229	Answer	Thank you for catching this. We will review our data and be sure it is accurate and consistent in the final plan.	30
394	Suggestion	This area desperately needs some urban trails since this will be near N Lamar Transit Center TOD and near a major highway. There is no easy way to cross in any direction near the transit center.	30
395	Suggestion	This area is a lower income POC area that is hostile to foot traffic. There are so many cars and traffic noise next to strip malls that this needs better crossings.	30
396	Concern	Any I-35 expansion needs to have urban trails and should be included in the urban trail network plan.	30
410	Suggestion	The proposed UPC/ASA trail would be a godsend for N-S connectivity. It would be great if this trail was a Tier 1 and prioritized highly.	30
485	Suggestion	While this proposed section of Walnut Creek Trail follows the MoKan / utility ROW, I've always felt it would be far more scenic (not to mention direct) to parallel the creek proper between Sprinkle Cut Off and 290. It would require acquisition but maybe worth another look. Shouldn't be rejected just because it's hard.	30
541	Suggestion	"Crossing" here may mean gates - bike/ped connectivity in/out of apartment complexes and shopping centers, rather than having to go a long way around along a vehicle route.	30
626	Suggestion	Literally nothing west of SCT - we can do better. With the TxDOT rework of 360 the time is now to add a trail corridor along 360. Team with TxDOT for real estate and the rough earth work component and it could be a fairly low cost to build trail and would make a huge dent in the inequality that is trails west of MoPac.	30
652	Suggestion	The Shoal Creek Conservancy's plan in the North Shoal Creek neighborhood (Segment B-10, p.66) includes a future trail connection along the creek between Anderson and Steck. The North Shoal Creek Neighborhood Association and Shoal Creek Conservancy are currently working together to develop this trail. I would like to suggest that this future trail be added to this plan	30
702	Suggestion	Update with new NWCT section that was just completed.	30
704	Suggestion	Add the urban trail section under U.S. 183 connecting to Neils Thompson Drive.	30
705	Suggestion	There are other existing urban trails in this area that are missing from the map. They may have been constructed by private companies. They are effectively or actually public.	30

756	Question	Lisa makes great points. Were the Community Ambassadors briefed on similar points to the ones she made?	30
916	Suggestion	Need a pedestrian crossing at I-35 and better connections through Capitol Plaza.	30
948	Concern	Is the Johnson Creek trail not being carried forward as an urban trail in this plan? It has been listed as an urban trail in the past - though it is not well maintained - and it provides an extremely useful trail connection to Zilker, so I would like to see it maintained and improved.	30
69	Concern	The map is messed up here. There is an existing short segment urban trail from the north end of Georgian Acres Neighborhood Park to Oertli, which your map does not show. That is, there is no need for a second direct connection from the park to the Barwood segment - the park is already connected via Oertli. (This mess up isn't the biggest deal in and of itself, but it raises huge doubt about what else is wrong in your work, to have missed this on the aerials, on the existing city infrastructure listings, in your community engagement, and in your fieldwork.)	31
71	Concern	The map is messed up here, too - there is an existing segment from Wonsley to Powell. These were both very intentional, to leverage the park loop trail as transportation, not just exercise, and especially to start to provide connectivity for people south Powell, an area that is over 90% apartments, surrounded by TxDOT roads, and somehow a "transportation desert".	31
231	Answer	The Urban Trails Program typically only labels a trail as an existing urban trail when the trail meets Urban Trail standards (IE: ADA accessible, hard surface, and a minimum of 12 ft wide.) When we do field work or start looking at a new trail to design and construct, we take all of the existing nearby infrastructure, such as the path you mention, into account. We then decide where connections need to be upgraded or where sufficient connectivity may already exist that we can add onto.	31
232	Answer	The Urban Trails Program typically only labels a trail as an existing urban trail when the trail meets Urban Trail standards (IE: ADA accessible, hard surface, and a minimum of 12 ft wide.) When we do field work or start looking at a new trail to design and construct, we take all of the existing nearby infrastructure, such as the path you mention, into account. We then decide where connections need to be upgraded or where sufficient connectivity may already exist that we can add onto.	31
397	Concern	"Side paths" along highways or frontage roads need physical protection to allow people on bikes and foot feel and actually be safe. Trees, bollards or traffic barriers would suffice as physical protection, but curbs will not. On the stretch of Manor Expressway shown the frontage road speed limit is 55mph!	31
524	Suggestion	I live in this neighborhood east of 35. I would love to see even larger trail plans for this neighborhood connecting it to the surrounding areas, but I am definitely in support of the trail this current plan proposes as an initial first step. Although the neighborhood is relatively low traffic, there's few sidewalks and bike lanes and not many bus routes. The area would greatly benefit from a trail that connects the entire neighborhood and provides safe walking/biking for the local residents.	31
706	Suggestion	This is a good opportunity to cite the location of this sidepath. It seems like the 183A SUP.	31
707	Suggestion	Some sections of I-35 now have SUPs (and have for over a year), but are not shown here. Contact TxDOT and CTRMA to ensure that you have current info.	31
708	Suggestion	This section of the 183A SUP is completed and should be indicated on the map.	31

757	Suggestion	At least some of this trail should be kept in, especially since some portions do not have any constraints cited and since some connect to regional trails or other ped-bike facilities.	31
758	Question	Did staff or consultants determine why this trail was originally included in 2014? Were there area champions for this trail who may still be champions? Was this trail included to provide a trail opportunity in an (then) EAZ with few trail opportunities?	31
760	Other	There are good feasibility arguments made to remove portions of this trail from the Plan, but due diligence is important for accountability.	31
925	Concern	Recent pedestrian improvements by TXDOT at 183 / Manor consist of 5 foot sidewalks on the curb of the access road with no shoulder. My point is whether TXDOT can be entrusted to build out these portions as described.	31
762	Question	Nothing appears to be dashed (i.e. recommended for removal) on this map. Where is there a dashed portion?	34
44	Suggestion	Northwest Austin seems to be very underrepresented the long-term plan. There are definitely geographic challenges there and fewer public corridors, but it may be a good idea to reach out to stakeholders in this area to make sure their voice is heard in developing the network.	35
226	Suggestion	Please upgrade "Walnut Creek Corridor: Southern Walnut Creek Trail" from Tier 3 to Tier 1. I currently live south of this area and there is no safe bike route to neighborhoods to the north, due to the rail line. Currently, the only alternative is Airport Blvd, which is unsafe. Give these fractured east side neighborhoods a safe N-S corridor.	35
227	Suggestion	Please upgrade "Mokan Corridor Trail" from Tier 2 to Tier 1. This is a very short/easy trail segment that would greatly increase connectivity for Johnston Terrace residents.	35
384	Concern	Connectivity at the south end of the Mopac Pedestrian bridge over Barton Creek is... not there, really. This map has immediate connections from that bridge categorized as Tier 1, but the trails that connect those to the rest of SW Austin are Tier 2. So, what we have now is a bridge to nowhere. What we will have after Tier 1 is trails to nowhere. Please reconsider the Tier 2 status of the trails that connect those Tier 1 trails to the rest of SW Austin. Barton Creek, while beautiful, represents a significant barrier to cycling from SW Austin to downtown and points north. The bridge was a wonderful first step, but this plan doesn't properly prioritize connectivity to that bridge to make it fully functional.	35
389	Concern	At the intersection of the Lance Armstrong Bikeway and Sandra Murida Way, cars attempting to turn right on red very rarely are looking for bikers or pedestrians. I can't count how many close calls I've had along this stretch of Bikeway. Y'all need to get ATD to ban rights on red anywhere along an urban trail, but ESPECIALLY downtown along Lance Armstrong. However the criminally negligent intersection design is at Montoplis Dr and the 183 trail. This BRAND NEW intersection has two high speed slip lanes and cars have zero incentive or inclination to stop for a biker or pedestrian even with a walk signal and being in the crosswalk. This is an intentional design choice made with the full knowledge of how dangerous this is, and someone's going to get killed. Do something about it.	35
391	Suggestion	The Johnson Creek Trail end abruptly at the terrible intersection of Enfield and Winsted just short of West Enfield Park. To get into the park pedestrians have to wait through traffic lights to cross both streets. The light cycle times are outrageous and it takes far too long to complete the last steps in to the park. The Johnson Creek Trail should be extended into the park and further north along Winsted. Ultimately, an underpass needs to be constructed at this location to connect the park with the trail.	35
392	Concern	The trail geometry in this section is perhaps a little too "exciting" with 25' drops into the rocky creek bed and a long unlit tunnel. This trail doesn't feel like something Austin is proud of.	35

398	Concern	I was also almost hit at this same intersection on a tandem bike. It was the only signalized intersection I crossed when traversing the entire Lady Bird Lake trail. Unprotected lefts are dangerous for all road users, but people on bikes or foot will pay the highest price. Would like to see Austin remove these unprotected turns even though this is outside the scope of this report.	35
450	Suggestion	The proposed trail along Little Walnut Creek from Mearns Meadow and Boyer to McKalla Station and Q2 Stadium looks like it has fallen off the map. Why isn't this prioritized? It's a vital corridor from a large neighborhood to the station and stadium that is currently navigated by very busy and pedestrian-unsafe roads in Metric, Kramer, and Rutland. Rutland, in particular, is a death trap on the north side of the road, as is the corner of Rutland and Valley. Please raise this trail in priority. Please pay attention to the interests of this diverse, mixed-income neighborhood.	35
709	Question	Has staff researched why this trail was included in the 2014 plan? E.g. were there reasons in 2014 that suggested it was more viable than the present analysis suggests? Were there community champions then who may still be community champions?	35
763	Question	Nothing appears to be dashed (i.e. recommended for removal) on this map. Where is there a dashed portion?	35
849	Suggestion	Please prioritize the La Loma connector as Tier 1 — and a priority even within that category. Connecting the neighborhoods off Springdale to the Walnut Creek trail and the High School safely should be a high priority. https://www.austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Public_Works/Urban_Trails/La_Loma_Board_091819web.pdf	35
959	Concern	The map here is extremely hard to read and understand, even when zoomed in as much as possible. I see lots of little Tier 2 and 3 segments that I would probably like to provide input on, but I can't make out where they are.	35
474	Suggestion	Austin Ridge Riders Mountain Bike Club highly values the urban trail system--it is an outstanding way to connect different parts of the city to destinations, including natural surface trails that our member mountain bikers ride daily. Therefore I'd suggest adding the sentence in brackets after this one: "These are long urban trail corridors that provide connectivity across the city; some users may travel the length of the corridor, while the average user may travel only a small piece of it to reach a nearby destination. [**Other users may use the concrete spine as to connect to a nerve-like network of approved natural surface trails, greatly enlarging the mileage of the whole system.***]	36
710	Suggestion	"to the detriment"	36
715	Suggestion	These call-outs should each have a bullet point that indicates what the nature of these "urban trails" are. Some of these do not at all meet the Plan's cited definition of urban trail. This creates confusion for the public and for practitioners using this Plan, who don't already know the idiosyncratic knowledge that city staff and other technical experts know. E.g. the LAB description should just be frank and state that it is partially an urban trail and partially protected bike lanes (and painted bike lanes until they're upgraded to protected bike lanes). Laypeople have approached me expressing concern about the confusing usage by the City on this. Getting the terminology correct and honest will help for later implementing upgrades, where appropriate.	36
932	Suggestion	Consider addition of Eastlink which is currently in various stages of design / implementation.	36
711	Suggestion	The Southern Walnut Creek Trail includes a substantial rails-to-trails portion (former MoKan railway), and pre-dates the Bergstrom Spur rails-to-trails project.	37
712	Suggestion	It goes south to Ben White, i.e. past Mabel Davis Park.	37

220	Suggestion	Gaps in the Lance Armstrong Bikeway between Nueces Street and Walter Seaholm Drive should also be mentioned.	38
475	Suggestion	Austin Ridge Riders would respectfully suggest adding "to Walnut Creek Metropolitan Park [** and its network of more than ten miles of natural-surface trails managed by PARD and community groups**]"	38
669	Concern	The IH-35 frontage roads are still a major safety barrier to the connectivity of this trail. Traffic does not stop, and trail users are forced stop and then hurry across before the next high-speed vehicle comes.	38
713	Suggestion	"At the downtown transit station" ==> "At Downtown Station"	38
714	Suggestion	"CapMetro's MetroRail" ==> "CapMetro's MetroRail Red Line" This will distinguish it from other lines.	38
861	Suggestion	Yep, currently you are fed into the hot mess of an intersection of West/3rd where there are cars, bikes and pedestrians all crossing from different directions.	38
106	Other	I am pleased that most of the Red Line trail is marked as Tier 1 priority. This will positively impact so many people!	39
400	Concern	Please keep this trail free of debris and encampments so it does not fall into disuse and disrepair like the Waller Creek trail. The city of Austin has been building excellent transportation infrastructure, maintenance still seems like a challenge.	39
424	Other	So excited about this! Southeast Austin deserves more trails, it is so terrible to bike there right now.	39
433	Other	There are basically no diagonal NW/SE connectors throughout the city and the Red Line Trail is crucial to enabling effective transportation throughout the city! Can't stress enough that this needs to be a top priority!	39
670	Suggestion	While this is accurate, the encampments and garbage on the trail are much bigger issues than the quality of the trail surface. Priorities for this trail should first be general upkeep and safety, then rerouting around the landslide. Signage should clearly indicate which parts of the trail have accessibility issues and should suggest alternate routes where available.	39
716	Question	What specific location (i.e. intersection) does "E. Cesar Chavez" refer to? Is that in Downtown, per the "Location" bullet point.	39
717	Suggestion	Shouldn't the northern terminus be the NWCT?	39
864	Suggestion	Needs to extend officially all the way to the Domain.	39
340	Other	I recently rode my bike on this trail from Govalle Park to turn around at Daffin Lane: I confess its jointed concrete surface was unpleasant, even on a bike with suspension.	40
104	Suggestion	In my dream world the "Big Loop" wouldn't go along Burnet Road due to the heavy automobile traffic and large number of intersections making for unpleasant riding. Instead we'd finally connect the north end of Shoal Creek to the Domain either through UT Pickle or to the west of it. Ideally all of this would be a Tier 1 priority but it looks like the "MoPac Shared Use Path" that would accomplish this is marked Tier 2.	41
105	Suggestion	Connecting the Walnut Creek trails would ideally be a Tier 1 priority, not Tier 3. We're so close!	41
234	Suggestion	Revise: "Credit: Shoal Creek Conservancy"	41
375	Suggestion	I know the majority of the big loop is already Tier 1, and that is great. I just want to stress the importance of completing the big loop. It's a fantastic draw for cyclists and runners alike and could result in future race events. Also it connects east and west Austin, helping check diversity/underserved/BIPOC boxes. Completing the eastern portions of the loop (Northern WCT) should be of the highest priority as land/development costs will continue to rise out east. Why not use Mayor Watson's vision of development around Decker Lake to secure more funding from City Hall as the NWCT would serve those residents well?	41

423	Suggestion	What about South Austin? Do we get a big loop?	41
651	Suggestion	The Shoal Creek Conservancy's plan in the North Shoal Creek neighborhood (Segment B-10, p.66) includes a future trail connection along the creek between Anderson and Steck. The North Shoal Creek Neighborhood Association and Shoal Creek Conservancy are currently working together to develop this trail. I would like to suggest that this future trail be added to this plan	41
942	Suggestion	I do love this idea and hope this gets done. Atlanta's Beltline (https://beltline.org/map/) has changed the city and incorporated many neighborhoods that would otherwise have been forgotten. A lot of opportunity for businesses around the area as well. Would love Austin to do something similar and if this is gets done it would be a great feat. I would encourage creating walking/biking paths separate from roads (see Shoal Creek)	41
764	Question	Nothing appears to be dashed (i.e. recommended for removal) on this map. Where is there a dashed portion?	42
939	Suggestion	Consider adding that Austin's zoning code has limited the ability of development of new housing to keep up with demand and the resulting development has been largely occurred in "neighborhoods vulnerable to displacement".	44
107	Suggestion	The Montopolis Neighborhood Connector is important and should be built much sooner than the potential 20 year time frame. One version of this connector was first proposed 12 years ago. Neighbors in the Frontier at Montana Neighborhood had a consultant grant from the National Park Service Rivers Trails and Conservation Assistance Program, which produced a trail alignment that is similar to what is depicted. I was involved with that effort. I think that the Alternate Routes in Yellow in this map make a lot of sense. Having the trail reach the Montopolis Practice Field and exit to Felix, to Valdez, to Ponca, to Kemp and to the bicycle bridge works well. Another suggestion coming from the NPS project was the construction of natural surface trail on the Watershed Property that was donated to the City (20+ acres) by the McElhenney family. That 1 mile loop was built by American Youth Works. And the City officially named part of that property as the McElhenney Oak Grove. See this City council resolution: https://www.austintexas.gov/edims/document.cfm?id=163448 So a suggestion is just as the Montopolis Neighborhood Connector mentions some other key landmarks, I think it should also specifically call out the McElhenney Oak Grove and call out the natural surface trail, and also include way finding information about this. Perhaps in the future there might be a bicycle rack or some other amenity along the connector trail near the entrance to the loop trail. People could ride their bicycles to the natural trail trailhead and go for a short walk to the pond or stand among the very large oak trees. I think the McElhenney Oak Grove needs to be put on City maps, including any trail maps. It needs to part of the ArcGIS overlay. When this resolution about the McElhenney Oak Grove passed council, then Mayor Leffingwell assured that it would be included on City maps. You also might add to the description, or to the argument, the fact that where this connector starts on E. Riverside is next to quite a number of hotels. There could be an opportunity for a bicycle rental station in that area for hotel visitors to go downtown without driving and adding more traffic.	45
718	Suggestion	Various commentary on this subject recommends that anti-displacement measures be taken well in advance of "building" the trails. This Plan and the 2014 Plan each serve as pressures. The recommendations listed here should be underway as soon as feasible, i.e. this year.	45
719	Suggestion	Action should be proactive and in advance. Timing this action with "building" is too late.	45

766	Suggestion	<p>It's concerning to remove a proposed urban trail in an EAZ without doing adequate research. At most, the trail should be downgraded (i.e. to Tier 2 or Tier 3) but remain in the plan. The needed research and stakeholder engagement is cited here, i.e. determine the cemetery boundaries & extents, and discuss with the elementary school leadership about specific issues.</p> <p>If on-street bikeways and sidewalks are an equivalent substitute for urban trails, we wouldn't have an urban trails plan at all.</p>	45
342	Concern	I presume that data supports this assertion. However, the Butler Trail is adjacent to all the bridges across Lady Bird Lake, and is consequently an important commuting route for cyclists, regardless of weather. It affords cyclists access to the LAB and a safe route under IH35. Unfortunately, its popularity often renders it virtually unrideable.	46
941	Suggestion	Where a new sidewalk will be added and no sidewalk exists consider as a rule to add new sidewalks on the north and east sides of city blocks if all other considerations are equal. These are the sides that could be shaded by trees from midday to evening.	46
29	Concern	While I love the Southern Walnut Creek Trail, it is too narrow for the volume of peds and cyclists that use it. Please design all trails to be wide enough to allow both peds and cyclists to walk/ride side-by-side in each direction. Even better - build separated ped/bike trails (like the Upper Boggy Creek addition).	49
187	Suggestion	I don't see the benefit of a parallel concrete path and it creates confusion. I suggest crushed granite shoulders on both sides of a paved path- this is useful for those who want to jog on softer surfaces or quickly direct a dog to the side to allow faster traffic to pass. The current design has dogs on both parallel trails, making cycling difficult.	49
222	Concern	While I love being a pedestrian, when these wide concrete trails are placed inside a green space, the ability to enjoy and be still inside the green space is compromised. The natural habitat is also compromised. Concrete trails are promoting transportation through a space, not slow enjoyment of the natural space. We need to delineate the two and esteem our limited green spaces in our city as sacred from the value of efficient transportation. Let's be taking back roads for pedestrianism and not precious green space.	49
401	Other	I actually like the idea of parallel paths to separate people on bikes and on foot on busy sections. I do not know if that is how the path is actually used.	49
402	Other	Shade trees are fantastic. They make trails bearable on even the hottest summer days.	49
542	Other	Respectful disagree. Hard surface trails in a park are a great way for wheelchair users or stroller-pushing parents to access the park. It also makes for great people watching to sit in the park and watch people stroll through!	49
663	Other	I also disagree, these trails are essential to walkability in our city and accessibility. The more we can enjoy our green space accessibly and the more we grow and cultivate it, the more of it we will have.	49
74	Concern	Again, "Availability of neighborhood routes" is simply not true, unless you omit almost everyone who actually lives in the area because they are in an apartment. It's gross and ugly that you went through all those equity words at the start of the report, then threw it all right out the window as soon as you started making recommendations about who actually gets to access to publicly funded amenities. If there are engineering constraints, yes, fine, but don't try to claim "the neighborhood" already has available routes.	50
233	Answer	We did not mean to imply that the neighborhood already has pedestrian and bicycle routes, but rather that due to the lack of public right-of-way along the creek and the context of nearby streets, a neighborhood bikeway could serve as an alternative to a trail.	50
414	Suggestion	Start building and add the art later- This city is 30 behind of transportation development. we can add art for the next 30 years	50

765	Concern	It would be good to run these concerns by the Community Ambassadors, if you haven't already. Lisa makes great points that a plan centered on equity shouldn't cite a factor based on inequitable distribution of wealth as a reason to remove a proposed trail project. E.g. the City could technically make a legal claim to the land for the trail, even if it's not seen as politically expedient due to wealthy interests.	50
38	Suggestion	Speed difference is an even bigger consideration on trails that are close to popular destinations like the newest Northern Walnut Creek trail near Walnut Creek Metro park. Because that section is so accessible to large numbers of walkers it becomes crowded and less optimal for higher speed through users. On nice days it already feels like it's at capacity only a few weeks after it opened! Would it work to opportunistically make trails wider and separate lanes when close to popular access points, but maybe save money by making them narrower in sections that are harder to access on foot?	51
109	Question	Short term says "over the next few years." What are we realistically looking at for this?	51
230	Answer	The timeline for "short-term" projects is largely dependent on the availability of funding. Funds from the 2020 Mobility Bond have been allocated to projects identified as high priority in the 2014 Urban Trails Plan. To implement new trails, funds need to be identified. Then, a trail typically takes about 6 years from conceptual development through construction.	51
502	Concern	Where our dwindling green spaces are being cut for these trails/roads the city should really be considering minimizing impact as the guiding principal. These aren't highways and bikes can share the path with an occasional pedestrian. Many of these trails will never be used for bike commuting or bikes traveling very fast. 99% of Austin is already developed, maybe some of these remaining green spaces should be left alone. Or minimizing impact should be taken seriously.	51
720	Concern	City staff should feel comfortable requiring adequate easements with new developments. If a dual-track trail is warranted, the easement to fit it in comfortably should be required.	51
39	Suggestion	Is average daily traffic the right metric? I hope we can design our trails to have enough capacity for popular times like nice weather weekend mornings. It might be helpful to factor in peak traffic stats too.	52
76	Concern	It's way too late to "initiate" these conversations. These conversations should be rushed to completion. This "culvert" must be designed to provide a safe and accessible crossing, regardless of the form of trail connections on either side (urban trail or park trail).	52
721	Question	Is this density overall, or only residential density?	52
722	Concern	The density shown for the North Burnet area seems low (compared to what it actually will be for 2040, let alone 2023). There is considerable multifamily and highrise office existing and under construction. Allowable heights and densities continue to be increased and are comparable to downtown Austin.	52
723	Suggestion	This section of the Red Line Trail should be "High", once the population density figures are corrected.	52
543	Suggestion	The other thing that helps with dumping is having proper places for people to put their waste (not just litter, but like mattresses). Sort of that's Duh. Just remember not to scope this problem too narrowly, but rather pull in WPD's trash in creeks folks and ARR.	53
726	Suggestion	Would be better to cite a more recent version. One newer version (March 2020) was released prior to the development of this Plan. Another more recent version was released in May 2021.	54
727	Question	It's not clear if this is a complete substitute for engagement with other members of the community, or if this is here for emphasis. I.e. does this indicate that the Urban Trails Program won't engage with other members of the community on projects? (If the intent is	55

		to continue to engage with others in the community, it should be explicitly stated as well, e.g. stating general community engagement centered on the mentioned populations.)	
729	Question	Does staff recommend streamlining this portion or removing it? Arguably, this step is inequitable, since it prolongs the current inequitable status quo.	56
730	Suggestion	"Plan view graphics": It would be better to use a non-technical term here (or define the term) in order to help the general reader.	57
731	Question	It's not clear from the text why these specific 10 projects were chosen here. Is that information intentionally or unintentionally left out? Why were these 10 chosen for this exercise?	57
30	Suggestion	A grade-separated crossing of I-35 should absolutely be included in this trail's initial phase, and it should at least connect to South Congress, where there are destinations. This proposed initial section of trail terminating at a commercially barren portion of I-35 seems unlikely to be useful to anyone besides recreation for the handful of apartment complexes it would run behind. Given the rapid development happening along South Congress, I think creating an east-west trail along South Boggy Creek is a great idea. I realize it might not be financially feasible, but completing this trail from Bluff Springs all the way west to South 1st would do much to connect the people and businesses of south central and southeast Austin that are currently separated by I-35.	58
108	Suggestion	Suggestion is about clarifying the name. In part of this corridor, on the Watershed Property, there is a 1-mile natural surface loop trail, built by American Youth Works, that is also known as the Montopolis Tributary Trail.	58
357	Suggestion	Extending the northern part of Shoal Creek to connect to North Walnut should be a Tier 1 priority as it helps build the big loop. Currently, a person riding a bike is stuck crossing Burnet in an unclear, unsafe way.	58
358	Suggestion	The crossing of Shoal Creek around Seiders Springs is not very safe and could be improved with Tier 1 priority.	58
359	Suggestion	It would be much safer if the short gap near the Central Library could be filled and be a Tier 1 priority. Those tight turns, mostly blind, gets a lot of traffic is unsafe for bikes.	58
360	Suggestion	Completing the Big Loop by connecting the north and south walnut trails is real important and should be Tier 1.	58
361	Suggestion	MoKan extension will make it much safer to bike in what has become a high traffic area. Let's keep this Tier 1 priority.	58
362	Suggestion	The trail head to Shoal Creek Trail at 29th Street just west of Lamar is very steep and at the bottom the gravel gets very loose. I recommend making this trailhead safer by paving and making the connection to Shoal Creek Trail a more gentle angle instead of the sharp 90 turn it is now.	58
953	Question	How will the Little Walnut Trail along Buttermilk Creek cross private properties in the Coronado Hills neighborhood? The trail cuts across all properties along Buttermilk Creek. Will the City purchase that land? There is vacant commercial property on the other side of the creek that can be accessed for the trail. Why doesn't the trail use the RR zoned land along the creek for the trail?	58
965	Answer	Maps contained within the plan are for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. It does not represent an on-the-ground survey and represents only the approximate relative location of property boundaries. The alignment (placement) of a trail is determined following a preliminary engineering study and is further refined during the design phase. Thanks for taking the time to review!	58

733	Question	<p>Is the six+ years timeline only a reflection of current expectations? Or this is also what the Urban Trails Program recommends? Why couldn't this Plan also make recommendations for how to shorten that process, e.g. to 3-4 years?</p> <p>I know enough to know that the 6-year timeline is not a hard rule for paved trails, but rather a reflection of the current City of Austin paradigm. I'm not assuming that it would be easy to reduce the timeline, but this Plan seems like exactly the place to provide such a set of recommendations to get there.</p>	59
734	Suggestion	Based on the equitable outcomes of urban trails, this timeline should be shorter in order to better serve equity. E.g. the timeline for Tier 1 trails could be 10 years instead of 20 years. Or the Plan could describe a scenario for how the timeline could be 10 years instead of 20 years.	59
768	Question	How do we comment on the Tiers map? The comment functionality doesn't exist for the maps.	60
769	Suggestion	Use consistent nomenclature throughout Plan, e.g. Tier 2 vs. Tier II.	60
770	Question	Where do we review staff/consultant feedback on publicly submitted trails that were not included in the Plan?	60
186	Suggestion	The painted lines on this segment are not working well for cyclist or pedestrians. Pedestrians with dogs can't be expected to share a single lane in both direction and never will abide by that rule. They will take up whatever space they want. Because of this confusion, cyclists are forced to navigate between pedestrians/dogs walking on both sides in both directions. I suggest a paved cycling path with crush granite shoulders on both sides for jogging, dogs, walking.	61
385	Concern	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The "MoPac Shared Use Path" which would connect from Shoal Creek's northern trailhead at Highway 183 to the Northern Walnut Creek Trail, is proposed as Tier 2. As an important link in the Big Loop, this segment should be Tier 1. • The Shoal Creek crossing between 34th and 38th Streets is currently a low-water crossing with right angles that are challenging for bicycles. This crossing is proposed as Tier 2. Improvements to this crossing should be a Tier 1 priority. • The Shoal Creek Trail from 24th-30th is currently proposed as Tier 1. Please share your support for this priority! This trail segment will address the area that needs to be reconnected due to the landslide. • A Shoal Creek Trail underpass at 3rd Street is currently proposed as Tier 2. This segment should be Tier 1. This trail segment is a key proposal in the Cypress & Shoal Public Space Strategy, which aims to improve connectivity and safety around 3rd Street and Shoal Creek. • Big Loop: The eastern portions of the Big Loop yet to be built, including the MoKan Corridor Trail and the Northern Walnut Creek Trail, are all proposed as Tier 1 	61
40	Suggestion	I came here looking for a map and it's just a placeholder! Can you make the maps more prominently linked?	62
191	Answer	We have added links to these pages directing viewers to the interactive existing and proposed urban trail network map. Thanks for making this suggestion.	62
476	Suggestion	<p>Austin Ridge Riders think this is an excellent section--creating destinations.</p> <p>We would respectfully request adding: ". . . connections to approved natural-surface trail systems" to this list.</p>	62
668	Question	The San Antonio mission reach trail has E-bike rentals available along the trails allowing people to explore much greater distances along the paths. I would like to see Austin add bike rentals at key points along the trail system.	62
735	Other		1 62

		Austin Ridge Riders would respectfully suggest adding, "as well as wayfinding at approved natural-surface trail connections, as appropriate."	
477	Suggestion	Currently, our club uses our own funds to place signage along the Northern Walnut Creek Trail at intersections with the natural-surface trails.	63
544	Concern	This is the same wayfaring system as at the Project Connect stops, right? I can get off the 801, glance at the map, and whiz along to the creek?	63
478	Suggestion	Austin Ridge Riders Mountain Bike Club, a 501(c)(3) non-profit strongly agrees with this statement. We have devoted many volunteer work days to managing issues along the Northern Walnut Creek Trail in Walnut Creek Metro Park (such as mud flowing onto the concrete and downed limbs after the ice storms), as it interfaces with the natural-surface trails that are highly popular with mountain bike riders.	64
545	Concern	It's awesome that people do this for free, but the urban trail plan should be that necessary operating personnel are funded.	64
546	Concern	This needs to connect somehow with TxDOT's version of public space management, esp where trails intersect with their roads like N Lamar and I35.	65
955	Question	The unhoused community will use the trail to live. How will the Little Walnut Trail along Buttermilk Creek between Cameron Road and US 290 Hwy be built across private properties in the Coronado Hills neighborhood? The trail cuts across all properties along Buttermilk Creek. Will the City purchase that land? There is vacant commercial property on the other side of the creek that can to accessed for the trail. Why doesn't the trail use the RR zoned land along the creek for the trail?	65
958	Suggestion	I agree, but also want to add that people using trails for commuting/transportation purposes are also less likely to be using trackers. This is another segment that can be left out if using Big Data.	66
738	Suggestion	There are currently SUPs along south and north I-35. Some that were implemented over a year ago (some 2+ years ago) are not shown here. Check in with TxDOT on the latest.	67
739	Question	Presumably, these Tiers do not necessarily match with the recommendations in this Plan. Is that correct?	67
954	Question	How will the Little Walnut Trail along Buttermilk Creek cross private properties in the Coronado Hills neighborhood? The trail cuts across all properties along Buttermilk Creek. Will the City purchase that land? There is vacant commercial property on the other side of the creek that can to accessed for the trail. Why doesn't the trail use the RR zoned land along the creek for the trail?	67
771	Concern	The TCM was not developed with an equity lens. Some components of the TCM, e.g. hostile architecture, actively perpetuate racial inequities.	68
960	Other	Fantastic!	68
961	Other	Good!	69
741	Suggestion	"Williams" ==> "Williamson"	70
772	Suggestion	Add: "People walking side by side"	70
773	Suggestion	Add: "Cargo bikes" or some other language that is inclusive of Urban Arrows	70
774	Suggestion	Add: "E-bikes"	70
775	Suggestion	Add: "Older bicyclists" There is evidence that people over 65 are not included in urban trail development and prioritization. I'm happy to discuss.	70

		<p>Not sure where this comment should live...</p> <p>Please note that with some pro-active planning, trail right of way easements can be flagged at large sites set for redevelopment. This can be used as a tool to help the Development Services Center flag these larger redevelopments to deed trail right of way as a part of their Site Planing Process.</p> <p>Furthermore, consider discussions with PARD the use of some Parkland dedication funds to be allocated to Urban Trail connectivity projects (pocket parks along trails, trail bridges, etc).</p> <p>As an example, Windsor Park was able to secure a trail r.o.w. at Tannehil Branch Creek by flagging it as a Tiered trail in advance of a project redevelopment.</p>	
944	Suggestion		71
41	Suggestion	With e-bikes and other micro mobility modes becoming cheaper and more popular, this is a good call to design for higher speeds. Some can go even faster than 24MPH.	72
776	Concern	The AASHTO geometry is based on faulty assumptions. E.g. it's based on observations of trail users at measured speeds using the entire width of a trail (e.g. 10' or 12') during turns, and not staying to the right (i.e. in the context of other concurrent trail users).	72
743	Suggestion	"historically white organizations": Perhaps what is intended here is "historically primarily white organizations", or something similar. The Red Line Parkway Initiative has been intentionally racially diverse and inclusive from its inception, while recognizing continued room for improvement.	73
778	Concern	<p>This is a common diagram and paradigm, but it breaks down at turns, and this is typically not acknowledged or accounted for in on-the-ground trail design & implementation. The typical cyclists leans during turns, and thus the physical width is wider. The minimum operating is also wider during turns.</p> <p>Toole Design should update their usage of this, or explain how this is still considered valid, given the above concerns.</p>	75
780	Suggestion	<p>Shy space should include concrete lips. Concrete lips pose serious danger to injury, and cyclists will shy away from the edge of concrete, unlike with asphalt, DG, or natural surface trails. As a result concrete trails require additional width to serve similar needs to asphalt trails of narrower widths.</p> <p>Tools Design Group should add concrete lips to their list. This may not be a common concern in their other typical consulting markets that rarely use concrete, and could explain why it is left out of their boilerplate recommendations.</p>	76
781	Suggestion	Austin PARD should be aware of these too. They just recently installed trash & recycling bins within what should be clear space along the Boggy Creek Trail.	76
782	Suggestion	Somewhere in the vicinity of "wherever space permits", it should also be stated that staff will always look for and request (vs. require) an easement that accommodates adequate width dual-track trails with appropriate buffers. Staff should also generally *require* an adequate easement, but this is very context sensitive.	79
843	Suggestion	In practice, the City has not yet built a dual-track trail where one trail did not already exist. This Plan should recognize that the City will built many trails first as single track and then add in a secondary track. In practice, it can be difficult to justify prioritizing a new disconnected dual-track trail over building twice (or e.g. 50% more of) the trail mileage. This Plan could recommend preserving and outlining the easement for a future secondary track as a critical step when only a single-track trail is built. This would include ensuring the easement is wide enough, and that another trail ROW could fit in, given environmental and topographical constraints. The City could look to other cities (e.g. Minneapolis) that have	79

		had dual track trails for decades to get a better understanding of what cross sections or alignments are appropriate in practice, e.g. the two trails do *not* need to be within sight of each other to function well, but it's key that entry points (to either trail) indicate that there is another nearby parallel trail for different uses. I would be happy to work with staff to add to this language.	
783	Concern	NBG has higher density than this already (in 2023). Something is wrong with the data source (or the choice of zone size).	80
785	Suggestion	Again, this section of the Red Line Trail (in North Burnet area) is going to be a high usage section. Once the population density map is fixed, the trail will reflect this higher usage.	80
784	Suggestion	Arguably, if the topography is steep, then trail width should be wider even in low-ped volume locations and where total volume is expected to be Medium. A prime example would be along Loop 360 (though not an urban trails site), where a width of 14-16' would be warranted since the hills tend to result in higher speed, the bike users are generally more experienced with higher speeds, and there are few intersectional or place-based conflicts.	81
786	Question	A 5' shoulder can be helpful, but where is the need for 5' (plus the natural area) explained?	82
788	Other	Thanks for making these the default cross sections.	82
791	Concern	Concrete trails do *not* allow for recoverable area or for "recovering". That is one of the biggest drawbacks of using concrete. An example from last week is a woman who suffered serious injuries on the SWCT when attempting to "recover" onto the trail after departing the trail. This is a common way to crash on our concrete trails. It is very possible that Toole Design Group has limited experience consulting in cities/areas that regularly use concrete for their paved trails, and that could explain this dangerous oversight.	83
792	Concern	As cited above, this is a concrete trail, and does not show an example of a recoverable shoulder.	83
793	Suggestion	Shoulders could offer an opportunity for desire paths for runners seeking a softer path. This should be written into the trail design in some fashion.	83
794	Concern	Again, concrete trails (as in the photo below) generally do not provide a recoverable area.	84
797	Concern	There are cross sections in the TCM that were widely panned by local bicycling nonprofit leaders and the Austin Bicycle Advisory Council and the Austin Pedestrian Advisory Council because they fail to place a vegetative (or other physical) buffer between bicycle traffic and high-speed multi-lane roadway traffic.	85
351	Concern	The joints on the South Walnut Creek Trail are particularly unpleasant.	86
798	Concern	These claims need to be cited or explained with evidence. Asphalt seems to fair at least as well as concrete locally, if not better. City staff seems to have a preference for concrete, but has not provided a series of examples to back up their preference.	86
799	Suggestion	Add: "Results in more user injuries and fatalities."	87
801	Suggestion	Add: "Bumpier than asphalt even when new"	87
802	Concern	There are decades-old examples of asphalt in Austin that do not appear to have had any maintenance, but they still function without user complaints.	87
803	Suggestion	Add: "requires regular maintenance" The concrete SWCT and Austin-to-Manor trails have required considerable maintenance. The Boggy Creek Trail has also required maintenance.	87
804	Other	It seems that the relative need for maintenance (between concrete and asphalt) is dependent on other larger factors, e.g. pre-existing ground lateral slope, soil type, quality of original construction	87

818	Concern	Concrete (even when new) is possibly the bumpiest of these choices (except rocky surfaces), in practice. I welcome you on a ride to observe the bumpiness of a newly built concrete trail. The bumpiest is not just from the joints, but all of the concrete in between.	87
819	Suggestion	Add: "blends into the natural environment better than concrete, more palatable than concrete for use in natural areas"	87
872	Concern	The use of decomposed granite for trails should be limited to areas where erosion will not occur. According to an Austin American Statesman Article 5/24/2019 "the city orders about 200 tons of decomposed granite each year for the Butler Hike and Bike Trail to fill in patches that are swept away. " This is not a sustainable practice and damages the environment.	87
814	Suggestion	The Urban Trails Program should migrate to using Universal Design as default, rather than "accommodating" people with disabilities. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Universal_design For example, WGC used Universal Design at Waterloo Park. This can be seen in their end-to-end urban trail that does not exceed 2% longitudinal slope. John Rigdon at WGC would be a good source.	88
815	Suggestion	Urban Trails work best when the inclines and declines are gentle. E.g. 2% should be the maximum target longitudinal slope. This makes it easier for a broader range of people to use them, it significantly helps to reduce speed differentials among users, it's safer for users, and it extends people's viable & enjoyable travel range. All of these add value to a project, and warrant extra cost upfront. This is part of why waterways and rail corridors are attractive around the world for paved trails.	88
816	Other	I somehow missed the 2% target already in the text here! Thanks for including that (as also mentioned in the TCM).	88
817	Other	I will add that having a longitudinal slope of no more than 2% also avoids the need for periodic flatter ramps, which results in (vertically) wavy trails that contribute to loss of control.	88
820	Concern	Minimizing exposure shouldn't be conflated with reducing crossing distance. The behavior at trail-roadway intersections suggests that the incidence of collisions isn't related to crossing distance itself but rather to binary results (such as whether the roadway user or the trail user see the other user and choose to stop or slow down) and number of lanes. I.e. if it takes a person 8 seconds to cross vs. 10 seconds to cross, this doesn't necessarily reflect the incidence of collisions. I welcome any reference to a rigorous study on this.	89
821	Concern	It's not clear what function "Reduce speeds at conflict points" serves for trail-roadway intersections. Yes, roadway traffic will likely need to slow down to typically trail speeds (from e.g. 25-35 mph) to help mutual visibility and to avoid collisions. However, it's not clear what benefit (safety or otherwise) is served by a trail user reducing speed, if they are traveling at, e.g. 14 mph or 8 mph or 3 mph. Perhaps more specific language such as "Moderate speeds at conflict points" would be more precise for the point intended here.	89
822	Other	Thank you for including an example that is not a 90° crossing.	90
823	Other	Thank you for including an example that is not a 90° crossing.	90
352	Concern	What constitutes a motor vehicle? E-bikes, electric scooters and Segways are technically motor vehicles because they include motors that relieve their operators of some (if not all) physical exertion. Yet they are frequently used on Austin urban trails.	91
824	Suggestion	Wayfinding signs should also serve (and face) the crossing roadway, for various reasons. Such signs should exist on every trail-roadway crossing.	91
825	Suggestion	I like splitter islands (vs. bollards). One or both of the passageways should be wide enough for various trikes (including recumbents), cargo bikes, and pedicabs.	91

827	Other	I see that there is a reference example below stating that a 10' path be divided into two 5' paths. That width should suffice for all uses mentioned above (assuming that there is no additional sharp-turn geometry).	91
353	Question	Will the bollards at either end of the Skyview Bridge be removed?	92
390	Answer	The Skyview Bridge is not under the purview of the Urban Trails Program. We recommend that you submit this request to Austin 311 so this question is routed to the appropriate program. Thanks for reaching out.	92
826	Suggestion	"moto" ==> "motor"	93
828	Suggestion	"... access"? Looks like the end of the phrase is missing.	93
829	Suggestion	It wouldn't hurt to mention again at the end of this passage that bollards are a fall-back choice, and that their use is discouraged when other options work. There is a lot of discussion about bollards here, and the casual engineer may gloss over the briefer intro discouraging their use.	94
831	Suggestion	There should also be a mention here that underpasses have the advantage of less elevation change (and shorter longitudinal ramping distance), because of the smaller clearance needed for trail users vs. roadway users.	94
830	Suggestion	"8 ft as a minimum"Add: "in constrained circumstances".8' is short, especially for people over 6'6" on bikes.	95
832	Suggestion	"Do not use fencing design that tends to catch bikes or wheelchairs as they pass by." (or similar language)	95
833	Suggestion	This also should be included or referenced in the fencing section above.	96
79	Suggestion	Lighting needs should consider being able to see the trail well enough to travel safely on it. But also to be able to see surroundings well enough to be/feel safe from crime (or wild animals, I guess). Explicitly reference CPTED principles.	97
80	Suggestion	Signage should also provide a 911 "address", however the trail locations are uniquely identified so that someone could explain where they are if they need to call for help.	97
834	Concern	This lighting pole is within the buffer area that should be kept clear of fixed obstacles.	97
835	Concern	Lots going on in these signs. I would have preferred a public input process before doubling-down on this format, and I'm not sure why that never happened. There are multiple examples in other jurisdictions that use simpler signage coupled with more complex kiosk info boards.	98
836	Suggestion	The City should explore using traditional street address systems for urban trails that exist closely within the city's street grid system. I can picture that this would be helpful and more intuitive, and could be coupled with mileage indicators as well, but think this should be an open discussion.	98
82	Suggestion	Don't just consider it, do it. Spanish should be routine, and then get clever about how people could use an app or something to get any language they want.	99
837	Concern	As we fill gaps in our network, we will no longer have the many "trailheads" that we currently do. I think that prominently using mileage won't work well for many trails, while it will also be of great benefit to others.	99
838	Suggestion	Agreed that Spanish should be included by default on Austin trail kiosks.	99
839	Suggestion	Could also explicitly mention that a center line helps to communicate that the space has regular bike traffic. I'll add that growing up in Minneapolis, and visiting and living in various other places, I was surprised to see the growing use of center lines on trails that were shared among bike and pedestrian traffic. I.e. center lines used to mean that it was for the exclusive use of bikes and other wheeled conveyance. For such center-lined paths, there was always an	100

		accompanying pedestrian path. I do think this practice helps to reaffirm the intended behaviors. The City could consider adopting this standard (and moving toward using it universally), i.e. center line always means there is a separate pedestrian path.	
840	Concern	It would be helpful to move toward consistency for such markings. On an informational ride last year, a father with his children noted that it was very confusing for his kids and that there was no clear instruction that he could provide to his kids regarding what they were supposed to do. We were riding along the Red Line Parkway between Downtown Station and MLK Jr. Station.	101
841	Concern	I think the specific design shown here is dangerous and should be avoided. This shows both a merging and multiple curves without tapering, plus a blind spot is behind the camera. Already during peak use, this is (for users) an unanticipated dangerous location. What is unfortunate, is that there was another design alternative here that would have also left at least as much space for the trees, but it was not chosen, and the reasons for that choice were not shared with the public until implementation (and some have still not been shared).	105
842	Suggestion	There should also be mentions here of alternatives to trees in the case of constrained cross sections or where trees are not allowed (e.g. utility corridors). E.g. large bushes and trellises can also provide shade and natural benefits.	106
875	Suggestion	Please consider exploring other options to over-planting trees when a trail is constructed in a corridor with existing trees. The section of the NWCT from Mopac to Balcones Park was heavily treed and lack of watering led to the demise of many of the plantings. Options include redirecting funds required for replacement trees to other projects where trees are needed for shade, removing/controlling invasive/undesireable trees to improve the viability of desirable shade trees, etc.	106
844	Question	"Council-adopted plan": This Plan indicates many trails should be wider than 14', and it provides that criteria further up. Does that satisfy this requirement here?	109
845	Concern	Seems like the original Red Line Trail would fail this test. It is within 25' of a tributary to Waller Creek along Airport Blvd. https://goo.gl/maps/fcXRM2RBZPPUcKc6 If this nevertheless qualifies because it is considered a sidewalk, or otherwise not a "trail" because it follows Airport Blvd., then this isn't an environmental policy, is it an anti-environmental, pro-car, pro-impervious cover policy.	109
85	Concern	There are two axes here - one axis is sort of public-neighborhood. People might come from somewhere to the trail head, and need to park their bike, sit down, go to the bathroom, look at a map, etc. Or they might just step out of their home and be at the trail head. The other axis is volume/quantity. If your "neighborhood" is large lot single-family homes, there will be a small volume of people. If your "neighborhood" is dense higher rise multifamily, there will be a larger volume of people. Either way they're all just a few steps from their own door.	111
846	Suggestion	The TCM contains hostile architecture guidance for urban trails, including the design of benches. I reported this to staff during the TCM evaluation process, but the hostile architecture was kept in the final manual. It could be worth mentioning here that when other City guidance recommends hostile architecture, that the practitioner can cite this Plan as why hostile architecture is not used.	111
847	Concern	This bench design is also an example of hostile architecture, meant to discourage lying down.	112

848	Concern	These are placed closer to the trail than the specifications for obstacles discussion in a separate section above. Are there other photo examples that could be used here? Also, is this problematic placement being addressed with the City staff that is approving this placement?	113
850	Other	It's worth knowing that low-income populations also rely upon public water fountains for recreational trips too.	114
851	Suggestion	"bus stop" ==> "transit stops" (includes current and future rail stops)	115
852	Suggestion	Swap the phrase placement of recommend and minimum, to make the recommended placement the default usage.	115
354	Question	Do any of Austin's urban trails include works like Creative Machine's Ballroom Luminoso in San Antonio?	117
393	Answer	There is community-led artwork called the Pillars Project on the Eastlink Trail, just off Rosewood Ave. There is also an artwork project currently underway on the Violet Crown Trail in partnership with the Hill Country Conservancy. Some trail projects have an approved budget where funds can be allocated to site-specific artwork through the City's Art in Public Places program. For example, the planned "New Longhorn Dam Bridge" project will allocate funding towards art. The Urban Trails Program plans to install more art and other placemaking elements along the trail, as noted in the action items listed on page 20.	117
853	Suggestion	"milage" ==> "mileage"	120
855	Suggestion	"havemany" ==> "have many"	120
854	Suggestion	"andregulatory" ==> "and regulatory"	121
856	Suggestion	"morepredictable" ==> "more predictable"	121
857	Suggestion	"railroadline" ==> "railroad line"	121
858	Suggestion	More spaces needed. Check for typos throughout this section.	121
860	Concern	The FRA/FHWA May 2021 document should be in this list. Its absence is very problematic.	122
865	Other	For reference, in case it's helpful: Rails-with-Trails Overview - RLPI 2021-12-10 https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Rnfv5fadjZbBqdAon0OgmOeJj1dOjK0uAG-TEOuQfro/edit?usp=sharing	122
859	Concern	This sentence and the next sentence and next one are confusing--they seem to simply be incorrect. There *is* national guidance on shared-use corridors, and the 2002 document (FRA/FHWA "RAILS WITH TRAILS: Best Practices and Lessons Learned") referenced is, in fact, guidance. At the time that this draft was written, there was already a March 2020 version of this document, and to-date, an additional version was released in May 2021. These two sentences are problematic as written, and should be revised. These will create confusion for different audiences as the City, CapMetro, and RLPI develop a trail alignment for the Red Line Parkway this year.	123

862	Concern	<p>Uniform language and definition should be used here. The best reference point is the FRA/FHWA document, which states "Setback: Distance from track centerline to trail". The distance figures cited here may be inconsistent with each other, e.g. 2' and 32' may refer to different measurements. Note that conversions can be made to use the FRA/FHWA definition, since all railways referenced use Standard Gauge, which is 4' 8.5" between tracks.</p> <p>Reference: FRA/FHWA document, Figure 9 on p. 59/112: https://railroads.dot.gov/sites/fra.dot.gov/files/2021-06/Rails%20with%20Trails%20Best%20Practices%20and%20Lessons%20Learned.pdf#page=59</p>	123
863	Concern	Again, there was a March 2020 version, prior to this white paper being written. Regardless, the May 2021 version can be referenced at this time.	123
868	Concern	It would be good to cite non-Texas examples. From my research on planning and engineering firms and their expertise, it seems that Texas expertise has suffered from echo-chamber practices, and does not provide much breadth of best practices.	125
866	Concern	This seems to have been erroneously copied from the rails-with-trails section above. This sentence and the next are out of place and almost certainly not true.	126
867	Suggestion	It would be good to generously address trees, bushes, shade, small buildings, lighting, drinking fountains, and other amenities. These often require special consideration within utility corridors.	126
869	Suggestion	Still not sure why the most recent (March 2020, at the time) FRA/FHWA document wasn't cited when this white paper was written. The most recent version (May 2021) should be cited.	128
873	Suggestion	"transit" ==> "railway" or "railroad"	134
874	Suggestion	Much of this content is duplicated from the Shared Use Corridors white paper above in Appendix E, p. 120+/166. My responses in Appendix there also apply to duplicated content here.	134
876	Suggestion	"to be allowed where" ==> "to be allowed on paved and decomposed granite trails where" The state law allows municipalities to exclude e-bikes from natural surface trails.	139
877	Suggestion	Add "Education", and maybe "Signage". Shaping a user culture of safe and respectful use of motorized devices will benefit greatly from expressing preferred behaviors. (This also applies to regular bikes.)	139
878	Question	Do you know if this mileage includes trails from all jurisdictions within Hennepin County, or only Hennepin County jurisdiction trails?	140
879	Other	I couldn't find this figure cited in the linked document.	140
880	Suggestion	I think the intent is probably more than "adequate". Perhaps "attractive" or "helpful"?	144
881	Other	Keep an eye out for 3/23/23 City Council direction to staff to evaluate burying power lines. This could provide great opportunities for mid-block ROW for new trails, especially short connections.	144
882	Suggestion	It would be good to be proactive by researching and pre-designating detour routes for commonly closed trail sections, e.g. recurring community events, sections in high-development areas, along utility corridors, rail ROW. (If I had to guess, I think Vancouver BC might have this practice.) Perhaps this would be a separate bullet point.	144
86	Suggestion	Also other entities - one of our existing urban trail segments goes through an AISD campus, for example. TxDOT, other school districts and charters, Cap Metro maybe in a few places.	146

909	Suggestion	Could add Public Improvement District (PID) funding. This is an allowable tax district under Texas law.	148
910	Suggestion	Burying the lede here.... This should be mentioned in the context of the long 2043 timeline for building out Tier 1 trails.	148
87	Suggestion	How does this run contrary to the parts about underserved communities?	150
913	Suggestion	Seconding Lisa's concern: "Friends of" groups that develop sufficient ongoing capacity, tend to be organized and sustained among people with access to large amounts of money or lots of free time. Too much reliance on this model can work against equity goals. The Plan should at least mention this concern.	150
928	Suggestion	As stated above, the Plan should use terminology consistent with the national FRA/FHWA Rails-with-Trails Best Practices, which defines setback as the distance between the center line of the rail tracks and the edge of the trail. (I.e. there is no example of a 2' setback using this definition.)	157
929	Concern	This would be a helpful place to cite the FRA/FHWA Best Practices minimum recommended setback for constrained areas, which is 10'. For any presumed audience that this appendix is meant to serve, that should be among the few key takeaways.	157
931	Question	Is this meant to say that trail-utility intersections should be treated the same as trail-roadway intersections? That doesn't make sense, so maybe something else is intended with this box and text.	157
933	Concern	The FRA/FHWA Rails-with-Trails Best Practices provides a minimum setback of 10'. So this phrase is not true as stated.	158
934	Concern	The industry term is evidently "setback". "Separation" refers to barriers such as fencing.	158
935	Concern	The industry term is evidently "setback". "Separation" refers to barriers such as fencing. This should state "setback", as should the other iterations in this sentence.	158
936	Question	Who does "our" refer to? Is this a consulting firm or City staff?	158
938	Other	This RTC report defines "setback" in the same way as the FRA/FHWA Best Practices. From the RTC report: "Setback— The lateral distance between the centerline of the nearest track (track located closest to the rail-with-trail) and the nearest edge of the trail or the separation feature (fence, wall, etc.)." https://www.railstotrails.org/resourcehandler.ashx?id=2982#page=27	158
940	Suggestion	The quote from the RTC report was presumably not referring to a 2' *setback*, since that would put the trail between the tracks themselves. The quote from the RTC report is "Some trails are extremely close to the tracks; the Frisco Trail in Fayetteville, Ark. comes as close as two feet from the tracks." (The FRA/FHWA document has a similar statement.) It is presumably a misleading quote, in that it's not referring to setback (formally) but to the distance between the nearest rail and the trail, i.e. something like a 4.7' setback (2' + half of 4' 8.5"). In any case, it's not a 2' setback, so it shouldn't be restated as such here.	158
945	Concern	I ask that this casual statement be removed from the Plan. The City is about to undergo a close study of the Red Line Trail, with Capital Metro, Red Line Parkway Initiative and others to determine an end-to-end alignment for the trail. In the most constrained sections of the corridor (generally the 50' Red Line ROW), this casual limitation is possibly of minor relevance in comparison to the other limitations and opportunities, and could unnecessarily prime the conversation in an unproductive way. At this time, it would be best to lean on citable documents, as listed elsewhere in the Plan, plus including the FRA/FHWA Best Practices document in that list.	158

General comments received between January 27, 2023 and March 20, 2023 on [Public Input](#).

<p>Excellent plan! Keep up the great work and do everything in your power to accelerate implementation, including holding space open for lighter, quicker, cheaper materials as appropriate. These important multivariable issues facing our city and society, in general, need us all to move with a sense of urgency. As many trips as possible must shift to active, ultra-low emission modes of travel. The Urban Trails network provides a special opportunity to provide safe and inviting off-street options to get to meaningful destinations while frequently also connecting us to nature, which is a much needed bonus.</p>
<p>Nearly all Austin trails do not allow motorized vehicles. So, does that exclude scooters and/or e-bikes? I ask because, while I fully support micro-transportation solutions beyond regular bikes, not all of these modes are compatible. There are e-bikes on our trails today exceeding 20mph, which is dangerous for everyone. So...what do we do about this? I did not see it addressed in your plan.</p>
<p>Electric bikes (e-bikes) are allowed on Urban Trails. As of 2019, e-bikes are allowed on all Texas trails except natural surface trails (Transportation Code Title 7, Subtitle C, Chapter 551, Subchapter A).</p> <p>We recognize that the different speeds of users can result in unsafe situations. That's why we have increased our recommend trail width from 12 to 14 feet and we will build dual-track trails, where bicyclists are on a separate path from people walking, whenever it is feasible. Our ability to build dual-track trails is dependent on space, funding, and the environment in which the trail is located.</p> <p>We also created these plans in coordination with the Bicycle Program. Providing more safe, protected, and well-connected on-street bicycle lanes will likely cause more people who are traveling at higher speeds to use these facilities.</p>
<p>Please consider developing plans for north-south trails in South Austin. East-west trails are great, but we've already had significant investment in sidewalk and intersection improvements along Slaughter and William Cannon, and most people want to travel north-south, where the infrastructure along Menchaca, South 1st, South Congress remains inadequate and few alternatives exist.</p>
<p>I agree wholeheartedly with this comment. There are E-W routes I feel safe biking along with my daughter in her bike seat, but trying to ride on Menchaca to the library, for instance, is terrifying - the traffic is fast and incredibly close to the small, poorly maintained sidewalks. If we're focused on connecting people to neighborhood destinations, this is a big gap along Menchaca and S First.</p>
<p>Put the trails where people bike! This plan is a waste of money but at least the planners can virtue signal. Once again we can't do anything for average people living in Austin.</p>
<p>How is this going to prevent homeless populations from just living on the trail. It's being built in the areas with much of that. Will it be a safe trail when that happens?</p>
<p>I appreciate the thought that went into this. Selfishly, I would like to advocate for more of the trail network proposed for east of Springdale to be bumped up from Tier 3 to Tier 2. I think there are some very worthy projects in terms of connectivity for this very unconnected section of town. Specifically, any of the proposed trails connecting the Southern Walnut Creek Trail to the neighborhood north of the trail between Springdale and 183 (across the railroad track). I know it isn't easy to cross the rail line, but that whole neighborhood is isolated and cut-off. Secondly, the proposed trail connecting MLK to 51st St and the Little Walnut Creek Greenbelt. This would also open up the northeast trail system in a big way. Thank you.</p>

Thank you for a well integrated plan that proposes improvements across all quadrants of Austin. The prioritization must be very difficult but this forward progress is wonderful and will get us there in the decades to come, thank you. A few notes.

The lack of bridge in Roy G Guerrero in East Austin has been an embarrassment, glad to see it high on the list.

A new path just west of the Pleasant Valley dam is perhaps out of your control since the town lake foundation is probably working it, but it seems wrongly prioritized considering it very closely duplicates a wonderfully improved path on that dam -- great work there btw.

The Mogan corridor will fully connect the southern walnut creek trail, great addition.

Further improvements on shoal creek to smooth out some differences look very helpful for safety.

The red line trail looks like a cornerstone of connecting north Austin, fingers crossed it stays highly prioritized.

The wells branch trail connector to walnut creek and the onion creek connector to slaughter trail are important north-south fixes to currently disconnected but highly used areas.

Again, thank you. I may not be around to see it all come to fruition but I'm delighted knowing there is a steady stream of significant improvements that will make Austin a better place to live.

I use the 290 trail to Manor which has been torn up at 130 due to construction for months. There are cuts in the curbs for the trail but it's not been reconstructed. It's the Schwob construction co project. Please look into this.

These plans are great. Dogs should be required on leash at all times on these trails

How will you protect cars from breakins happening now as reported on hiking sites on Facebook. Rg My Bonnel. See crime reports via KrimeLab.com. Maybe try APD Crime Viewer. Hope it has instructions now. Thanks.

Please connect Cedar Park / Leander with the rest of Austin (Red Line?). We cannot use all of the new trails closer in if we cannot get to them in the first place. We are cut off up in North Austin.

As someone who commutes primarily on bike these trails have been wonderful to use when they exist. There have been steady improvements I've seen during my 7 years in Austin, I just wish things would move faster. The planned connections from Walnut Creek park under Lamar and i35 will finally add safe options for folks East of the park. The trails are already lively and will only get more popular as the system fills out.

See page 27 "Existing Urban Trail Corridors" Of the 9 trails listed, only one is in South Austin. Even with completion of the Bergstrom Spur years away there will still be big inequities. Prioritize building a shared use path along Williamson Creek Greenbelt from S. First to S. Congress which would provide a critical bike/ped connections for residents, including the Project Connect rail station on S. Congress. This trail is also listed as high priority in the adopted vision plan for central Williamson Creek.

I wish There was an easy, more direct way to get from LBJ HS to the Domain. Crossing 3 highways is not the best and there seems to be demand around this area for this, specially now that new housing has been popping out non-stop for the past year.

Draft looks good. I would like to ride my bike again. Urban trails is a great idea. I would be a good idea to add places of cover (shade) and emergency call boxes at the cover shaded places, along with small water fountains. Why? Usually it has been hotter

and hotter each summer, and the wild hogs hunt the trails.....for joggers, and bikers. I have photos of some wild hogs hanging out.
Plans are great! Very excited for these sustainable and positive transformation of our city!
This plan is great and amazing for Austin and I wish to see it completed. Equally underwhelming is the 20 year time horizon and no additional details on what will be completed when. We are a wealthy modern city. How can it take us 20 years to build just 84 miles of trail through Austin?
Urban Trails are highly engineered complex projects. A typical trail project takes a minimum of 6 years from conception to ribbon cutting. All projects begin with a Preliminary Engineering Report (PER) to determine a route, followed by design, and bidding the project out to construction. Public input is considered throughout the process and typically real estate must be acquired. Funding must also be identified for each stage of the process from PER, to design and construction.
My frustration is not with the process. It's with the very limited funding we have for bigger improvements to non-road infrastructure. We're going to see 5,000 million dollars dedicated to just a highway expansion in Austin when many residents don't even want it. We can barely spend 10s of millions on any other form of transportation when so many of us do want it.
Could TIF be used in more densely populated areas to increase funding for trails? Maybe density bonuses could be given to developers who build or donate sections for a trail.
Agreed. Notwithstanding the complexity noted by "Austin Public Works, Public Information Specialist", I was involved in projects for a major oil company that dwarfed these projects (by a factor of at least 100), and the timescale was significantly shorter from R&D through completion. I'd like to see an accounting of the progress made on the 2014 plan 9 years on. Hundreds and hundreds of pages in these plans to review, and very little substance...
I don't see anything that addresses the safety of the trails. A proposed trail from E St Elmo to E Stassney that runs north of and parallel to Viewpoint Dr currently has a huge population of people camping in that area. There are visible access trails to the camps all along Viewpoint Dr and a huge camp from the dead end at the east end of Viewpoint to E Stassney that's very visible from either end. I live off of Viewpoint which is currently undeveloped on the north side and though I used to hike in the woods where the proposed trail would run, I don't feel safe even walking on that side of Viewpoint anymore.
Please upgrade a few trails between Springdale and US Hwy 183 to "Tier 1". The railroad tracks are a major obstacle to mobility in this area, and it forces pedestrians and cyclists to use unsafe and uncomfortable out of the way alternatives, such as Airport Rd. I'd suggest "Walnut Creek Corridor: Southern Walnut Creek Trail" and "Mokan Corridor" as critical North-South upgrades adjacent to Walnut Creek Trail. Thanks for your hard work! Its good to see Austin getting more connected every day.
The La Loma connector trail has been proposed and would be a huge value add for a small section of trail. I agree with you. https://www.austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Public_Works/Urban_Trails/La_Loma_Board_091819web.pdf
Upgrade Williamson Creek to a Tier 1 priority, has potential to connect to Violet Crown Trail, Onion Creek Greenway (Travis County), Oak Hill trails, Country Creek trails, Onion Creek Metro Park, Bergstrom Spur and with safe protected shared use paths to most of the larger parks and preserves. Also make UP Rail in S Austin a tier 1 priority as a safe N/S corridor to downtown
Can we prioritize oak hill trails from tier 2 to 1? That's an area that's already isolated in terms of trail access and public transit, surrounded by highways. It would be great to be able to leave the neighborhood without having to rely on cars.

Yes we really do need a tunnel under Hwy 183 over to Airport trail along Hwy71
<p>The "MoPac Shared Use Path" which would connect from Shoal Creek's northern trailhead at Highway 183 to the Northern Walnut Creek Trail, is proposed as Tier 2. As an important link in the Big Loop, this segment should be Tier 1.</p> <p>The Shoal Creek crossing between 34th and 38th Streets is currently a low-water crossing with right angles that are challenging for bicycles. This crossing is proposed as Tier 2. Improvements to this crossing should be a Tier 1 priority.</p> <p>The Shoal Creek Trail from 24th-30th is currently proposed as Tier 1. Please share your support for this priority! This trail segment will address the area that needs to be reconnected due to the landslide.</p> <p>A Shoal Creek Trail underpass at 3rd Street is currently proposed as Tier 2. This segment should be Tier 1. This trail segment is a key proposal in the Cypress & Shoal Public Space Strategy, which aims to improve connectivity and safety around 3rd Street and Shoal Creek.</p> <p>Big Loop: The eastern portions of the Big Loop yet to be built, including the MoKan Corridor Trail and the Northern Walnut Creek Trail, are all proposed as Tier 1. Please share your support for this priority!</p> <p>Thank you</p>
The "MoPac Shared Use Path" which would connect from Shoal Creek's northern trailhead at Highway 183 to the Northern Walnut Creek Trail, is proposed as Tier 2. As an important link in the Big Loop, this segment should be Tier 1.
The "MoPac Shared Use Path" which would connect from Shoal Creek's northern trailhead at Highway 183 to the Northern Walnut Creek Trail, is proposed as Tier 2. As an important link in the Big Loop, this segment should be Tier 1.
The Shoal Creek crossing between 34th and 38th Streets is currently a low-water crossing with right angles that are challenging for bicycles. This crossing is proposed as Tier 2. Improvements to this crossing should be a Tier 1 priority.
The Shoal Creek Trail from 24th-30th is currently proposed as Tier 1. I support for this priority! This trail segment will address the area that needs to be reconnected due to the landslide.
A Shoal Creek Trail underpass at 3rd Street is currently proposed as Tier 2. This segment should be Tier 1. This trail segment is a key proposal in the Cypress & Shoal Public Space Strategy, which aims to improve connectivity and safety around 3rd Street and Shoal Creek.
Big Loop: The eastern portions of the Big Loop yet to be built, including the MoKan Corridor Trail and the Northern Walnut Creek Trail, are all proposed as Tier 1. I support this priority!
<p>The "MoPac Shared Use Path" which would connect from Shoal Creek's northern trailhead at Highway 183 to the Northern Walnut Creek Trail, is proposed as Tier 2. As an important link in the Big Loop, this segment should be Tier 1.</p> <p>The Shoal Creek crossing between 34th and 38th Streets is currently a low-water crossing with right angles that are challenging for bicycles. This crossing is proposed as Tier 2. Improvements to this crossing should be a Tier 1 priority.</p> <p>The Shoal Creek Trail from 24th-30th is currently proposed as Tier 1. Please share your support for this priority! This trail segment will address the area that needs to be reconnected due to the landslide.</p> <p>A Shoal Creek Trail underpass at 3rd Street is currently proposed as Tier 2. This segment should be Tier 1. This trail segment is a key proposal in the Cypress & Shoal Public Space Strategy, which aims to improve connectivity and safety around 3rd Street and Shoal Creek.</p> <p>Big Loop: The eastern portions of the Big Loop yet to be built, including the MoKan Corridor Trail and the Northern Walnut Creek Trail, are all proposed as Tier 1. Please share your support for this priority!</p>

Shoal Creek has a lot of dumping that is never cleaned up, like behind the Iconic at Shoal Creek apartments at Crosscreek Drive and Shoal Creek Blvd. This needs to be cleaned and the apartment needs to be held accountable. The litter includes food containers, animal waste and construction materials.

Shoal creek should be walkable from Walnut Creek Park to Downtown, so there needs to be trails, trash cans and non-light polluting lights all along the route. This will be great for people, but also for the creek environment as people will see it, have more connection to it, and will take better care of it.

The city should continue to develop the Little Walnut Creek greenbelt and bring a portion of it into the Southern Walnut Creek trail system, and the Little Walnut Creek Greenbelt should be improved in accordance with the January 2019 community master plan. Currently this green space has not met the goals of the 2019 Strategic mobility plan and the 2019 trailhead project has not completed phase 1 construction despite the awarding of funds over 3 years ago. Beyond these two initiatives, much remains to bring the site to the standards of other greenbelt spaces in the city, especially those on the west side of town. In addition to the improvements listed, I believe there is room within this 206 acre site for at least one soccer-sized field northwest of the proposed amphitheater or along 51st St., and the over 100ft in elevation change of the site can be used to enable natural scenic points to view the surrounding valley and watch planes on final approach to the airport runways due south, possibly with the inclusion of an interactive display using publicly available flight data. The approved 2019 vision plan specifically calls out illegal dumping, homeless encampments, and a lack of community awareness of the site, and all these continue to be present problems. Furthering a sense of disuse is the lack of improvements to the property and poor parking access. The only major lot is that on 51st and 183 created as part of the southern Waller creek hike and bike trail, and this lot does not have a crosswalk or clear sidewalk into the little boggy creek greenbelt despite being across the street and an obvious trail connection identified within the 2019 plan. Complicating efforts to improve the site, the hotel located within the commercially zoned property on the north corner of 51st and 183 has become abandoned and is currently shuttered and gated, providing the opposite feeling of a safe recreation environment intended by the park. If possible the city should condemn and rezone this derelict building and convert the already existing parking to park use and rebuild the building as a restroom and community center, possibly including park maintenance facilities too. With the growth of the east side and increasing development in Mueller and across the 183 corridor, development of this park is crucial to development of east Austin, and better connections can be made to the existing urban trail network by designating the portion of the trail from the pedestrian bridge crossing of 183 at 51st to Springdale road a tier 1 trail as an extension of the existing spur coming from the lower Walnut Creek hike and hike trail to the YMCA across the pedestrian bridge from the park. I believe with the proper development this park can provide recreational opportunities second only to those seen at Zilker park and Barton creek, with the urban trails being the core recreational focus of the park.

My comment is simple. Please prioritize way finding maps for every urban trail, whether newly created or already there. This info is crucial to making our urban trails actually usable for all citizens, whether they are seasoned hikers/walkers/bikers or novices, young or old, mobile or in need of mobility aids.

Since Austin is considerably denser than San Antonio or Houston, it makes sense that we have less urban trail mileage. However, a good portion of the urban trail placement is underwhelming because they aren't in very dense or urban areas. Some more urban trails along future orange / blue lines would be great to see.

Please build out more South Austin trails!

All looks great, but I would add to rename the Shoal Creek trail to the Janet Fish trail as she pioneered the trail and got it going. Many women are not recognized for the work they do, yet there is a small bridge on the trail named after her, but she deserves more than that. Rename the entire Shoal Creek Trail to the Janet Fish Shoal Creek Trail.

Please make sure to accelerate development of the trails, such as implementing all Tier 2 Trails by 2030. Please also increase signage to make trails more accessible. In addition, as much connectivity as possible would be great on major crossings (ie, Airport, I35, 183, etc)
Architecture designer
Widen the sidewalk along N. Lamar between 34th and downtown ASAP. This could become a viable commuter route for many central Austin neighborhoods (Bryker Woods, Allendale, Pemberton, West Campus...) Once they add a rail line onto Guadalupe, car traffic along N. Lamar will be even worse. Sharing a narrow sidewalk with pedestrians is dangerous for cyclists, joggers, dog-walkers, etc.
Please consider bike lane and road improvements to Burleson rd from McKinney Falls Pkwy to 71, Montopolis from Burleson to Grove, Grove from Montopolis to Riverside, Colton Bluff Springs Rd, Alum Rock Dr, and Nuckuls Crossing. This area of Burleson is currently very eroded and the unprotected bike lanes are not usable. We also need bike lane sweepers as bike lanes often have debris that makes it dangerous for riders! Lastly, please put underserved southeast Austin trails as higher tier, like Dry Creek South greenway (to help bikers more safely get to COTA), Onion Creek trail and metro park trail, Marble Creek Greenway, and trails that connect southeast metro park to Richard Moya park.
Please accelerate implementation of this plan to complete all Tier 1 trails by 2033. This is too important, and Austin is expanding too quickly, to wait!
Rode most of Shoal Creek Trail/Bldv recently. It is in much better shape than previously. Signage is nice and underpasses are much cleaner than before. Nice not to be overwhelmed by urine smell this time out. Section before 31st St where you have to walk your bike and the rock cliff looks unsafe is awkward. Maybe better signage away from there for cyclists. Ride hike and bike trail a lot. In good shape. Really helps Austin to be a great city. New trail around Holly Power Plant is great. Would be nice to have a bridge back at Krieg fields area. Would be nice to have small bridge replaced and fix of "the ditch" on Country Club Trail.
I am grateful that the city is paying attention to our trails and asking for feedback! This is a great project! My two cents: I would just like to say that I support Shoal Creek being a Tier One priority. Right now, though it is considered part of the trail system, there are many aspects of it that make it dysfunctional as a legitimate option for bicyclists. Of course there's the landslide north of 24th, (which seems to be placed incorrectly on the map) but also in the wooded section between Shoal Creek Blvd and the Janet Fish Bridge, the asphalt is so torn up you can barely ride it without a mountain bike. It's full of potholes and huge gaps. Also, in several locations, especially south of 9th, the path is so narrow that I feel as a bicyclist I am menacing any pedestrians who happen to be on the path. Especially on a weekend when people are out the path just isn't wide enough, and so I use on-street routes despite how much I would love a car-free creekside path. It's actually dangerous going around some of the blind curves with such narrow paths. Also, of course the trail isn't suitable for bicyclists on the cliffside section from 29th to 31st, and it seems that the only reasonable option would be to expand the sidewalk on Lamar. Thank you for receiving this feedback! Narrowness of the trail and the state of repair are my two big concerns.
The old Cedar driveway which runs from approximately 8800 block of Old Manor Rd eastward to the trail is currently being used in the daytime by the trucks, trailers, and equipment of the tree shredding operation for the debris from the ice storm. Can somebody advocate that as part of the restoration to the status quo ante this track be graded and graveled when they have finished?
These maps are extremely hard to understand I still don't see any safe crossings from west of Mopac to east of Mopac. You have the one? That I know is very unsafe. The Johnson Creek usually has homeless or drug addicts on it...crossing anywhere from Lake Austin is a death sentence. Crossing bikes from Westover or Windsor is the scariest as well.... try and point out the lanes to nowhere because I've biked to those and then poof I'm on a scary street... white stripes do not keep bikers safe.

<p>Would love to see more east-west connectivity and development of the Pershing Trail and those around the Givens Park area.</p>
<p>Please consider the surrounding neighborhood's needs when sacrificing roadway space for walking/ bike paths. For example, 31st Street has been made very dangerous outside of a school as the road was shrunk from 2 lanes to 1.</p>
<p>Some detailed comments. Here's four connections that didn't make the cut and all deserve Tier 1 status imho: a) A short (200 ft) connection from north end of West Cow path to existing wide sidewalk requires very limited acquisition and one bike/ped bridge over Yett creek. Much less invasive than tearing up Yett Creek park and allows N-S access from Riata without confronting US 183. A mere 5000 Apple employees would appreciate this. b) Current design of Walnut Creek trail immediately east of I-35 has no crossing to points south of Walnut Creek (at least until Dessau). A bridge at the tiny spur called Olmos Dr. (off Walnut Crk Dr) would solve this. Without it the creek remains a barrier to a genuinely safe, non-grade crossing of I-35. c) No connection shown under the UP tracks along tributary 7 of Walnut creek to the "Duval Connection to MoPac shared use path" even though the city (Watershed) and the UP reached design stage for culvert replacement 7 yrs ago. What happened? d) No connector from Great Northern to ...yes, Great Northern, underneath Anderson Lane. You don't have to build out the MoPac trail (shown on opposite side of the tracks on your map) for this 700 ft. traffic evader to happen. And three that made your map but deserve an upgrade: a) As others have pointed out, the "Mopac Shared Use Path" deserves tier 1 status, at least from north end of Shoal Crk trail to Balcones Woods Drive. This would be godsend for NW Austin, including the Domain / Pickle campus area. b) since Duval Rd Connection to Mopac Shared Use Path already exists, if in a dilapidated form, why can't it be readily upgraded? Also great, safe connection to N Walnut C Trail thru Balcones Park. c) the Country Club Creek Trail Extension from Elmont to Crossing place should be upgraded to tier one even if the Creek trail itself is not. Wish there was a way to label these on your cool GIS Network Map, ... thanks.</p>
<p>RE your item (c) - the railroad is apparently balking at including a bike/ped connection with the culvert replacement. Urban trails staff were initially enthusiastic, but Watershed protection is apparently unwilling to push this issue. Regrettable as this is a great opportunity to install a safe crossing at a much lower cost than a stand-alone tunnel or overhead crossing. https://www.austintexas.gov/department/whispering-valley-and-west-cow-path-flood-risk-reduction</p>
<p>Please consider connecting the proposed trail at Givens with the Red Bluff Preserve through Ledesma. We love accessing Red Bluff from our neighborhood and would feel better about doing so with our small child, as many neighborhood families would, if Ledesma was considered a part of the urban route plan. As is, there are poor sidewalks and even poorer barriers for speeding between Givens Park and the back creek entrance of Red Bluff starting at the end of Ledesma.</p>
<p>Great to see progress but please consider what we are destroying when these roads/trails are built! Lots of these proposed trails are smack in the middle of heavily used mountain bike and neighborhood hiking paths! I get that there is a desire to develop more accessible infrastructure. But the human urge to clear cut forest and pave needs to be balanced with what is really a needed improvement. I'm thinking about South Austin specifically. When the new Violet Crown section near Home Depot was built our neighborhood lost a huge swath of beautiful forest and meadow. Why did the clear cutting need to be 18 feet wide? That's not a trail it's a road. Half the width would be more than enough. I was told that highway funding requires this. That's not a good enough answer to destroy our green space. Many of these trails would never be used for bike commuting. 99% of Austin is already developed, maybe some of these remaining green spaces should be left alone. Or minimizing impact should be taken seriously.</p>
<p>Please make vct trail from veloway to sh45 north trailhead a priority. Leave existing dirt trail from slaughter creek and mopac to la crosse as is. Dedicate those funds to build more dirt trails southward.</p>

<p>The proposed trail system shows a trail along Buttermilk Trail but there aren't any comments on this section of the trail. Why is that?</p>
<p>The proposed trails along Buttermilk Creek are on the southside of the creek and will run along private property of existing housing stock. Why would a trail be proposed to be put on existing private housing land? Why not propose the trail to run along the north side of Buttermilk Creek where there are three vacant lots and lots with apartment complexes on them where there is more land to run something like this on?</p>
<p>Hello,</p> <p>Maps contained within the plan are for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. It does not represent an on-the-ground survey and represents only the approximate relative location of property boundaries.</p> <p>The alignment (placement) of a trail is determined following a preliminary engineering study and is further refined during the design phase.</p> <p>Thanks for taking time to review!</p>
<p>The Shoal Creek Conservancy's plan in the North Shoal Creek neighborhood (Segment B-10, p.66) includes a future trail connection along the creek between Anderson and Steck. The North Shoal Creek Neighborhood Association and Shoal Creek Conservancy are currently working together to develop this trail. I would like to suggest that this future trail be added to this plan</p>
<p>The Shoal Creek crossing between 34th and 38th Streets is currently a low-water crossing with right angles that are challenging for bicycles. This crossing is proposed as Tier 2. Improvements to this crossing should be a Tier 1 priority.</p>
<p>The plan should ensure there is equitable mileage developed per council district, and ensure we are connecting current and future commercial developments. Examples I have mostly revolve around north Austin such as Apple - development of access along Parmer Lane, access to/from the Red Line trail to development on Parmer, further access through North Austin MUD 1 owned trails along Rattan Creek to points west.</p>
<p>Would love to see the La Loma Connector completed. https://www.austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files/Public_Works/Urban_Trails/La_Loma_Board_091819web.pdf</p>
<p>Please create better signage to make Austin's trails easier to navigate. The City has been falling short of its goal to provide wayfinding signage on all urban trails. Wayfinding on all trails is a critical piece of an interconnected urban trails network.</p>
<p>The pilot project on Shoal Creek and W 31st St runs right through a grove of trees compressing the soil in the trees' critical root zone. This segment of the pilot project trail runs parallel to the existing paved hike and bike trail so it is redundant. Please preserve our green space and trees by redesigning this pilot project trail so that it uses the existing paved trail.</p>

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON BICYCLE DRAFT PLAN

This document includes all public comments received on the Draft Bicycle Plan between January 27, 2023 and March 20, 2023 on [Public Input](#).

Theme	Count	Action
Affordability, Gentrification, Displacement	4	Noted
Bicycle Parking and Theft	17	Noted and clarified
Community Trust and Relationships	1	Noted
Construction, Private Development, and Special Events - Detour Issues	12	Noted
Definitions	5	Noted and clarified
E-Bikes	13	Clarified e-bikes influence on bicycle planning
E-Bikes - Concern with Fast E-Bikes	6	Noted
Education - For Drivers	3	Noted
Education - For People Riding Bicycles	1	Noted
Education and Encouragement	17	Noted. Added action for language accessibility of programs
Education and Encouragement - To School	10	Added goals for "bike trains"
Enforcement	5	Noted
Enforcement - Parking in Bicycle Lanes	15	Noted
Enforcement - Support for More	2	Noted
Engagement - Bike Plan & ATXWBR	7	Noted
Engagement - Community Ambassadors	1	Noted
Equity	1	Noted
Equity - Engagement	1	Noted
Equity - Project Selection and Engagement	2	Noted
General Support	5	Noted
Implementation - External Alignment	2	Noted and clarified
Implementation - Funding	5	Noted
Implementation - Internal Alignment	6	Noted and clarified
Implementation - Partnerships	4	Noted
Infrastructure	18	Noted
Infrastructure - AAA Bicycle Priority Network - Clarification on New Additions	1	New additions to the AAA Bicycle Network have been clarified in maps and statistics
Infrastructure - AAA Bicycle Priority Network - Gaps	12	Noted
Infrastructure - AAA Bicycle Priority Network - Suggested Additions	1	Noted
Infrastructure - AAA Bicycle Priority Network - Support for Faster Buildout	16	Noted
Infrastructure - Accessibility	2	Noted
Infrastructure - Bicycle Boulevards	4	Noted
Infrastructure - Bike Lane Obstructions	1	Noted

Infrastructure - Coordination with City Operations	1	Noted
Infrastructure - Design Details	8	Noted
Infrastructure - Design for Safety	7	Noted
Infrastructure - Design Principles	5	Noted
Infrastructure - Implementation Strategies	7	Noted
Infrastructure - Lighting	5	Noted
Infrastructure - Location Specific	42	Noted
Infrastructure - Maintain Motor Vehicle Operations	2	Noted
Infrastructure - Maintenance	9	Noted and clarified
Infrastructure - Maintenance - Street Sweeping	7	Noted
Infrastructure - Maintenance - Vegetation	3	Noted
Infrastructure - Parking and Bicycle Lanes	14	Noted
Infrastructure - Pavement Surface	6	Noted and clarified
Infrastructure - Prioritization	14	Noted
Infrastructure - Protected Bicycle Lanes	10	Noted
Infrastructure - Protected Bicycle Lanes - Concerns with Two-way Facilities	7	Noted
Infrastructure - Protected Bicycle Lanes - Driveways	1	Noted
Infrastructure - Protected Bicycle Lanes - Support for Higher Quality Protection	36	Goals and narrative have been revisited to support higher quality bikeway protection
Infrastructure - Protected Intersections & Roundabouts	5	Noted
Infrastructure - Recreational Bicycle Facilities	7	Elaborated on the types and benefits
Infrastructure - Safe Routes to School	9	Noted
Infrastructure - Shade	6	Noted
Infrastructure - Shared Streets	2	Noted
Infrastructure - Sight Distance	1	Noted
Infrastructure - Signals	2	Noted
Infrastructure - Signals - Detection Issues	7	Noted
Infrastructure - Signals - Timing	4	Noted
Infrastructure - Speed Management	2	Noted
Infrastructure - Support for Green Street Elements	1	Noted
Infrastructure - Support for Recent Improvements	1	Noted
Infrastructure - Trails	3	Noted
Infrastructure - Trails - Dual Trails	4	Noted
Infrastructure - Trails - Natural Surface Trails	6	Noted and clarified
Infrastructure - Transit Stop Design	1	Noted
Infrastructure - TxDOT Roadways	15	Noted
Infrastructure - Wayfinding	1	Noted

Introduction - Acknowledgements of Systemic Racism	4	Noted
Introduction - Private Development	1	Noted
Land Planning and Code Requirements	7	Noted
Measuring Success	5	Noted
Miscellaneous	6	Noted
Mobility Services - Bike Share	9	Noted
Mobility Services - Scooters	7	Noted
Policies	1	Noted
Policies - Modal Priorities	5	Noted
Private Development	1	Noted
Private Development - Narrow Streets	1	Noted
Private Development - Plan for a gridded street system	3	Noted
Private Development - Require New Bicycle Infrastructure	2	Noted
Quality of Bicycle Transportation - Current	2	Noted
Quality of Bicycle Transportation - Proposed	1	Noted
Safety - Crash Data	6	Noted
Safety - Issues	13	Noted
Safety - Reduce Motor Vehicle Speeds	11	Noted
Suggested Clarifications	38	Addressed as appropriate
Traffic Laws	9	Noted
Transit Integration	12	Noted
Typos & Errata	105	Addressed
Vision	1	Noted

Comment ID	Type	Comment	Page
912	Concern	<p>I just want to be perfectly clear that ATD has repeatedly demonstrated they are unserious about active transportation. They don't care about you. Go home.</p> <p>You don't put freeways in complex urban environments if you want people to walk or bike. This isn't TXDOT's fault. TXDOT didn't build riverside or guad. Why is 12th street a 6 lane road? I've never seen anybody driving on it.</p> <p>Why does every single intersection have a right AND left turn lane but the bike lane just fucking disappears?</p> <p>Why are there literally no safe places to cross I-35 downtown (**not funded by roy or ann butler)</p> <p>Why does my girlfriend live half a mile away, but I have to bike 1.5 miles to see her?</p> <p>Why does red river from Dean Keaton to 45th look like a freeway? Isn't it a pretty important route into campus? I thought students walked and biked? Why does the design of duval allow drivers to do 45mph? Why do the speed bumps force drivers into the bike lane?</p> <p>Why are there ANY streets leading into campus that don't have bike lanes? 24th? 21st? Game day traffic is only 6 days a year and it's dangerous for students and workers to bike the other 359.</p> <p>But look I can bitch and moan all I want but I can't actually fix this. Only you guys can make the streets a safer place to exist and I'm BEGGING you to realize that your efforts fucking suck and they're barely helping. YOU HAVE GOT TO REASSESS WHAT IS IMPORTANT AND THE ONLY IMPORTANT THING IS THE EXPEDITIOUS REDEDICATION OF URBAN SPACE TO ACTIVE FORMS OF TRANSPORTATION.</p> <p>What we currently have is a sick joke. You're not trying</p>	1
806	Suggestion	<p>Duplicating this comment to the top: Bike network should also include future bikeways on undeveloped land. The City has existing authority to create a streets master plan to grid and connect streets when those sites are developed. Staff should take the opportunity to grid everything within the city limits and EJT for (narrow) streets, urban trails, and bikeways. This work done now will pay dividends in the next 10-100 years.</p>	1
606	Concern	<p>ATD has failed to provide any meaningful alternatives to driving, even within the downtown area. This report has lofty ambitions and inadequate plans to achieve them</p>	1

239	Concern	<p>REMOVE CAPTCHA PLEASE.</p> <p>Every single comment takes more than 2 minutes, just to complete the asinine CAPTCHA. This is an absurd limitation to feedback, are you trying to get us to give up? I understand the first time, but for every single comment? And of course it's the slow version where it loads additional images. And half the time it tells you you're wrong. Totally unacceptable for a public forum. Do better.</p> <p>I bet this document could have 50x the engagement if you made it easier to do so. Complete policy failure by whoever designed this web interface.</p> <p>Oh, and thanks for censoring s-t-u-p-i-d from my comment. Really adds to the experience.</p>	1
332	Resolution	<p>Hello. Thank you for bringing this to our attention. The captcha should only be requested when a user leaves their first comment - but there was an error when the document was embedded on this website. The IT team has resolved this issue.</p> <p>The tool that hosts this document has a profanity filter. We have asked the team if there is a way to turn this off, but it is not a request they have had before. The company is looking into it.</p>	1
605	Concern	ATD has failed to provide any meaningful alternatives to driving, even in the downtown area. They are not serious about shifting modeshare, and this report is mostly posturing.	1
483	Concern	All of this is a waste of time and money as long as the police don't feel obligated to enforce the laws that protect vulnerable road users. Bike paths are parking zones and passing lanes for motorists in my neighborhood. I haven't seen a cop hand out moving violation in years. As long the paths aren't clean and drivers are breaking the law with impunity you're creating death traps. Why did the city pass a safe passing law if no one obeys it at all?	1
429	Concern	It's gratifying to see micro-mobility being considered in this document. However, the requisite planning, regulation and full consideration of implementing this technology is lacking. Mixing 28mph powered vehicles with small children learning to ride a bike, pedestrians, mothers with strollers, etc. is a recipe for disaster. Trail segmentation and width must be reconsidered to accommodate this coming mobility form. Before we waste more time on an obsolete plan and infrastructure, we must plan for the future.	2
46	Suggestion	typo	12
110	Suggestion	to	12
45	Suggestion	typo	12
47	Suggestion	typo	12
554	Other	Bike lanes are not a legitimate cause of displacement- You're not being serious	13
492	Concern	Including bicycle, tricycle, scooters is interesting utt doesn't address the bicycle as a commuter device. Public transport is a disaster in Austin. In Holland people bicycle many miles to work. Why not in Austin?	13
493	Concern	Including scooters in this plan is a mistake unless it is accompanied by a plan to have the scooters act in a much safer manner. The scooter providers really need to up their game in educating the scooter users in safe use of bike lanes.	13
553	Suggestion	IDK could your focus area maybe be a useable network of car-free streets?	13
111	Suggestion	typo	13

655	Concern	What is proposed isn't an effective network, it's a disjoint collection of streets. The current system too frequently dead-ends routes on high traffic T-intersections and the proposed streets only add to that.	14
6	Question	Is this a connection between Crossing Place and Wickersham at the end of Elmont that I see? I hope so! Walking or biking from anything in the Crossing Pl neighborhood to Riverside HEB, or to the Hike & Bike Trail or anyone else is terrible currently. You have to go all the way around on Riverside, or go through the currently sketchy trail through the woods with a hole in the fence.....	15
113	Suggestion	delete "that"	16
112	Suggestion	a	16
632	Concern	I believe shade, such as from trees, is a critical component considering how hot Austin gets and considering how the weather will continue to warm for decades.	16
635	Concern	These two-way segregated bike lanes are problematic in a lot of ways. 1. Not maintained -- full of debris, potholes, obstacles -- bicycles forced into the worst part of the street. 2. Joggers love them -- which is good for them, but not so good for bicycles. 3. The furniture used to separate these lanes from car traffic can become hazards themselves -- loose concrete buttons, broken plastic poles -- they end up in the bike lanes making them dangerous. 4. Car cross-traffic does not expect 2-way bicycle traffic -- they'll pull right in front of a bike. 5. Segregated paths might be great on really busy streets like Guadalupe, but they're really unnecessary on lower-traffic streets like Speedway and Shoal Creek. Give us a segregated path to get to Central Market or to help us get across highways. But otherwise, not really appropriate on most streets.	18
506	Concern	I do not like using the 2-way bike lanes. If you are going against traffic, drivers don't think to look for you. Destination on the other side of the street are not accessible easily. This photo is comical in the poor use of the lane as mentioned by another commenter.	18
494	Concern	This photo exemplifies the need for education in using bike lanes. You have a woman riding against oncoming bike traffic and you have bikers weaving their way through pedestrians on a sidewalk where there is a bike path.	18
633	Concern	These are incredibly dangerous and everyone hates them. Turning left in a bike lane like this is extremely dangerous. As a cyclist you have to watch in front of you and behind you in the bike and in the road. Additionally, cars don't know what to do and just assume you will stay in the bike lane.	18
173	Suggestion	Support help - needs something here. maybe "and"	19
174	Question	comma?	19
175	Question	New sentence?	20
114	Suggestion	delete apostrophe	20
356	Question	Huh? Confused about the dots you are trying to connect here between the Dutch slave trade and the American slave trade and Dutch bikeways and American bikeways...what?	20
115	Suggestion	and	20
767	Concern	This is false. Building insufficient housing, having insufficient public safety nets, among many other reasons causes displacement. Property taxes are de facto wealth taxes. Going further, property taxes fund our schools and other public goods in a much fairer way than other taxes. Broad-based taxes funding progressive outcomes - education et al - are good.	22
176	Suggestion	add "distance"	22

636	Concern	Okay... I guess... But it really seems like the investment in infrastructure in East Austin is only happening now that the east-side is gentrifying. When it was predominantly people of color living there, you couldn't find a safe bike lane. But now that the people of color are moving out, suddenly we want to right past wrongs? Yeah.... I'm skeptical.	22
363	Concern	"The real estate and redevelopment industries continue to actively support segregation and displacement" -- this is a pretty far fetched statement to present as fact.	22
116	Suggestion	plan's	22
177	Suggestion	Keep with next text, now widows or orphans please.	24
88	Suggestion	Figure 1-3?	25
117	Suggestion	typo	25
118	Suggestion	typo	27
178	Suggestion	Make these three challenges bullet points please	27
119	Suggestion	typo	28
179	Question	Streets?	28
120	Suggestion	7 Council Members elected at large	29
515	Other	Really excited to see things like this being dedicated to bike infrastructure! Using existing structures/fabric creates exciting and diverse mobility for a more interesting experience. As someone who has biked on the sidewalk of this bridge before it became a bike path - I love it, please encourage more of this adaptive reuse when possible!	29
5	Suggestion	While the statement "completed trail to the airport" is true, the trail is not safe by any definition. The section that follows Old Bastrop Highway is very dangerous. there MUST be some hard separation between the bike path and the highway. Jersey barriers would be perfect. As it is now car are driving on the bike path frequently.	29
121	Concern	This is a misleading assertion. It seems intended to convey that we've built 50% of the original network envisioned in 2014, which we haven't. We've built some of that network, plus a lot of other AAA facilities that were added to the network once they were built.	30
122	Suggestion	typo	30
888	Concern	This is a flawed assumption. With the explosion of e-bikes, trips of much longer than 3 miles are now not just possible, but increasingly popular. Therefore, it is NOT appropriate to focus protected bike lanes on only short trip zones. Instead, protected bike lanes should be the norm in EVERY case; exceptions should be rare and difficult to justify.	31
637	Suggestion	There should be some acknowledgement in this document that the fastest growing part of the bicycle community rides e-bikes. Infrastructure and design is usually targeted to meet the needs of the weakest, slowest, and least experienced cyclists. But a rapidly growing segment of our transportation is made up of people riding e-bikes. In a lot of ways, e-bike riders are like the "A-Level" cyclists who ride fast, and can keep up with the flow of traffic. Our bicycle plan should include this very fast-growing segment of commuters.	31
123	Suggestion	typo	31
516	Suggestion	Part of creating safe bike lanes is not only making a dedicated space for cyclists, but also altering the adjacent space for cars. If a roadway is still encouraging fast speeds through its built language, then drivers will not alter their actions to be safer for cyclists/pedestrians even if there is a bike lane. Consider reducing the width of the lanes, reducing sight lines, adding trees close to the car lanes, etc there are many tried ways to make cars slow down and pay more attention.	31

638	Suggestion	I have been impressed what paint can do to create a buffer with traffic. When Speedway was repaved recently, and painted with wide, double-solid white lines creating a 2-foot buffer between the bike lanes and the cars everything was great. The paint clearly indicated that cars needed to stay out of the bike lane. Later when the plastic poles were added, they were superfluous -- the paint was already doing a good job, and the plastic poles didn't make the street any better. Segregated bike lanes or bike trails on very busy streets (e.g. Airport Boulevard) are very welcome. But we don't need them on streets like Bull Creek -- on those streets segregated bike lanes actually make things worse. Wide, double-solid white paint is really all you need.	31
495	Concern	The drivers in Austin do not pay sufficient attention to bicyclists and appear to have little knowledge of bicyclist rights. What money is being spent on driver awareness programs?	31
180	Question	this sentence looks incomplete	31
507	Concern	S. Lamar is still terrible for cycling all these years later.	31
883	Suggestion	either buses need to carry more and different types of bikes of you need actually secure bike parking at transit hubs or else this doesn't work.	32
124	Suggestion	A	32
517	Other	This is important and should always been an explicit responsibility	32
181	Question	Confusing: If affordable is in yellow then all of West Austin is unaffordable? I get what you are trying to show but needs to be explained better	33
182	Concern	almost looks like the diagrams are switched. The one with the biggest yellow shows that the places farther from the center city are unaffordable should be the one that includes transportation.	33
795	Suggestion	Strike "development pays for itself". We should not make new people coming into the city - whether they be the next generation, immigrants, refugees, or migrants - primarily shoulder the burden of funding public goods. The city is for all who want to live here, not just incumbents. We wouldn't hand parent(s) a tax bill at the delivery room. Likewise, we should focus on broad based public funding for public goods. New people are not a negative impact.	34
796	Suggestion	Oxford comma	34
183	Question	2 spaces?	36
518	Concern	The integration of e-bikes, etc. needs to be better considered. I find it terrifying to be walking on a sidewalk/bikelane combo (like Pedernales, or the Hike and Bike trail), and passed by an e-bike at 35MPH. They are more suited for the street than for any path open to people walking.	38
496	Suggestion	The number of electric scooters should be significantly reduced. They are a hazard to all ages bike lanes. Increase the number of rental bikes.	38
364	Concern	This qualification is an overreach. For better or worse, these plans need to be taken as policy direction until or unless City Council offers updated direction.	39
125	Suggestion	principles	39
438	Suggestion	Austin Ridge Riders respectfully requests that recreational off-road cycling, like mountain biking, BMX, cyclocross, and youth-oriented bicycle playgrounds and pump tracks be discussed in this document. We can assist in writing those portions, or connecting with you with a consultant like International Mountain Bike Association (IMBA) to add appropriate language. So, for section, I would suggest, "Trails and bikeways bring people to and through parks and natural areas (particularly those with mountain bike trails, BMX facilities, and other recreational cycling facilities) without the impacts of motor vehicles."	40

468	Suggestion	One major factor that discourages the use of bicycles for short trips is a concern that they will be stolen, despite the use of locks and other anti-theft devices. Perhaps the city could encourage or subsidize the installation of bike-locking racks with obvious security cameras monitoring the area. Or even allowing for bikes to be stowed and locked inside retail establishments, where there is much more exposure and less opportunity for theft.	40
497	Suggestion	Bicycles are very susceptible to theft in Austin. I would suggest the Dutch approach of Fietsenstalling (bike parking) whereby an inside area is designated for bikes to be locked up for a small fee. Check In/Out of bikes is usually managed by an economically disadvantaged individual.	40
126	Suggestion	that	41
650	Suggestion	If a Complete Streets approach will be a guiding framework for this plan, Austin should consider updating the City's 2014 Complete Streets policy to incorporate some of the newer standards and best practices established by Smart Growth America and the National Complete Streets Coalition like prioritizing vulnerable users and solutions that account for equity.	42
127	Suggestion	This subheading seems out of place.	42
188	Question	Is the parenthetical phrase in the right place?	42
189	Question	Layout issue?	42
128	Suggestion	Delete?	42

653	Suggestion	As a member of my former Nghbrhd Assoc, I was responsible for getting bike lanes constructed in my community, and when I was studying architecture in Europe, I was exposed to comprehensive bike&pedestrian systems in several countries. As a result I have these comments: (1.) Bike lanes should be <u>raised</u> above street level and integrated as parallel lanes w/ widened sidewalks/pedes. pathways. Painted stripes and plastic tubes do not offer real safety and in fact only provide <u>false sense of security</u> . In Vienna, Amsterdam, etc. bike lanes are raised to sidewalk level; they are <u>not</u> constructed in the streets! (2.) Any planning on alternative transportation routes adjacent to streets must also deal with locations of light poles and power poles in the R.O.W., which take up valuable space and create dangerous obstacles. We need a plan and funding to locate these underground as much as possible. (3.) When I was thirty, I could ride a bike across town, but now, over 20 yrs later, that's no longer possible. We have to realize that not everyone is going to get out of their car and on to a bike, and that current trnsit systems don't always go where we need to! That means that instead of narrowing and/or eliminating vehicular lanes, we should be locating bike lanes and wider sidewalks to the sides of existing roadways. The only way that we're going to be able to deal with the rapid growth of the Austin population is to have an "all in" truly multi-modal approach to transit. Trying to force people out of cars and on to bikes simply will not work for a substantial number of the city's population, due to age, health, etc. A 60 yr old doctor or lawyer living in the hills in west austin isn't going to be able to ride a bike to the office, especiaally when it's ninety degrees and 80% hunidity! We need all of these: rail, bike lanes, and continuous sidewalks, but for the foreseeable future we're also going to need lanes for private vehicles, whether they be combustion, electric, hybrid, or hydrogen-powered....!! We can't improve traffic in Austin by making it worse for one form to the advantage of another... We all need to appreciate that *social equity also applies to people selecting the most appropriate form of transit for themselves, rather than being forced into a decision*. As someone who worked for over a decade to get bike lanes in my community, supports rail in Austin, and has lived in European cities with comprehensive, integrated transit systems, I feel qualified in making these suggestions/comments.	43
439	Suggestion	Austin Ridge Riders respectfully requests that International Mountain Bike Association's "IMBA's Guide to Building Sweet Singletrack" and "Bike Parks: IMBA's Guide to New School Trails" should be added. We also suggest that "Guidelines for a Quality Trail Experience (2017)" be added. https://www.blm.gov/sites/blm.gov/files/Guidelines-for-a-Quality-Trail-Experience-2017.pdf This document should include several pages on off-road recreational cycling that the road infrastructure connects recreational cyclists to. Therefore, citations to the standards documents mentioned above are advisable.	43
498	Concern	If there were white poles guarding the bike lane (as in Austin) most of them would have been hit or sheared off by traffic. Use concrete barriers or buttons.	44
640	Concern	Concrete buttons come loose, and they end up in the bike lane. They are very, very dangerous. Plastic poles are fine, but we ONLY need them on VERY busy streets. Plastic poles are just annoying on low-traffic streets.	44
807	Suggestion	A "bad" level of service score is a safer environment for peds and cyclists.	44

639	Suggestion	A wide, double-solid white line works very well. On a street this busy, maybe it makes sense to add some plastic poles, too. But most of our streets are not this busy. Double-white lines like this are quite sufficient on most streets.	44
7	Suggestion	Is there actually maintenance? Where and when are the narrow streetsweepers being used? I have never seen one and am on a bike almost every day exploring our city. I occasionally take the time to drag a roller magnet on our bike lanes and on the average pick up 20# of metal in a 10 mile stretch. This is not good for bikes or cars. Tires are expensive and I would guess that over half of the riders in town do not know how to fix a flat.	46
508	Concern	Maintenance is sorely lacking.	46
622	Suggestion	Wayfinding is an important goal. I'd like to see more maps/signage at trail entrances/exits, and along bike lanes - perhaps add QR codes to Austin's interactive bike map to signage along bike routes.	46
143	Suggestion	This is a misleading assertion. We have not completed 50% of the AAA network envisioned in 2014.	46
235	Suggestion	Non-parallel sentence construction.	47
519	Concern	This type of narrow lane on the side of the road is too dangerous and should not be considered as a viable network option. Cars see this as a "shoulder" and will swerve into it to avoid debris on the road. There is a lane like this on Ed Bluestein Blvd North that is 4'-6' wide, with traffic moving at 75MPH next to it, and even occasionally needing to cross the bike lane (for example at the MLK intersection). My only thought here is that the planning and implementation of this lane was never reviewed by anyone but engineers in the abstract. I've never seen this lane used by a biker. Bikers instead ride on the adjacent pedestrian sidewalk for safety.	47
634	Concern	Before building more of these, can the designers and engineers be required themselves to make a left turn with lots of traffic?	47
144	Suggestion	by	47
145	Suggestion	ly	48
42	Suggestion	Seriously enforcing traffic laws would be a great way to make streets safer. The people breaking the laws can pay the entire cost of enforcement. All streets would be safer, not just the ones in your plans. Some people may choose to leave Austin. That's okay. Other people would be attracted to Austin. After being hit the second time, I mostly quit biking for transportation. I see most of the problems in time, but the ones I don't see can finish me. You have big brains, big data and big plans. But nobody will enforce traffic laws or make people keep sidewalks clear. Disgusted.	48
240	Concern	Unsure what "reduce system kinetic energy" means here. Kinetic energy is a product of mass and velocity. One cannot reduce kinetic energy without reducing velocity.	48
500	Other	<p>From your note, you can reduce kinetic energy by reducing mass as well. I interpreted it to mean we should focus on reducing velocity AND mass throughout the system. For example, each single-occupant car trip that's replaced by a bike trip reduces both variables.</p> <p>So redesigning streets to be more human-focused can have a greater impact on overall kinetic energy reduction than trying to enforce speeding laws on car-centric streets.</p>	48

431	Suggestion	Strategies are limited as long as the automobile transportation is not significantly slowed down and red light runners are stopped. Make it expensive to speed! Given that there is little traffic enforcement and tickets given out by the Police is an inefficient system of law enforcement, we must have mounted cameras as is the case in many cities around the world.	48
486	Concern	I bike every day and there are so many safety issues, many the result of weak traffic enforcement: - Cars going through lights without consequences- Scooters going the wrong way on bike lanes- Electric pedicabs making lanes unsafe- Poor pedestrian markings- Specialized bike signals that confuse cars and pedestrians with their sequencing	48
8	Suggestion	Stop using the concrete turtles. It is time to use the more substantial armadillos. These are more expensive but they will not be knocked loose by cars like the turtles. Also if we look at the long term the cost probably evens out since the turtles take a lot of maintenance all the time.	49
432	Other	unprotected or non-buffered	49
884	Concern	Protected bike lanes are great except for driveways and interruptions where it is very hard to navigate who should do. Berkman in Mueller and Zack Scott show the concept done well; Berkman North of Mueller and Manor show how it can be poorly executed.	49
520	Concern	Need to clarify in this document exactly what is a motor vehicle, legally and colloquially. Is a class3 e-bike that goes 28MPH a motor vehicle? What about a 5000W e-bike that goes 65PMH? Just because these things are bicycle shaped and electric does not mean they are any less dangerous than a motorcycle.	49
20	Concern	If the goal of a "Protected" bicycle lane is to prevent serious injury or death of a cyclist (as mentioned in previous section), then the wide use of flexposts should be discontinued. By definition they are flexible for the benefit of motorists but will not actually protect the cyclists they are meant to protect. We need more permanent and protective barriers (raised curbs, etc.).	49
923	Concern	Flex posts do NOT provide any protection for cyclists or other users of such lanes. They do provide awareness and delineation, but provide no protection whatsoever from vehicles. Please - stop calling such devices protection! They are not! Protected lanes require barriers that prevent intrusion of vehicle traffic. This assertion MUST be eliminated from your proposal.	49
52	Concern	Flex posts really shouldn't be considered a physical barrier. Not only do they not provide protection for cyclists if cars swerve into the bike lane "unintentionally," but I see cars, trucks, and delivery vans deliberately running over the posts so they can park in the bike lane, make a U-turn, or to move around a slower car. Protected bike lanes with only flex posts for protection are not perceived as safe, because anyone using them will constantly see cars infringing on their space. Additionally, this leads to the flex posts being destroyed, which either means the city spends more on replacing them, or more commonly, them remaining broken and providing even less of a deterrent than before. The city should use more substantial barriers like curbs or planters, and absorb the extra expense by not having to spend as much on maintenance.	49

53	Suggestion	Many of these intersections need to be "smarter." All of the bike intersections I have used have had an inflexible cycle that does not change based on the road users currently at the intersection. This means that often times bikes, and even cars, will end up waiting for several minutes at a red light while no vehicles are using the road in the green direction. I haven't seen Austin make any intersections using much smarter lights that can detect all types of road users and make adjustments on the fly to best accommodate them, as most Dutch intersections do.	49
241	Concern	Unsure how Shared Street Avenue G gives cyclists travel priority.	50
236	Concern	I recall Rio Grande between MLK and 29th referred to as a "bike boulevard." This ten-block stretch of Rio Grande is not low volume.	50
147	Suggestion	of	50
242	Concern	I was recently harrassed on my bicycle by a motorist who was clearly frustrated by having to share Avenues F and G and 56th Street with a cyclist.	50
886	Suggestion	A big tool is banning or discouraging right on red!	50
243	Concern	I was swept off a median refuge island and seriously injured by a motorist who ran a red light.	50
9	Concern	The crossings associated with MOPAC in to or out of Zilker Park are very dangerous, The traffic on the access roads that cross the bike/ped paths is flying buy at +/-60mph. There need to be more signage and maybe add some speed humps to slow traffic.	50
146	Suggestion	<p>Many traffic light intersections in Austin are a pain to navigate on a bike. Bikes won't activate the in-road sensors to trigger the light to change. After waiting through a light cycle to discover this, you have to awkwardly navigate your bike on to the sidewalk to press the pedestrian crossing button and then back into the street to wait for the light to change.</p> <p>Compare this to other cities where bikes are either automatically detected or crossing buttons are placed in locations that are easy to reach from a bike. Intersection improvements like these would improve bikers' comfort and treat them like equals on the road.</p>	50
779	Concern	I couldn't agree more. The intersection at Duval and 38th Street (on our bike commute to daycare) is just one example for this ubiquitous issue. With our 3-year old in a bike seat and our 1-year old in a trailer, reaching the pedestrian crossing button becomes virtually impossible. During peak hours, there is constant east-west traffic, but not that much north-south traffic, so without the "help" of a sensor-triggering car, it's easy to get stuck that way and forced to either get off the bike (if you have a kickstand) and walk to the button and back, or to heave the weight of your bike, two children, and the trailer around the tight corner and up the sidewalk, only to then hardly make it back to the bike lane in several awkward maneuvers.	50
885	Concern	Cross airport at Zach Scott is the same there is a bike light, I cannot figure out when or why it gets triggered and I always hit the pedestrian cross to guarantee I will get a chance to cross during the light cycle.	50
10	Concern	The bike/ped crossing (overpass) from or to the Springdale shopping center over 183 needs attention. The entrance/exit to the overpass is very dangerous and there is not enough protection for bike/peds nor enough warning for cars to anticipate the bike/ped traffic.	50

148	Suggestion	This sentence seems to be missing a date; it doesn't make sense as written. I'd suggest splitting it in two, like this: "NACTO provides the leading bikeway and urban street guidance for urban streets in North America. In August of 2011, the Austin City Council passed a resolution . . ."	51
808	Suggestion	Add ebike element.	51
237	Suggestion	X-axis labels are very difficult to align at this angle. It would be clearer with labels at each tick mark, just saying "0.3", "0.6", etc, with "miles" below.	51
641	Concern	E-Bikes are changing this math. People will happily ride an e-bike over greater distances. And a LOT of people will be on e-bikes in the next 10 years.	51
930	Concern	This data is very out-of-date. Due to the introduction and popularity of e-bikes, the length of bike trips has expanded greatly over the past 18 years! This chart is essentially useless for current planning.	51
149	Suggestion	Where's the figure described in this sentence? I don't see it. It seems to describe the chart that appears on page 46 of the 2014 plan (based on nationwide Dutch travel data from 2005), but I don't see that chart here. I don't think it's necessary, but if it's not used, this sentence should be deleted.	52
153	Suggestion	It's probably best to leave that chart out; it seems obsolete now that electric bikes have changed people's mental calculations about distances they're willing to go by bike.	52
196	Other	Found that chart down on page 79.	52
244	Concern	E-bikes are not a wholly human-powered form of transportation.	52
937	Concern	As noted previously, this statement is false, due to the introduction and rapid adoption of e-bikes. For e-bikers, the only limit to the range of a bike trip today is the battery. 3-mile round-trips are no longer the norm; much greater distances are possible and are being realized, even by novice cyclists. Consequently, all projections and strategies in this plan based upon a 3-mile round trip by bike need to be revised to favor, protect, and incentivize longer trips.	52
150	Suggestion	As noted above, I don't see that chart here. But it does appear on pg. 46 of the 2014 plan.	52
151	Suggestion	a	52
152	Suggestion	maybe data described above? For now there is no data above, because the chart is missing.	52
54	Concern	This also means upzoning all areas around transit stops.	52
245	Concern	Seen by whom? I consider e-bikes and e-scooters motor vehicles. Encouraging their riders to use infrastructure nominally dedicated to human-powered transportation introduces many of the same conflicts as those between cyclists, pedestrians and automobiles.	53
470	Other	I don't think it's fair to equate Class 3 e-bikes with motor vehicles. With the electric assist cutting off at 28mph respectively, their speed is well within the range of athletic cyclists. Their size and weight is also much closer to non-motorized bicycles than traditional motorcycles or scooters. I do agree that de-regulated or Class 4+ ebikes are unsafe on human-powered paths--but such use is already restricted by law.	53
155	Suggestion	typo - should be "in"	53
154	Suggestion	typo - either delete "and many" or add the word "others". (If the latter, the word "and" should be deleted before Seoul.)	53
555	Suggestion	Current network is usable for experienced riders, but lack of cohesion is constantly forcing the unfamiliar onto your deathtrap arterials. I'm STILL finding alternate routes I wish the infrastructure would simply lead me to.	54

246	Concern	Directness is moot when developers are permitted by CoA to appropriate bike infrastructure for construction staging.	54
665	Suggestion	New rule: Every bike lane/route must connect to another bike lane/route, and no "dead ends". A map of all bike lanes/routes should look like a spiderweb, not an asterisk.	54
887	Concern	Bike lanes appear and disappear (Chicon) on a lot of streets and I will always take a quiet residential street over a bigger street with a painted bike lane, especially if I am sharing that space with a bus (Chicon, Berkman). You never know when a bike lane will end or there will be construction and you'll be forced into a bad situation.	54
907	Concern	Point of abject failure is cohesion	54
156	Suggestion	delete the hyphen	54
11	Suggestion	lose the turtles and add armadillos.	54
501	Suggestion	Trash bins in bike lanes continue to pose risks to bikers - need some solution called out for this	54
248	Concern	Smooth surfaces cannot include chip-sealed asphalt, concrete with regular expansion joints or any surface repaired and patched for the comfort of motor vehicles.	54
12	Suggestion	IF we are to meet or get close to the Vision Zero goals we must start enforcing code and actively remove site line barriers on our streets. Code suggests that there will be no vegetation of 16" from the apex of a corner. Not enforced. Note the site line at Guadalupe and St Johns, SE corner by the bus stop...you cannot clearly see to the east down St Johns due to vegetation. This is common on many streets. Additionally trees should be trimmed up out of the bike lanes. I have noted this issue downtown, on the Shoal Creek bike lane between Koenig and 38th and other places around town.	54
238	Suggestion	Comfort and Safety are both compromised when cars park in bike lanes. I have reported cars parked in bike lanes to 311, but it seems nobody is willing to enforce this law. There was a proposal to allow a "bounty" system for parking enforcement. New York City has done this, with smashing success, it helps officials know where to spend their time on parking enforcement, it helps us all maintain a safer community. I'd love for the Council (or whoever) to approve such a measure to help us improve city-wide transportation.	54
55	Suggestion	Several large cities in North America have now passed laws that allow people on micro mobility devices to treat stop signs as yield signs. This would go a long way to achieving this directness goal, especially in neighborhood bikeways. Not only has the data shown this to speed up bikes and increase their mode share, but it has also been shown to be a lot safer for the cyclists too. Please consider.	54

471	Other	<p>In 2022, Colorado also passed a law allowing for cyclists to perform "safety stops." I think this is an excellent way to describe the practice. Here's a link to what the Colorado Department of Transportation says about it: https://www.codot.gov/safety/traffic-safety-pulse/2022/may/assets/safety-stop-pamphlet-final.pdf</p> <p>There are plenty of statistics backing up the concept of safety stops; some of those studies are linked in the link above. It makes sense intuitively, too: when cyclists come to a full stop and then accelerate from 0mph into an intersection, they spend more time in the intersection and have fewer options to maneuver to safety (especially by accelerating or dodging) if a reckless driver proceeds through the intersection, oblivious to the cyclist.</p> <p>Along with rule changes, I think a PSA campaign would be necessary so that drivers would understand that cyclists were operating both safely and legally.</p>	54
499	Suggestion	Cars park in bike lanes all the time and we are told to call 311 when there is a problem. It is time cars honor the bike lanes or face onerous fines!	54
643	Suggestion	Look at this -- do we really need poles here? Isn't the paint doing enough on a low-traffic street like this?	54
644	Suggestion	On busy streets, these separated paths are awesome. We need a trail like this along the east side of Lamar between 46th and Central Market. (There is enough right-of-way.) Trails like this should be built to take cyclists where they want to go (but can't currently go).	54
642	Suggestion	These little poles in the MIDDLE of the bike lane? They're terrible! Cyclists hit them (and those poles are heavy and solid), and the street sweeper can't get into the lane with these here. Awful and dangerous -- get rid of them.	54
157	Suggestion	applied?	55
440	Suggestion	I would suggest adding "schools, and recreation destinations."	55
158	Suggestion	be	55
56	Concern	I have never seen these small street sweepers in use. I frequently see protected lanes have tree and road debris build up in them until a cyclist or near-by resident eventually becomes frustrated and sweeps or shovels the lane themselves. This is also true for unprotected painted bike lanes. Street sweepers rarely also sweep them, even though there is no barrier, allowing tree debris, or dirt runoff from a store create safety hazards in the lane that persist for several months.	55
57	Concern	On many of the already built bike intersections outside of downtown, the bike light typically remains green for only 3-4 seconds....	56
211	Suggestion	Tricycles, all types manual, hand cycles, and e-assist.	56
556	Concern	All of your streets are engineered for about 45 MPH	57
557	Suggestion	Per this sheet- Every major street in the city needs the speedway treatment at minimum (plastic posts)- I also would hesitate to actually encourage riders from riding on any "fully Protected" lane by a major street- The infrastructure should naturally route you AWAY from quad, riverside, etc - Think Lance armstrong Bikeway- super fking dangerous, "fully protected". You can't make a bike lane safe without slowing down the cars.	57
521	Suggestion	Add another column to the chart next to target speeds, "Actual Recorded Speeds." Then adjust the blue column accordingly.	57
247	Concern	Target Speeds are meaningless without some kind of speed enforcement.	57
159	Suggestion	Plan, singular	58
160	Suggestion	typo - delete "to" (or "that")	58

645	Suggestion	Protected bike lanes on moderately-busy streets might make some sense if you are going up-hill. Bikes slow down, and a little extra buffer from cars might feel better. But going down-hill, the buffers are less necessary (and can be a little more dangerous).	60
889	Concern	It is incredibly hard to cross I-35 on a bike, 4th street is dangerous and not a great option. This of course furthers inequality but it doesn't matter what you build on either side of it if you can't get across it it is not connected!	60
249	Concern	The Butler Trail and the Pfluger Bridge are nearly unridable as a commuter routes because pedestrian traffic is not segregated.	61
441	Suggestion	Austin Ridge Riders strongly agree with this. I would suggest adding: "Experience from experts in the mountain bike trail field may be relevant for developing connector "singletrack trail" as a low-cost alternative." Natural surface "singletrack" can be a connector across a city for a lot of users. International Mountain Bike Association has done feasibility studies for connecting natural-surface trails (aka mountain bike trails" that can be used for commuters as well.	61
442	Suggestion	Suggest adding a bullet: "Off-road natural-surface singletrack trail, sometimes thought of as mountain bike trails or simple walking paths, may be considered as part of the transportation network, as appropriate. Recreational cyclists in genres such as mountain biking, BMX, cyclocross, or gravel, may use singletrack, as appropriate, as a way of riding to and from a recreational cycling destination.	61
800	Suggestion	A well-connected grid is important, the subdivision code and TCM should be updated to require a grid in all new subdivisions. Streets that are gridded and connected can also be narrower per AFD's argument for needing access during emergencies.	61
161	Suggestion	typo - delete "a"	61
250	Concern	And hills.	62
251	Question	Previous?	62
252	Concern	Orphan	63
162	Suggestion	principle	63
164	Suggestion	sp - dependence	63
165	Suggestion	Cheers for calling out minimum parking requirements, but this is a really unclear way of doing it. The sentence should be reworded to make clear that parking mandates should be eliminated.	63
163	Suggestion	should read, "15-minute walk or bike ride."	63
13	Suggestion	Bike lanes on North Hampton Dr. to Means Elementary School are gone. Need to be repainted to help with Safe Streets to Schools program (probably the wrong program name). Also the "pencils" need to be replaced on Guadalupe south of Reilly Elementary School. Parents are still parking in the bike lane here. I think a conversation with the school leadership as well as publishing in the school news to parents might help.	64

962	Suggestion	This section is terribly written, but highlights an extremely important issue. In addition to the important concerns noted, high car traffic around schools at pickup/dropoff has ripple effects on the surrounding roads, creating pinch points in the larger transportation network. I would suggest going so far as to limit cars around schools. I would also like to see the city contribute to AISD providing bus transportation for more students.	64
253	Suggestion	hyphenate	64
166	Suggestion	This sentence is a mess.	64
503	Suggestion	I agree that the sentence is badly phrased. The vicious circle of huge cars dropping tiny children and then coming back and idling for hours (sometimes) to pick them up is a real one. It is hard to solve, but creation and enforcement of no stopping zones would be a beginning.	64
201	Other	comma needed	64
254	Concern	Another barrier is the one-way street patterns around some AISD campuses.	64
963	Suggestion	Note that barriers need to be considered even more broadly when considering safety of elementary students as young as 5. E.g., even moderate hills can be a significant barrier.	64
167	Suggestion	This sentence is a worse mess.	64
202	Other	add comma	64
443	Suggestion	Austin Ridge Riders suggests adding: It is encouraged for schools to develop programs to teach safe cycling and make use of facilities such as bicycle playgrounds (including "mock street" learning facilities) and bicycle-recreational facilities such as skills parks, pump tracks. A large reason why youth might choose to ride a bike from their home to a destination is because the destination itself involves recreational cycling.	64
168	Suggestion	principle	64
444	Suggestion	Austin Ridge Riders suggests adding: "Skate parks, BMX bike, and mountain bike facilities were also identified as desired amenities--and many of these users may choose bikes, skates, scooters, etc. as the form of transport to and from the facility." (See page 43 for the mention of mountain biking, and pages 155, 159, 163, 171, 175 for mentions of Skate parks and BMX).	64
256	Concern	Safe bicycling paths through city parks must include paths that are not subject to temporary closure for for events such as ACL Fest.	65
14	Question	interesting comment. I have heard from minority residents that the bike/ped infrastructure CAUSES gentrification to happen faster in their neighborhoods. ??? How many representatives , cyclists especially, are involved in the decision making for bike/ped infrastructure? How many of these folks are community leaders that can help with communication within their community?	65
255	Question	Attribution?	65
59	Suggestion	Parks in Austin need a lot more bike racks. Some have great trail access by bike but few or no bike parking facilities.	65
445	Suggestion	Austin Ridge Riders suggest adding: "For genres of cycling including mountain biking, cyclocross, gravel, and BMX, purpose-suited facilities in a park itself may be the destination and reason for the cycling activity."	65

448	Concern	<p>Austin Ridge Riders has a concern that this sentence seems to imply that dual track, rather than singletrack, is necessary to avoid hiking and biking conflicts.</p> <p>We would suggest striking ", including dual track trails that have separate places for people to walk and bicycle to reduce conflict."</p> <p>If it is not struck, then we suggest: "Trail etiquette on the part of off-road cyclists is widely relied on and is widely successful in minimizing user conflicts on singletrack natural surface trails."</p> <p>If we are really going to separate hikers and mountain bikers, then the MTB community would want to see purpose-built MTB-specific trail, some of it directional with posted "no hiking" signs--so, compromise on this point is important.</p>	65
257	Suggestion	either "is comprised of" or "comprises."	67
376	Suggestion	This plan should include an updated map that incorporates the proposed new segments. Providing feedback without such a map is challenging.	67
805	Suggestion	Bike network should also include future bikeways on undeveloped land. The City has existing authority to create a streets master plan to grid and connect streets when those sites are developed. Staff should take the opportunity to grid everything within the city limits and EJTB for (narrow) streets, urban trails, and bikeways.	67
195	Suggestion	This connection from the Brushy Creek Regional Trail to Staked Plains is shown as an AAA path but I can assure you it is clearly not. At best it is a barely developed, rocky mountain bike path.	67
646	Suggestion	Construction at the Austin State Hospital is creating an opportunity. An urban bike trail around the perimeter would be great. There is enough right-of-way on both the east and west sides of the property for a wide pedestrian / bicycle path. We need it more on the west-side of the property, connecting the "triangle" to the Central Market center. But I think you could go all the way around the property.	67
258	Suggestion	"... prioritized accordingly per the prioritization approach..." is reflexively redundant and awkward. How about just "prioritized according to the approach described in the next exception."?	68
259	Question	GIS?	68
558	Suggestion	Increase the weight of access across major barriers- To date, you've failed to make a single safe way to cross I-35	69
261	Question	Number agreement?	70
260	Concern	I think there's comma fault in here somewhere.	70
269	Suggestion	is	70
266	Suggestion	Number agreement? The previous sentence mentions factors (plural). "They provide"?	70
268	Suggestion	parentheses?	70
262	Suggestion	Parallel: "policy makers"	70
265	Question	"relate to what drives travel demand"?	70
264	Question	"includes" and "integrates"?	70
267	Suggestion	hyphenate	70
263	Question	Number agreement?	70
270	Suggestion	delete space	70
271	Suggestion	insert comma	70

274	Suggestion	"by which"	70
273	Question	Insert comma?	70
272	Question	Unparalleled: third group?	70
383	Other	Happy to see Menchaca here. Density exists along this route, but there's no comfortable way to ride north to the city. I used to live on S 5th, which was an easy route to everywhere. Now I feel like I can't ride, which is a shame considering how many condos and apartments are on this street. Reducing the need for people in higher density areas to drive should be a priority.	71
64	Concern	There's an incredible gap in the planned network along 24th street that connects UT and West Campus with Shoal Creek and neighborhoods to the west. Outside of downtown, West Campus is the most walkable and bikable neighborhood in the city, and this non-car owning population deserves a safe way to go east-west and connect to great parks. Don't neglect this.	71
559	Concern	The Rundberg hotspot stands out from the more central priorities. I view the current modeshare split of the rundberg area as a failure of your policy administration. Go ride a bike across i-35 on st johns	71
48	Question	Could you share what the top of the prioritized list contains? On a cursory look, many of Austin's major arteries are not safe to cycle on (no protected bike lane). This includes South Lamar, North Lamar, S 1st, 38th street. Does the criteria allow for existing low safety cycling infrastructure to be upgraded to the higher safety ones (such as concrete barriers) based on the connectivity potential of a given segment? If not, could it be changed such that these major roadways can receive protected lanes ahead of any work on relatively lower traffic roads?	72
276	Suggestion	"equitable, accessible and understands the needs of local communities."	73
275	Suggestion	delete hyphen	73
905	Concern	OK sure but like- you haven't rededicated any meaningful space from cars- um- anywhere, but especially in the urban core	73
903	Suggestion	Install one steel bollard for every ten flexposts so you can't run them ALL down lol	74
946	Concern	Neither flex posts nor concrete buttons provide any protection from vehicles. Consequently, they do not improve cyclist safety nor promote hesitant cyclists to ride on such streets. It would be a much better use of funds to invest in true protection, such as concrete barriers and physically separated bike lanes.	74
15	Suggestion	no more buttons (turtles). Let's upgrade to Armadillos!	74
16	Question	Who pays for blocking, removing and replacing the built infrastructure when is is removed for construction projects like the mess on Rio Grande in West Campus or other construction related impediments?	74
647	Concern	Buttons suck! The ones that somebody has painted in day-glo colors on Shoal Creek are the only ones I can see at night. And when they come unglued from the street, they create a major hazard in the bike lane.	74
278	Question	"a several"?	74
528	Question	Not clear what type of infrastructure is in the bottom photo... are there concrete barriers? Can't tell what's going on in the left side of the photo.	74
904	Suggestion	This redesign was good	75
169	Suggestion	principle	75
279	Suggestion	Change the contracting approaches to make retrofitting shade less challenging.	75
17	Concern	This only works if maintained. See my other comment about this.	75

60	Suggestion	I have seen surveys taken on other cities that show that, even where the city is not willing to pay for the upkeep of its trees, most residents along the trees are more than happy to take care of them, so long as the city has clearly communicated to them that they should.	76
170	Suggestion	plants	76
171	Suggestion	This sentence needs work. How about rewording it to something like this: "Current lighting policies and programs also lead to inequities for different modes."	77
277	Suggestion	Either full stop/new sentence, or "and was implemented..."	78
61	Concern	This is very true in many locations. These routes will not feel safe unless they are well lit.	78
947	Concern	* All trail lighting should be shielded, so that it points down and so that the source of the light cannot be seen unless directly under the light. This design eliminates glare for the users and diffusion into the surrounding environment (e.g., light pollution).	79
172	Suggestion	sp - dependence	79
491	Suggestion	spelling - coevolution?	79
18	Suggestion	I agree that better lighting is important...if maintained. The lighting on the new Lamar underpass at 24th street is not functional now (the in pavement solar lights). Good idea to have these though. In the bigger picture I hope that we can meet the Dark Sky initiative standards and still achieve safety. https://www.darksky.org/	80
19	Suggestion	The "nature trails" or single track or mountain bike, or gorilla trails should be maintained by the Austin Ridge Riders by contract. They should try to meet or exceed IMBA standards. Easy stuff.	80
456	Suggestion	We (ARR) appreciate the sentiment (and I know Andy from riding). ARR does maintain natural-surface trail in certain parks with Community Activated Park Project approval. However, we are an all-volunteer 501c3 organization, and in our current form do not have the bandwidth to manage all natural surface trails in Austin as a contractor. HOWEVER, I agree with the point here which is that TRANSPORTATION DOLLARS can and should be used to fund proper development and maintenance of natural surface singletrack, where that trail is both the destination and the connectivity for cyclists.	80
89	Concern	If Safe Routes to School is a key department here, specify that they will extend to serve ALL schools and students, not just districts. This is a huge equity issue, since relatively more students of color attend charter schools, and relatively more charter schools are located in underserved parts of the city.	80
563	Suggestion	Lane conversions additionally solve the Problem of major arterials which allow drivers to go 50MPH- The primary cause of people not riding a bike See Riverside, Barton Springs, Metric, Literally just pick a street and you've over-engineered it.	81
561	Suggestion	A lot more of this please	81
504	Suggestion	I agree with the goal: but many Austin roads curve. Motorists 'hug' the curves when speeding. And that makes it dangerous for cyclists beside them. So narrowing streets has to be accompanied by barriers strong enough to protect other road users,	81

897	Suggestion	You could write a one page report that just says "Remove 10% of street parking" and it would be a more effective policy direction for cycling than this study- Please please please lean into the lane conversions and not the education	81
560	Other	This guy is wrong- just narrow that shit	81
62	Suggestion	This is a concern about existing facilities. It seems like there's little enforcement preventing people from parking in bike lanes, and the infrastructure itself is often not good enough to prevent parking (i.e., vehicles drive over turtle shells and flex posts to park.) It is common for delivery vans, and trucks to park in bike lanes, even when there are near-by parking spaces. Construction workers also frequently park their personal vehicles in bike lanes, as well as using bike lanes to store material, or place signs to direct traffic, even when there are other alternatives. Worse, it is also common for police officers to park their cars in bike lanes, even where there are other options. The people who are supposed to enforce these parking policies cannot also be those who ignore them. Perhaps a possible solution would involve either parking enforcement police officers, or similar unarmed alternatives, to ride around on bikes and ticket those parked in them. This practice is common in places like Toronto.	81
509	Concern	Bike lanes on S. Congress are basically loading zones. Very frustrating to have to merge into high speed traffic because of this. I have never seen enforcement.	81
281	Concern	Motor vehicles parked in bikes create particularly dangerous and vexing situations on streets where both bikes lanes are on the same side: e.g. Shoal Creek, Rio Grande in West Campus	81
562	Suggestion	Protected bike lanes on congress retain virtual infinite points of conflict because of parking. Ridiculous in 2023	81
890	Suggestion	This, I know it would be expensive but bike lanes should be against the sidewalk with car parking against the vehicle travel lanes. The way it is set up now is scary on a bike.	81
906	Question	who writes this shit	81
365	Suggestion	It's not true that there are only a few miles of bike lanes where parking in the bike lane is still an issue. This practice is wide spread and better design (i.e. less permeable barriers) would go a long way towards tackling it.	81
505	Concern	I agree with the commenter! There are many many places where cars, vans, trucks park in bicycle lanes.	81
280	Concern	Unclear what there is to evaluate if no one may park in bike lanes.	81
510	Concern	That statement was written by someone with no direct experience of cycling around Austin.	81
949	Concern	Back-in diagonal parking should be the standard, not the exception, for street parking. It provides a much safer environment for cyclists over parallel parking (which exposes cyclists to getting 'doored').	82
950	Concern	All commercial developments, whether public or private, MUST provide a safe and secure place to lock bicycles. This is essential to incentivizing folks to use bikes for errands and not just recreation.	82
63	Concern	This has been stated in the city's policy for a long time, but I still see new bike lanes being added on the wrong side of the car parking. Why?	82
282	Question	"quantify"?	83
648	Suggestion	Please include data related to e-bike use. E-bike riders are willing to ride more often and much further than non-powered bike riders.	83
366	Question	Are these trip capture targets for Austin? Explain in figure caption or title.	83

565	Concern	Downtown is literally just a place to drink and drive	84
566	Concern	<p>Like pick a random street downtown- It's probably three lanes of moving traffic, and two lanes of parked cars. Would you send your kid out for a gallon of milk on a bicycle? I don't think so.</p> <p>ARE YOU REALLY TELLING PEOPLE TO RIDE A BICYCLE WITH YOUR DESIGN CHOICES? Because I think you're all fucking clowns</p>	84
564	Suggestion	Just ban cars, dummy	84
899	Question	It's not safe to bike literally anywhere in your stupid ring of congestion lmaoooo	84
567	Suggestion	Yes TXDOT provides most of our road deaths but I want to remind you how often ATD ROW provides a mobility barrier to pedestrians and bicyclists	86
21	Suggestion	Please ask TXDOT to put in more safety features at 4th and I35 where the bike lane crosses under the highway by the convention center. Hard to believe no one has been run over there with the cars traveling so fast!	86
522	Concern	I've heard from the BAC that a few people HAVE been run over at this spot. The city knows how dangerous it is and isn't fixing it.	86
548	Concern	<p>TXDOT/CTMRA have shown that lack of willingness to provide meaningful change in biking facilities - the 183 Mobility is the only major work in the TXDOT ROW for the foreseeable future and it solidly delivers the subpar status quo facilities - McNeil/Spicewood interchange is a prime example. Rather than focus on an actual solution, it continues to force cyclist and pedestrians to cross 17 lanes of traffic in 500 feet.</p> <p>Given the lack of TXDOT mandate for cycling infrastructure, COA solutions should prioritize working around their ROW whenever possible rather than waiting/including them.</p>	86
283	Question	"exacerbate"?	86
285	Suggestion	Why not be specific: "a front white light visible from at least 500 feet in the front, and a red reflector or red light in the rear."	86
284	Concern	Consistent typographic convention: "TxDOT" or TXDOT"?	86
22	Question	Who cleans and maintains these paths? The path to Manor needs to be cleaned regularly due to the amount of glass and all of the new construction along the path (new driveways, etc...) is pretty bad.	88
225	Answer	<p>It depends on the type of trail and where the trail is located. Natural surface trails located on parkland are typically maintained by Austin Parks and Recreation Department. Urban Trails (wide concrete trails) located outside of parkland are typically maintained by Austin Public Works. Some local nonprofits maintain natural surface and urban trails as well, such as the Trail Conservancy, Hill Country Conservancy, and Shoal Creek Conservancy.</p> <p>The Austin to Manor Trail is an Urban Trail. If you see any issues on trails, please call 3-1-1 or use the Austin 311 mobile app to report trail damage, trash, obstructions, or other issues.</p>	88
90	Suggestion	Not true - central city, but also the segments with apartment complexes whose only way in or out, even for bikes and pedestrians, is along the frontage roads. Need to acknowledge context sensitivity here.	88
91	Suggestion	and segments with public schools. CSS	88
487	Other	This is fabulous	89

25	Concern	A shared use path on the NORTH side of Ben White is direly needed. Who from the City is coordinating with TxDOT to see that these SUPs and bike lanes actually get built?	90
568	Suggestion	Dont waste time here just build good crossings and remove cars from paralell streets where possible.	90
569	Concern	Txdot will say no if you try this- Source: IDK I wasn't born yesterday	90
951	Concern	But this buffer offers NO protection to the cyclist. Consequently, the buffer should be replaced by a impenetrable physical barrier, such as a concrete or steel structure.	91
92	Concern	This is terrifying, without the guard rail. It's also unclear to drivers, esp when TxDOT implements by filling in what should be the elevation between the vehicle lane and the shared use path. They don't get any visual or tactile clue that the SUP is not for vehicles. (Yeah, it looks different, but there's no way to know that means people are walking there, vs it's some kind of lane for people who are slowing down because they're going to turn.)	91
93	Suggestion	For all of these, vehicles turning on to the road need a reminder that there is two-way bike/ped traffic. They need to look both ways.	91
900	Concern	I can only point to fifteen blocks of bike lane anywhere in the city which meet even the minimum specs of this chart	91
286	Suggestion	Capped: "Bicycle Advisory Council"	92
309	Question	Can Austin require that all businesses provide off-street parking for deliveries? Delivery trucks almost invariably block bike lanes rather than vehicle lanes, which leads to situations unsafe for cyclists— especially on one-way streets where both-direction bikes lanes are on one side of the street, e.g. Rio Grande between MLK and 29th.	93
952	Concern	no, No, NO! Please - stop using flex posts and paint! They provide NO protection, and therefore are a waste of money lures cyclists into increased risk. Instead, put your resources into fewer miles of truly protected, physically separated bike lanes.	93
570	Suggestion	Do better	93
571	Suggestion	I demand the permanent pedestrianization of congress, 6th	93
901	Concern	The current "Network" is not a network. You get spit out onto arterials no matter which way you go.	93
891	Suggestion	Would love to see evidence that any of these consistently work. Just make the bike light go automatically!	94
902	Concern	Your failures in signal timing are abundant and they negatively affect pedestrians, cyclists, and particularly the disabled. I recommend dedicated pedestrian / bike phasing in the RING OF CONGESTION	94
94	Suggestion	Esp do this on the TxDOT roadways. COA is willing to pay for them to improve their roads. What if we were willing to pay them for better (safer) construction detours for bike/ped/ADA users? Even if there's no city funding in the project otherwise.	95
287	Concern	Proposed bike detour standards must address all the qualities of bike detours: added distance, added time, added stress &etc	95
65	Concern	This is absolutely necessary and isn't done at all currently.	95
892	Concern	Charge high fees for taking the bike lane for construction. part of the 3rd st protected bike lane near the convention center has been shut down for literally years.	95
511	Concern	Yes, please!	96

95	Suggestion	Also here - what if COA maintained the white sticks and etc along TxDOT roadways?	96
66	Concern	There needs to be some kind of standard set for this, or communication to residents along bike corridors. Many currently block bike lanes with their trash cans, and even when residents take care to avoid blocking bike lanes, trash trucks usually put the bins back down in the middle of the bike lane.	96
288	Concern	And fresh chip seal.	97
70	Concern	This chart does not take into account the potential benefits of sidewalk level separated paths. Also, large bumps and planters can easily be designed to accommodate trash collection.	97
27	Suggestion	I would challenge the perceived preference for flexposts as the quick solution to create a "protected" bicycle lane. As the entire network matures, I would love to see more investment in the improved perceived safety of concrete curbs. The flexposts lack of durability makes them a short-sided choice. As you mention in the chart, if we (the city) need to replace a flexpost 3-4 more times (which seems pretty common in high traffic areas such as S. Congress), then a concrete curb becomes more cost effective (and comes with many other benefits).	97
68	Concern	This chart does not consider the potential benefits from a sidewalk level and completely separated path.	97
489	Concern	Construction is another issue. Roadwork often leaves streets that are unridable. West 12th street in clarksville jus east of west lynn right now is an example of this. Contractors should be held to a higher standard for road maintenance.	97
294	Concern	I struggle to discover why CoA puts speed bumps and cushion in bike lanes.	97
488	Concern	These lanes are useless: they are used by ubers, amazon prime, and other vehicles as a place to idle and commonly blocked for cyclist use.	97
956	Concern	Flex posts do NOT provide any protection to cyclists. If you can park a vehicle (car, truck, delivery van, etc.) in a bike lane, it is NOT protected. Please cease calling these lanes 'protected'. They are NOT! Instead, invest the money in physical barriers that do not allow intrusion by any vehicle.	97
957	Concern	Where did you get data that supports the assertion that cyclists perceive flex posts as providing safety? I don't know any cyclist that believes this.	97
295	Concern	Using parked cars to control moving cars seems wrong-headed to me, especially as eliminating parking offers benefits beyong freeing up space for other uses.	97
296	Concern	I my experience, using 3-1-1 to report bike infrastructure issues has not been worth the effort: operators typically do not understand the nature of the call and incidents are "resolved" without action. And the 3-1-1 app lacks bike-specific issue choices.	97
50	Other	Now called Resource Recovery department :)	98
289	Concern	Chip seal may be cost-effective for the City, but it renders road surfaces extemely unpleasant and dangerous to ride a bike on, especially when it's fresh.	98
512	Concern	Chip seal treatment is unrideable for days.	98
72	Concern	From what I have seen, street sweepers often don't sweep even painted bike lanes. Leading to debris that builds up for months.	99
297	Other	It can depend on the part of town: e.g. bikes lanes on Springdale and Oak Springs are routinely littered with broken glass and other debris while those on Shoal Creek are clearer.	99

572	Suggestion	Every goddamn traffic light in the city makes you press a button to walk. Meaning like 25% of the time, you get there technically during a "Walk" but you don't have a walk signal. I'm sure you've done the math and it improves flux by 20% or whatever but None of this cyclist sensor bullshit is even necessary if you just respect the pedestrian as an actor in urban space.	99
73	Concern	I have found that construction sites tend to be big problem areas. Bike lanes are often blocked unnecessarily, by workers personal vehicles, or to display signs in that could just as easily be put on the curb. It is very rare that any accommodations are made to ensure people on bikes can pass through safely.	100
964	Suggestion	Alternative routes also need to be appropriate for the same type of user as the blocked route. E.g., if a flat, well-protected bike lane often ridden by children is going to be blocked, the detour also needs to avoid significant hills and be safe for a child riding on her own.	100
298	Concern	Indeed, it almost never the case. Greystar's 2022-2023 closures of the 2300-block of Rio Grande force all Rio Grande traffic onto surrounding streets, many of which are narrower and none of which have bike lanes.	100
893	Concern	There is not a train or bus stop in this city I would be comfortable leaving my bike locked up overnight.	102
75	Suggestion	There are currently many bus stops in Austin with no bike racks, and even many that are not connected to a sidewalk. More care should be put into the integration of transit stops into the community as a whole.	102
549	Suggestion	For bicycles, it could be roughly 3-5 miles depending on terrain, traffic control and frequency of transit. For example, McNeil/Howard has little to no driveways/traffic lights as you go east/west. This means more time is spent moving rather than mingling in traffic. It's also relatively flat so you are able to move faster.	104
550	Suggestion	Also, if your only options are taking the train or driving downtown, you in a forced scarcity moment. Your ability to ride further is increased because the only alternative is driving.	104
184	Suggestion	Ironically this map shows the dire need for more streets to be included in the AAA network. There is no access to the NLTC to the east or west. Anderson Lane needs to be included in the AAA network to improve access to high quality transit from the adjacent neighborhoods.	105
299	Question	"for full" what?	107
77	Concern	Currently, most bus stops don't have any bike parking.	108
300	Concern	What about existing CapMetro stops, both older and more recent, where cyclists and pedestrians are forced to compete for right-of-way? e.g. the Lance Armstrong Bikeway at West Avenue and West Cesar Chavez, Guadalupe at St Johns. Directing cyclists onto sidewalks or anything that looks like a sidewalk, especially near transit stops, forces cyclists to compete with pedestrians for right-of-way. It incidentally encourages motorists to think that all cyclists ought to ride on sidewalks all the time.	109
573	Concern	Metrobike is useless- the scooters demonstrated an insane pent up demand for an actual useful system like citibike. Capmetro bought it so you can bank on the fact that they'll run it into the ground.	110
446	Suggestion	Misspelled Austin's	110
447	Suggestion	MetroBike is now operated by CapMetro and the non-profit will be dissolved this year.	110

78	Concern	I love the expansion of the bike share system. However, I have seen several new bike share stations that are built in places that cause existing bike parking to be removed. The system needs to expand in a way that doesn't hurt people already using bikes.	111
490	Concern	Please read this comment. I use bicycle 1-2 times per week and I have issues 80% of the time. The electric bikes almost never work at stations that are solar powered (most), there are significant maintenance issues beyond that (brakes, seat, docks). The system needs to be expanded beyond downtown. It is very very poorly run and maintained. If anyone did quality control and sampled bikes for quality, they would realize in 30 minutes that the system is a disaster as it is managed. Lime bikes may be more expensive but they work. Bicycle bikes rarely work.	111
185	Question	Where are the planned expansion areas for bike share? It seems odd for those plans to not be included in the Bike Plan.	111
224	Answer	Capital Metro is the lead agency managing the bike share system. For more information on the bike share expansion plan, visit: CapMetro.org/OurServices/Metrobike	111
301	Question	"convenience"?	111
302	Concern	In my experience, electric-assist micromobility, especially scooters, are a menace to cyclists. While I appreciate that scooters represent trips not taken in automobiles, their operators seem as careless and entitled as any other motor vehicle operator. I also personally resent having to surrender hard-won bike infrastructure to what is, after all, a for-profit enterprise.	111
574	Concern	The scooters have had a larger impact on micromobility than THE ENTIRE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT.LET ME REPEAT MYSELF THE SCOOTERS HAVE HAD A LARGER IMPACT ON MICROMOBILITY THAN THE ENTIRE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT. Other things/entities which have done more for cycling in austin than ATD: The Roy and Ann Butler Trail Foundation, The Parks and Recreation Department. I'm waiting for you guys to help	111
303	Question	"car"?	112
304	Suggestion	number agreement	112
305	Question	"unbanked"?	112
513	Other	I think that means people who do not have a banking account / access to the banking system.	112
96	Suggestion	Also at the origin. Retrofit _secure_ bike parking for apartments, esp in lower-income areas.	113
203	Concern	Is this Program still operational? If so, more promotion is needed to business owners to let them know that free bike racks are available.	113
371	Question	If it is not still operational, what were the exact years it was operational?	113
306	Question	Does CoA currently allow bikes in its buildings?	114
81	Suggestion	Those who decide where these bike racks are installed should be better trained. There are many examples I can think of where one is installed against a wall, curb, or other obstruction which makes it so only a single bike can be parked there.	114

307	Question	Does Austin still forbid parking a bikes in a space intended for a car?	115
314	Other	Supporting people who commute on bikes rather than in cars seems like a goal consistent with this draft's revised priorities.	115
315	Suggestion	I think it depends on whether the ebikes are owned or rented. someone who subscribes to a bikeshare may presume the bike they ride is professionally maintained; someone who owns the bike they ride will be more likely to value the services of a bike station.	116
575	Other	I trust noone	118
458	Suggestion	<p>I suggest stating: "Consider various recreational cycling groups (mountain biking, road racing, road touring, BMX, gravel, cyclocross, bicycle polo, social cycling, "ride out" crews, etc.) for possible Community Ambassador relationships."</p> <p>The reason I'm suggesting this is that this document doesn't seem to acknowledge that many commuter/transportation cyclists are also parts of cycling sport/lifestyles groups. Building appropriate cycling facilities such as mountain bike optimized natural surface trail; BMX dirt jump and concrete parks; a velodrome for track cycling; child-oriented "bike playgrounds" and "traffic gardens", etc. is an important part of building and supporting a culture of cycling.</p>	119
457	Suggestion	spelling: "Ghisallo"	120
551	Concern	<p>I would not bother with this program. The sheer cost of the off-the-shelf ebikes is not a realistic expenditure. It only benefits those with the means of purchasing what equates to a luxury good.</p> <p>Conversions are a better price-to-performance ratio but that is too tricky.</p>	120
576	Suggestion	Free scooter passes for Low-income folks would be about 1000X more practical than metrobike just on the off chance that you have like- a job or places to go	120
578	Concern	If you have to "Sell" people on riding a bike, you've failed	121
577	Suggestion	No it should increase expenditures on things that aren't media- such as lane repurposing,	121
581	Suggestion	If you wanted "longhorn bike day" you wouldn't have red river looking like a freeway for the 359 days a year that aren't gameday	122
459	Suggestion	I would suggest adding: "mountain bike urban & natural-surface trail rides, BMX demonstrations or competitions. . . "	122
580	Suggestion	Your infrastructure should simply be usable by anybody- That's the goal. Fire your media team. nobody needs ads for the street itself	122
579	Suggestion	Every single day, hundreds of people dodge traffic on south congress to get that stupid picture of the capitol sightline- I recommend its permanent pedestrianization from 12th to Elizabeth, but I will settle for Bike day on sunday (because people will eventually demand its pedestrianization if you do this)	122
316	Other	And Yellow Bike maintenance and repair classes that are free for CoA employees.	122
204	Concern	year needs updating. I hope Viva Streets are in the plan for the future!	123
388	Suggestion	This rebate should apply for any purchase, not just at local shops. E-bikes sold at approved shops are almost universally deluxe models and do not come in at price points under 1000 dollars. If you want actual take up amongst riders who are not wealthy, scrap the local shop requirement	123
317	Question	The strategies below seem to apply to K-12 only. What about the ca. 75,000 higher education students who commute to school?	124

99	Suggestion	Also requires a route that is safe from crime or "adult situations". Someone on a bike or on foot is more exposed to whatever is along their route, vs school bus or parent's mini van. (AISD has actually designated whole neighborhood planning areas as "high crime" so that they run school buses, even for students who live pretty close.)	124
98	Suggestion	Requires safe bike storage at home, esp for apartment residents and also considering larger families.	124
97	Suggestion	If Safe Routes to School is key here, they must extend to serve all students and all schools, not just district. This is strong equity issue, because relatively more students of color attend charters, and charters are relatively more located in underserved areas of the city.	124
205	Concern	A staple of successful SRTS programs are Bike Trains. The Austin SRTS Program should provide resources, training and encouragement to parents interested in leading Bike Trains on how to plan and implement regularly scheduled Bike Trains.	125
206	Concern	Add to Indicators and Targets: Establish Bike Train (or Bike Bus) initiatives in at least 10 schools holding regular rides by 2024.	125
207	Concern	These actions should have defined goals and targeted dates.	125
461	Suggestion	Suggest adding new 3.4.7. "Support building facilities for cycling *at* schools, in the form of bicycle playgrounds and traffic gardens for younger students and BMX & mountain bike trails, pump tracks and skills park facilities on campuses." For example, Colorado Mesa University in Grand Junction CO features an asphalt pump track and skills park. The Thaden School in Bentonville AR features a pump track. And Ghisallo Cycling Initiative constructed a dirt-surfaced pump track and bike trail at Langford Elementary in Southeast Austin.	125
460	Suggestion	Agree. I would suggest adding, "such as support for National Interscholastic Cycling Association (NICA) affiliated programs."	125
333	Suggestion	#	126
582	Suggestion	Not necessary- ride a bike you'll get an education right away in how little ATD has done to help	126
514	Concern	We need this.	126
583	Suggestion	No please use engineering principles to keep my soft shitty body from being murdered by a truck- Education is a joke	126
208	Concern	Classes are limited to AISD schools and do not include Charter Schools or schools within ACL that are in other school districts. Greater coverage is needed to cover all schools!	126
584	Suggestion	This is simply unserious. YOU are responsible for the safety of road users.	126
102	Suggestion	All of this needs to be language accessible.	127
209	Concern	Actions should have a specific target number as a goal.	127
462	Suggestion	Construct trails, mock-cityscapes ("traffic gardens"), bicycle playgrounds, BMX facilities and mountain bike skills courses, on school campuses, particularly ones partnered with PARD that could be open to the public, to both teach and excite students about cycling.	127
101	Suggestion	Doesn't the library department do some of this now?	127
100	Suggestion	Austin Public Health?	127

103	Suggestion	There's a general direction to reduce using sworn law enforcement staff to do things that don't need that expertise/expense/constrained workforce. Eg already Mobility Safety Officers for some enforcement, promotoras or CHWs for connecting communities with public safety resources, etc. Maybe rework this whole section to get APD into the role that only APD can do (investigate bike thefts eg), but not bog them down in tasks other groups are better at.	128
585	Concern	These conflicts are largely a result of the failure of ATD to provide meaningful space to cyclists	129
210	Suggestion	To reduce speeding, streets should be designed and built (or retrofitted) to eliminate the ability to speed.	129
586	Suggestion	Road diets on ATD ROW deathtraps YESTERDAY	129
587	Concern	Again, the beg buttons in every crosswalk downtown don't inspire confidence that you're gonna do much here	130
588	Concern	Jaywalking is essentially always safer- and that's your fault!	131
83	Suggestion	Are there efforts to get progressive laws like this on the books in Austin? As both of these yield laws have been shown to improve cyclist safety, the current laws force people on bikes to sacrifice their own safety or break the law and face a penalty. That seems like a situation that needs to be remedied immediately.	132
84	Concern	They are currently not aligned with best practice.	132
525	Concern	The city of Austin, and Texas at large, would benefit from greater education geared towards drivers and higher enforcement of sharing roads. Bicycling will never be safe as long as drivers are openly hostile and dangerous towards cyclists. Greater road sharing safety instructions and enforcement is needed towards those in cars.	137
589	Suggestion	Please stop Jesus just build infrastructure won't somebody think of the infrastructure	137
590	Suggestion	Wow- ALSO not necessary	137
591	Concern	Yeah let's call the library and the energy company that will help	138
335	Suggestion	Work with ARR Collection staff so that bike routes are not obstructed by wheeled bins after ARR staff empty them.	138
334	Question	to...?	138
336	Suggestion	Work with APD and area emergency room staff to accurately document injuries sustained by cyclists when cyclists are hit by motorists.	139
337	Suggestion	Work with APD, EMS and area emergency room staff to accurately document injuries sustained by cyclists when cyclists are hit by motorists.	139
338	Suggestion	Work with APH, EMS and area emergency room staff to accurately document injuries sustained by cyclists when cyclists are hit by motorists.	141
592	Question	Who comes up with this shit?	141
777	Concern	The property tax system, while flawed, is one of the few examples of a broad based taxes where the wealthy - landed gentry - pay a higher share of the taxes. Current moves by Council - see the Homestead Exemption, aka the HEx - and the Lege agree with reducing property taxes, it's just that these reductions are targeted at the wealthiest. Any and all reductions in property taxes should be viewed primarily as reductions in public education funding. We ain't gonna fix displacement by lowering taxes on property owners.	144
593	Concern	All P&Z does is sign off on new suburbs and assume more ROW liability for Y'all- good luck getting LDC changes in the next hundred years Imao.	146

595	Suggestion	Just change the urban form and people will change their behavior- Stop dicking around	148
594	Question	#2 priority bike share? Is this outdated?	148
596	Suggestion	THE FUNDING SOURCE IS THE REGULAR BUDGET YOU DON'T NEED EXTRA MONEY TO DO YOUR REGULAR JOB	149
597	Suggestion	You don't need more mobility bonds to repurpose lanes. you have an operating and capital budget already. Prioritize it accordingly	149
598	Concern	This is known to cause sprawl	149
463	Suggestion	I would suggest adding "and recreational bike park facility." (This would be intended to cover things like BMX and MTB dirt and ramp parks, youth-oriented pump tracks, bicycle playgrounds, bike polo courts, etc.)	150
464	Suggestion	Fund off-road recreational-bicycling facilities that act as both a destination for existing transportation cyclists and improves and grows the culture of cycling.	151
599	Suggestion	I cannot recommend this enough for swaying the public's view of how we want to use urban space	153
600	Suggestion	I'll stop sending angry emails if you guys do bike sundays	153
449	Suggestion	Can remove the Bike Share of Austin as part of the partnership as that entity will be dissolved as CapMetro takes full responsibility for the operations of MetroBike.	153
601	Suggestion	Don't partner with bad actors ffs	154
787	Concern	Council should adopt the policy of acquiring all TXDOT facilities inside the City limits. The City can better determine the design and operation of these facilities. Interstate highways should go outside of the city.	154
451	Suggestion	Please edit this to mention crashes instead of accidents. #crashnotaccident	157
452	Suggestion	again - #crashnotaccident	157
374	Question	What is the baseline for all these indicators, that is, where are we now?	158
602	Question	What are you going to do when you fail to reach these goals in a decade? this is like 1000% increase in a decade? Do you expect compound growth from a few half-assed plastic posts?	158
339	Suggestion	CoA and its VisionZero program cannot achieve any stated goal when they cannot define an accurate starting point. I know of three crashes between motorists and cyclists in which the cyclists were injured seriously enough to require surgeries, yet theses crashes are not part of the serious injury datasets. CoA must find a way to reconcile initial crash reports with EMS and area emergency room diagnoses to create accurate datasets from which meaningful reductions can be calculated.	158
603	Suggestion	You're literally the people in charge of removing the parking on congress. You guys know you can help, right? People already realize they're not supposed to park in the bike lane.	159
453	Suggestion	This is a great goal, and it should have meaningful indicators and targets. At a minimum, there should be periodic meetings with the BAC and bike groups to discuss progress on the plan.	160

465	Suggestion	<p>Is it possible to add a new strategy?</p> <p>Promote bicycling at on-campus recreational and instructional bicycling facilities such as bicycle playgrounds, traffic gardens, pump tracks, and natural surface trails.</p>	161
604	Suggestion	<p>But no, for real- the flexposts are a start- but it shouldn't require another billion dollar bond to start giving streets sensible treatments whenever they're repaved. I'm disappointed that ATD will continue to feign concern for cycling safety, and then make all their decisions through the lens of which choice does not inconvenience drivers. The flexposts are nice. I want more flexposts. I definitely want more fuck-up-my-car actual bollards. I want streets where car thru traffic has been completely removed with the use of bollards/planters. But for now, ATD doesn't take alternative modes seriously, and they continue to maintain ridiculously over-engineered roads like Red River, Guad, Riverside, 12th St. Every street downtown is like three lanes of car traffic and two lanes of parking. DOWNTOWN We're talking here!!!! From the bottom of my heart, You've failed us all You're the only ones who can actually make a difference by taking lanes away in the central city- and you're making master plans about bike education.</p>	167
466	Suggestion	<p>We suggest adding a definition "Bicycle Playground: A professionally-designed facility focusing either on miniature streetscape mockups for road riding instruction (also known as "traffic gardens") or an off-road skills-developing track with obstacle features, like rollers, platforms, banked turns, tunnels, etc."</p> <p>https://www.imba.com/resource/what-bicycle-playground</p> <p>https://www.saferoutespartnership.org/blog/traffic-gardens-teach-and-inspire-kids</p>	169
523	Suggestion	<p>Good to see this definition, but it is incompatible with reality. How can this be monitored when an "e-bike" is sold as both what is described here, and as a 40PMG vehicle. Is there another definition needed, "High Speed e-bike?"</p>	169

455	Suggestion	<p>I would suggest adding a definition of "nature trail" that brings in the concept of singletrack for mountain bike use in addition to hiking. The term nature trail is used in the document but not defined.</p> <p>Such as: Nature Trail: "A natural surface (i.e. existing dirt/clay) path through a forest, field, park, etc., typically singletrack width, appropriate for both hiking and mountain bike use."</p> <p>Alternatively, I would suggest changing references to "nature trails" to "natural-surface trails" or "singletrack trails" in several places in the document.</p> <p>Our concern is that the historical definition of "nature trail" according to definitions in Merriam Webster, Cambridge, Britannica, etc. is defined in a way that mentions hiking or walking, but not biking.</p> <p>Mountain bikers have been responsible trail users for several decades in Austin, and have had a hand in creating and maintaining many of the multi-use singletrack that people enjoy.</p>	170
454	Suggestion	<p>I would suggest adding a definition of "singletrack." See for example, "Denver Moves: Pedestrians & Trails" page 3. "Singletrack trail – an unpaved trail, usually only wide enough for one user at a time." https://www.denvergov.org/files/assets/public/doti/documents/plans/denver-moves-pedestrians-trails-2019.pdf I would add to that definition, "popular with both hikers and mountain bikers."</p> <p>Or see "Trail Solutions: IMBA's Guide to Building Sweet Singletrack"(2004).</p>	170
467	Suggestion	<p>We suggest adding a definition of Traffic Garden: "a youth-oriented instructional facility featuring a miniature city-scape for teaching road riding skills in a controlled environment."</p> <p>https://www.saferoutespartnership.org/blog/traffic-gardens-teach-and-inspire-kids</p>	170
790	Suggestion	crash not accident	173
789	Concern	Strike Level of Service and vehicle hours of delay.	173

General Comments received between January 27, 2023 and March 20, 2023 on [Public Input](#)

Please put the bicycles on the sidewalk area, not the streets. Also, the bike lanes and ugly white posts are forcing sharp turns, including by busses and emergency vehicles. And requiring part of the vehicle to be in the oncoming lane sitting at these lights and intersections!! On Burleson road you usually have to stop behind cap metro and trash, etc because white posts don't let them move to right and white posts in center keep from passing.
This is exactly what the white posts are supposed to do. They are meant to discourage vehicles from driving in the bike lane and killing people on bikes. You will be ok making slower turns and waiting 15-30 seconds behind a bus
That's your feedback on the Austin Bicycle Draft Plan for 2023? Make bicycles ride on the sidewalk and get them off the streets, because you think the flex posts are ugly and they slow you down?
I think he is talking about grade-separated bike lane
Sidewalks are for pedestrians, not bikes or scooters. This sad comment is a perfect example of the mentality that Cars own the roads and cyclists should always be the ones to compromise. The truth is that there needs to be a hierarchy bikes, and pedestrians should be at the top and cars at the bottom.
Dear anonymous commenter. Slowing down cars is good. Over 25mph the chance of a pedestrian/cyclist getting killed when hit increases enormously. For a friendly and safe city you want to encourage bike use and discourage anything that impedes bike use.
Excellent plan, and congrats on the current progress. Keep up the great work and do everything in your power to accelerate implementation, including holding space open for lighter, quicker, cheaper materials as appropriate, including anything that will slow motor vehicle speeds and decrease motor vehicle volumes. These important multivariable issues (as identified in all three of these plans) facing our city and society, in general, need us all to move forward with a sense of urgency. As many trips as possible must shift to active, ultra-low to no-emission modes of travel. The cycle network provides a unique opportunity to shift many short trips that are inherently cycling distance. For the on-street network, please whenever humanly possible use more concrete barriers or other such devices (self-watering planters, etc.) versus flex posts - more authentic protection is needed if we are going to get the interested yet concerned folks riding. For the new build stuff, I'm loving the red concrete (let's figure out how to do this with asphalt too) and integration with rain gardens, more of this whenever it fits in the budget, or you can leverage developer dollars.
In addition to the comments I left in the document I think the program needs to engage local bike shops, UT, St Eds and others to actively solicit responses to this document. They should also be engaged to teaching bike safety, rules, and maybe basic maintenance. Glad to discuss this and the planning document as a whole any time.

Generally, I don't think road bumps should be used for protected lanes, even if they are intended to save costs. They are frequently knocked free by cars hitting them, and end up in the bike lane causing a hazard and defeating their purpose. In addition, I don't think they are very visible to someone driving a modern pickup truck or SUV with poor visibility. Even just painting them something that doesn't blend in like white, would be an improvement.

If not already planned, CoA should engage with Travis county on areas that split Austin or identified routes, such as Howard Lane between Howard Station and McNeil and Parmer. Within a short couple of mile route, there is a mix of wide protected bike lanes, no bike lane/shoulder, very narrow unprotected bike lane, and interruptions to the bike lane to accommodate turning lanes for private business driveways. If a bike route is identified, it should be a priority to make it usable and safe without frequent disconnections, even if that means overcoming design challenges or collaborating with the county.

I agree with John about the need for effective barriers. Bollards knocked into the bike lane can cause a cyclist hitting them to crash. That is especially so if it is dark.

flimsy pastic bollards offer no more than symbolic protection at best, and at worst, a false sense of security! Truly safe bike lanes have to be either RAISED above street level above the curb (the waythey're typically constructed in Europe), or protected by SOLID concrete curbs (ideally with landscaped/xeriscaped buffers...).

We can't have enough connecting bike trails/protected bike lanes/cycle tracks

I love the plans for bike trails. We have a project in our neighborhood. However the trails are useless if people can park and block them. I saw cars parked between the curb and protective dividers completely in the bike line. I see cars parking at the curb cut entrances at intersections which completely block all bike access to protected bike crossings at intersections. I see school traffic completely violating all no stopping and no parking signs. What's the point of having bike lanes if parking violations are ignored and parking isn't limited to protect bikers and bike lane access

Report it on the 311 app. The response time is not fast but they eventually come out and will ticket the car. In other words, they sort of do enforce it but due to the size of the city need people to report violations.

Many existing bike lanes work well until you reach an intersection, which is typically the most dangerous area due to turning vehicles. Intersections such as Shoal Creek at 38th have great bike infrastructure. It would be great to see these designs more widespread

create more city/federal jobs for the poor to construct these faster and for the cities economy. and introduce more way of public transportation (city buses, city taxis(NOT RUN BY A PRIVATE COMPANY BECAUAE CAPITALIST CANT BE TRUSTED))

I notice that many roads (Duval in Hyde Park) use the silly system of having right-to-left: curb, car parking, bike lane, cars driving. That's very unsafe for bikes. Why not the much more sensible system of right-to-left: curb, bike lane, parking, cars driving?

Also: many roads have a bike lane on one side and a bike gutter on the other. Eliminate the bike gutter and have a nice two-way bike lane with a raised median between it and the car lanes?

Where can I find an interactive map to see impacted areas similar to the Urban Trail docs? Thank you!

As someone that commutes primarily on bike, I've seen steady improvements over the last 7 years here. There are still major issues with surprise gaps in the network though. I'm curious how many of the staff on this project actually use the bike network? Here's a fun challenge: pick two random points in Austin within 4 miles of each other and then try to bike from one to the other :)

<p>Improvements to biking and walking are greatly appreciated. Even though Austin is making strides, I can no longer count the number of occasions where I was almost killed by a car, either speeding or getting too close, or not paying attention, or just not recognizing how vulnerable a pedestrian/biker is. Every bike lane MUST be protected, paint is not protection. And right turns on red invite danger, especially along the Lance Armstrong bikeway. I can't emphasize enough how cars and their are still prioritized in this city over human life. These improvements should be done automatically when a street is repaved, without the need for "community feedback" that consists of the oldest, most aggrieved car-brained citizens. Poor intersections that really stand out for danger and high likelihood of someone getting hurt are 24th and Lamar (narrow sidewalks, cars zooming through yellow lights), Cesar Chavez and Seaholm Dr (cars turning right on red with zero concern for bikers), and the most egregious example of all is the new left turn onto Montopolis from 183. Trying to cross this NEW intersection on a bike invites death. Cars are given a large radius for fast left turns, too quickly to notice or care if someone is crossing the street. This is an enormous oversight, and I encourage the engineers who designed this try to cross on foot themselves. It's borderline criminal negligence.</p>
<p>Also crossing 51st at Cameron is extremely dangerous. The Cameron Rd traffic light allow car drivers to make a left into the crosswalk while the pedestrian walk sign is in walk mode. Most cars will not stop for pedestrians or bicycle riders crossing 51st street from the southeast side of Cameron Rd.</p>
<p>Thank you Kevin- I'm glad someone else understands that the actions of ATD have been completely inadequate- laughable even in this regard. The community feedback is masturbatory- the priority is still cars and only cars. Cycling is unsafe here (BECAUSE OF ATD) and pretending it's safe is insulting.</p>
<p>Car drivers making right turn on red and left turns are extremely dangerous. It's crazy that a car can drive through a pedestrian walkway when the walk signal is set to WALK. People riding wheelchairs, children and others are not visible to many vehicles and drivers are tuned out. I was hit by a driver leaning over to read a cell phone held by the passenger while making a left hand turn. The pedestrian walk sign was set to WALK so I rode my bike across. He had a green light. No driver should be able to drive on a pedestrian walkway when the pedestrian signal is set to WALK. They do it all the time in Austin.</p>
<p>Even worse, drivers often ignore the red light and don't come to a complete stop before turning right on red. Austin should adopt what a number of other cities have done and ban right turns on red. It's a very simple change that will have a huge impact on safety.</p>
<p>There needs to be bike cages near transportation centers like the airport and bus/train terminals (Greyhound & Amtrak) so you can store your bike if you go on a long trip.</p>
<p>On the metrics, feedback from those riders who survived getting hit is critical if you are serious about not killing people. When I was hit, police arrived, gave the driver a ticket for about \$200 and gave me a police report while I was in the ambulance. The city missed an opportunity to learn how to prevent accidents in the future. Valuable feedback can be used to reduce deaths from the near-death experiences and recommendations for improvement from bicycle riders and pedestrians who are hit by vehicles.</p>
<p>Metrics on</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) hit/survived and hit/killed 2) # of intersection that enable pedestrians/bicyclist to be hit while crossing with a WALK sign, 3) # of bike paths / sidewalks that "disappear" creating dangerous driving conditions for the cyclist / pedestrian <p>should also be included in the set of metrics.</p>

I have serious concerns about the inclusion of "bicycle boulevards" as part of the AAA network. Their entire design also seems contradictory with another aspect of the WBR plan, that of shared streets. For shared streets, it's necessary to slow traffic to 10 mph and extremely low volumes in order to provide a safe and comfortable experience for pedestrians.

But we think it's okay to put an 8 year old on a bike out on a bikeway in mixed traffic with 20+ mph speeds and much higher traffic volumes. That's at least 4X harder collisions, much higher chances of serious injury or death from collisions, and much higher chances of being hit (due to higher traffic volumes).

I don't see any way to comment on the planned AAA map, so I'll have to do it here.

Even if there are appropriate locations for bicycle boulevards, Mullen/Teakwood is most assuredly not it.

This is a higher volume cut through that many take at high speed. Many accidents have occurred. Multiple times cars have ended up literally crashing into houses. This is not a safe location for a bicycle boulevard.

The very design of the roadway and the surrounding land use should preclude it from this treatment.

1) Despite the dual names, it is a single road with a semi-blind curve that vehicles take at high speed.

2) It is a wide road, but despite that there is minimal use of the road for street parking (wider spaced houses each with dual garages and driveways reduce the need) so there is minimal calming from on street parking.

3) The NACTO criteria says to remove the center painted line. If you do that on the Mullen/Teakwood curve you're going to have head on collisions.

4) There is insufficient lighting (street lights are widely spaced) especially around the Mullen/Teakwood curve.

What are the lighting criteria for "neighborhood bikeways"? Many neighborhood streets in Austin have minimal street lighting, insufficient for mixed traffic use at dawn/dusk/night (especially for all ages/abilities). Will additional lighting be added as part of construction? Will it be a criteria sufficient to call for another treatment?

REMOVE CAPTCHA PLEASE. Every single comment takes more than 2 minutes, just to complete the asinine CAPTCHA. This is an absurd limitation to feedback, are you trying to get us to give up? I understand the first time, but for every single comment? And of course it's the slow version where it loads additional images. And half the time it tells you you're wrong. Totally unacceptable for a public forum. Do better. I bet this document could have 50x the engagement if you made it easier to do so. Complete policy failure by whoever designed this web interface. Oh, and thanks for censoring s-t-u-p-i-d from my comment. Really adds to the experience.

Oh my god do you really have to pull the race card on this! I have been riding bikes in and around Austin for 50 years. All I need is wide smooth streets. Most of your plans and infrastructure are just a waste of money and more establishment fat.

Any planning of this type MUST be centered around micro-mobility. This is a front line for electrification and efficient, convenient mobility. The planning I see here is deficient in this regard. Much (most?) of the bicycle infrastructure in Austin is woefully substandard - paint on a street, bollards and turtle bumps provide little confidence for riders. Paint on substandard paving (look at Shoal Creek north of Allendale/Koenig for a good example) is unacceptable for bikes, much less 28 mph

micro-mobility. This segment of mobility is growing and increases in fuel costs will accelerate that growth. GET AHEAD OF IT!

Please cease to have a trail cut through the grove of trees along Shoal Creek Blvd at 34th Street just across the street from Saint Andrew's school. Instead consider using the current sidewalk/trail that runs along the east side of Shoal Creek or continue the bike lane to 34th Street. This provisional pathway is compressing the roots of the trees in the small amount of green space.

A few main comments.

First, the drivers in the city are terrible at understanding the needs and vulnerabilities of cyclists. This is a car-oriented city and people make fast turns without any conception that a cyclist or pedestrian might be there. My takeaway from this is that any successful mobility measures have to be aggressive. A line of paint won't do it: a concrete curb will. Lowering the speed limit won't do it: narrowing the street with bulb-outs will. Even then, there needs to be enforcement. I use the protected Rio Grande bike lane as my main route, and literally 50% of the time there is a car or giant delivery truck parked in the bike lane even despite the concrete curb.

Second, the plan needs to be focused on routes where people will actually bike. I live in central Austin, and was shocked to see somewhere around Yager Lane a buffered bike lane protected by bollards, with no one at all using it, when along Guadalupe, which people actually use, the line of paint is faded and the bike lane is full of potholes and gutters. I understand that in terms of planning it's easier to put bike lanes on spacious suburban streets, but this is like the story of man looking for his keys under the street lamp because "that's where the light is." Central Austin, East Austin and South Austin, from Mopac to 183 and from 71 to 183, is the area where the most impact can be had. This is the part of the city where people are excited to bike--provided they have the infrastructure.

Thank you for listening.

Please consider prioritizing areas of the city where there are greenbelts or creeks to build bike lanes. They are naturally occurring geographic areas that tend to be lower ground and easier to bike on since there aren't as many hills. This also means that half of the streets next to creeks don't have driveways, so there are less physical impediments for pleasant biking. Further, any space that has an alley for cars behind homes means that that side of the street won't have any blockages for driveways, so bikes can feel more comfortable about fewer impacts from motorists (since cars are on the alley behind homes). These are ideal places where we can reclaim space from cars for protected bike lanes.

Lastly, the plan should include a provision that every street with a school on it should have a protected bike lane on it, full stop. Every school should have protected bike lanes that lead to a bike parking area right near the entrance to the school (closer than where cars are parked).

RE Greenbelts & creeks: ROW and erosion are major concerns - consider the Shoal creek landslide that still has no cleanup plan due to ongoing legal issues.

Please expedite the program to allow citizens to provide violation information on cars parked in bicycle lanes so they can be fined for the violation. This is a deadly and ongoing problem for all bike lanes, primarily caused by rideshare and delivery drivers.

Austin is significantly lacking in retail (especially apparel) that can be accessed by bike or foot. Retail streets, including E Cesar Chavez, S 1st St, Guadalupe St (north of campus), should be prioritized for slower car traffic, more bike lanes, and more pedestrian crossings, to provide access for all people to shops, and encourage more shops to open due to increased foot traffic. Please consider adding protected bike lanes to S 1st St, north of Oltorf St, along with more pedestrian crossings. There are lots of shops in that area that would benefit from a more bike and pedestrian friendly design. For some context, I live in East Austin, don't own a car, and use my bike to get almost everywhere. When I really need to do some shopping I bike on sidewalks of South Lamar to get to suburban shopping malls. Obviously, this is extremely unpleasant, inconvenient, and unsafe.

Bike lanes without bollards or walls are a joke. As long as Uber, delivery drivers, scooters, or just drivers are allowed to park without consequences then most of the bike lanes are dangerous. Constantly having to swerve around obstacles in the bike lane is pathetic.

Grow a spine Austin! Collect that ticket revenue! Put that money into building and maintaining infrastructure.

Thanks!

I don't have the time to read 174 pages. The essence of successful communication in a democracy is to keep it brief, keep it clear, keep it simple. 174 pp tells me someone is padding their contract, and someone else is TRYING to make sure that we, the affected people, will not read it. You have succeeded.

Point 2: I have safely ridden a bicycle 30,000 miles in 45 foreign countries, including four where they drive on the left. I will not ride my bicycle in Austin outside my own neighborhood, because it is too dangerous and too exhausting. First: Drivers here hate cyclists. Second: neither the roads nor the bicycle roads are maintained in a safe condition. Third: Signs are absent or confusing (see comments about cars going through green pedestrian lights. Fourth: I'm colorblind, and I can't reliably see the new-style green lights. Fifth: Two-way bike lanes on narrow streets are a really dumb idea (Great Northern, etc). Sixth: bike lanes that suddenly cross the road at an overpass (west bound Hancock Dr and Mopac) are another dumb idea. Seventh: those turtle bumps and the white posts are not very good ideas. Eighth: vehicle lanes that don't line up across an intersection will eventually get a cyclist seriously injured by a car driver who can't figure out where his lane actually goes (many intersections in west Austin). Ninth: road markings that are so poorly maintained that drivers can't see them are another really dumb idea that will get someone killed. Tenth: bike lanes that disappear and reappear (Metric Blvd) are asinine. To sum up: Austin is a third world country with an ineffective and corrupt governmental apparatus that is trying to masquerade as a first world country. making it unsafe at all times and in all places.

I would like to see the city purchase one or possibly two street sweepers dedicated to keeping bike lanes clean and clear of debris. Broken glass, nails, and sand and gravel patches are all common and render some bike lanes unsafe. I think that cycling clubs could be encouraged to become trained drivers and volunteer, say, 2-hour shifts scheduled all around the city.

In addition, I would like to see bike lanes striped with regard for the uncomformities in the road. Along Shoal Creek Boulevard there are several places where the southbound lane is expected to jump tree roots or other obstacles because no-one bothered to look when they drew the lane stripes. These are frankly even more hazardous than glass or gravel if there is oncoming bike traffic.

I like how the red bike path being installed along Airport near Koenig is implemented with saw cut joints instead of thick expansion joints like the Lance Armstrong Bikeway. On the LAB, the wide expansion joints create such a bumpy ride for anything but a fat-tired mountain bike with suspension. I can't ride my thin-wheeled road bike on there. The red bike path being installed along Airport is much better with its thin saw cuts. One additional improvement would be to run power trowels on the surface for a hard-troweled finish rather than the rough broom-swept finish. The smoother finish creates less rolling resistance and also a smoother ride.

Separated bike paths (like the bumper turtles and the stakes) are a great tool on high traffic roads but they are not needed and very likely make biking more dangerous on low traffic neighborhood roads. South Austin as an example, they are much appreciated on Slaughter and Stassney but unnecessary on quieter slower roads like Emerald Forest where a wide painted bike lane would be adequate and actually improve car driver's visibility to see cyclists! With the separated lanes drivers absolutely have less awareness of a bikes. I have more close calls at intersections now that these have been put in, because the drivers just don't see us anymore.

Some people won't bike unless there are separate lanes but that has to be balanced with making things more dangerous for those of us that actually bike to get around town.

Parking in bike lanes is a big problem, as many have said. I have NEVER seen anyone get a ticket. In many cases, trucks and buses are idling to run their air-conditioning. That at least should be stopped. But having many excellent rules and not enforcing any just enhances general sense of impunity. Better to have no or few rules.

Many places where 51st Street intersects with north-south streets are dangerous. Yet it leads to Mueller where many cyclists live.

Fix the lack of police enforcement on aggressive vehicle drivers. No police presence on our roadways is dangerous to cyclists who are the most vulnerable. It doesn't matter how well the bike lanes are marked if speeding vehicle drivers are encroaching into the lanes and running red lights. Increase the number of academy sessions per year, increase the pay for police to keep other cities from poaching, and support the police. In turn Austin becomes a safer city for all citizens.

Lots of good ideas overall, and general awareness of the issues faced by cyclists. I hope to see implementation.

I'm much happier filling out a bike survey than fighting the ridiculous, expensive garages in Zilker Park. Survey is confusing , what am I being asked for? Random comments throughout the doc? I should be able to understand what the choices and options are. Is it this doc or nothing? (Surveys are not rocket science, but need to be created by people with experience so you get results you can use.) I'm a cycling commuter for decades and support money for bike infrastructure, some comments: Facilities should be equivalent across all parts of town as a baseline. Getting paths / lanes for kids to ride to school is worth extra money and effort, maybe top priority. Second priority is commuting lanes, I think striped bike lanes w/ no parking are fine here Adding shade is never a bad idea in Texas. Dislike buttons and pylons are ugly. Can we compromise on shorter pylons? How do you have a survey without cost?

Vehicles traveling at high speed greatly increases the risk for pedestrians and cyclist, it has been proven than reducing the lane width (just the paint marking, not even physically constraining space) automatically induces a reduction in travel velocity.

Few thoughts: - A larger focus on high comfort "east-west" routes. There are islands of mass transit hubs (Howard station as an example) that suffer because there is not a clear high comfort path to them. - A "Lead me, follow me, or get out of my way" approach with state/regional authorities. We've seen for the past few decades they continue to drag out critical connections. There isn't going to be a inflection point where TXDOT suddenly prioritizes funding cycling infrastructure more than it has historically has - it's time to accept that and work around it. - Tying into point one, fully designed and marked high comfort "start/end" trips pathing and signage. The scattershot of high quality pathing, such as walnut creek, needs to be a single scoped project that does not drag out for decades - yes- south Walnut Creek took TWO+ decades to get built. - Abandon "paint on a road" as a plan to adding cycling infrastructure on high speed (30+) roads. It serves no one but the brave or foolhardy to use that infrastructure. - Set a clear plan in motion for connecting suburbs to mass transit hubs - with "Express" lanes seemingly the only tool mobility authorities have, buses are going to be the only way users of infrastructure can take advantage of those improvements.

Strong agree on all of these points.

I have posted several comments on different details of the plan. This is a general comment about city planning for urban life generally. As a cyclist/bus rider who rarely uses a car, I obviously want cycling to be easier and safer. But there is a limited amount of space not occupied by houses, private yards, businesses and business parking, utilities etc. All these users have to be accommodated if we do not want to turn many citizens into scofflaws.

Let us consider the demands for residential space which the city has been trying to meet by allowing denser housing and taller buildings. The idea obviously is that the residents will use bikes, buses etc and not generate car traffic. This has never been proved: the pattern of modern Texan life makes car ownership necessary. Not requiring parking with new construction will just squeeze parked vehicles into neighborhood streets, endangering cyclists and pedestrians. Additionally, if we postulate bus frequency high enough to replace private cars, then space must be found to create dedicated lanes or they will cut off cyclists and block other traffic every 400 yards or so.

Households without cars will order more for delivery: vans running to a tight schedule will inevitably part in bike lanes.

Good regulation would help: but then no-parking, no-stopping rules have to be followed up with tickets and fines. And that means more personnel for enforcement. In a gun-heavy society like Texas, enforcement also needs to be armed at least some of the time.

How can all these needs and requirements be met?

Reiterating what others here have said - bollards and bumps are good but often are hit and become obstructions in the bike lanes. Curb separation is ideal, like what they have done in Mueller. Separate pedestrian paths rather than shared bike/pedestrian paths, to avoid collisions. And solving a few connection issues - like how to get from Pedernales bike path onto the downtown bike path west - there's a big gap of narrow and very pothole ridden streets, no ideal way to connect there. We are still a very car-centric city, and I'm not sure we'll ever get to what the Netherlands has, but overall I love the direction this is all heading!

Please consider various three and four wheeled vehicles with pedals when planning widths, surfaces, and parking. Please consider various levels of electric or other assistance. Please consider lighting on at least some of the non-automobile paths and almost all parking for pedaled and other alternative vehicles (such as scooters, skateboards et al).

As a member of my former Nghbrhd Assoc, I was responsible for getting bike lanes constructed in my community, and when I was studying architecture in Europe, I was exposed to comprehensive bike&pedestrian systems in several countries. As a result I have these comments: (1.) Bike lanes should be _raised_ above street level and integrated as parallel lanes w/ widened sidewalks/pedes. pathways. Painted stripes and plastic tubes do not offer real safety and in fact only provide _false sense of security_. In Vienna, Amsterdam, etc. bike lanes are raised to sidewalk level; they are _not_ constructed in the streets! (2.) Any planning on alternative transportation routes adjacent to streets must also deal with locations of light poles and power poles in the R.O.W., which take up valuable space and create dangerous obstacles. We need a plan and funding to locate these underground as much as possible. (3.) When I was thirty, I could ride a bike across town, but now, over 20 yrs later, that's no longer possible. We have to realize that not everyone is going to get out of their car and on to a bike, and that current trnsit systems don't always go where we need to! That means that instead of narrowing and/or eliminating vehicular lanes, we should be locating bike lanes and wider sidewalks to the sides of existing roadways. The only way that we're going to be able to deal with the rapid growth of the Austin population is to have an "all in" truly multi-modal approach to transit. Trying to force people out of cars and on to bikes simply will not work for a substantial number of the city's population, due to age, health, etc. A 60 yr old doctor or lawyer living in the hills in west austin isn't going to be able to ride a bike to the office, especiallly when it's ninety degrees and 80% humidity! We need all of these: rail, bike lanes, and continuous sidewalks, but for the foreseeable future we're also going to need lanes for private vehicles, whether they be combustion, electric, hybrid, or hydrogen-powered....!! We can't improve traffic in Austin by making it worse for one form to the advantage of another... We all need to appreciate that *social equity also applies to people selecting the most appropriate form of transit for themselves, rather than being forced into a decision*. As someone who worked for over a decade to get bike lanes in my community, supports rail in Austin, and has lived in European cities with comprehensive, integrated transit systems, I feel qualified in making these suggestions/comments.

There are many hindrances to bicycling in Austin, but the greatest is that so many four-wheeled vehicle drivers seem to think of speed limits as suggestions which they ignore. This is a danger to bicyclists, pedestrians, and other drivers. More enforcement of speed limits is a priority, and I do not see it addressed anywhere.

Bike lanes that are raised above street level, or are completely separated from vehicle lanes by a concrete curb.

I have a few recommendations:

1. The section of Woodrow between West Anderson Lane and Koenig Lane requires proper bike lanes. That section of road is a major neighborhood collector between those two busy stroads, and Woodrow gets a lot of traffic, so have proper curb- or bollard-protected bike lanes would help narrow Woodrow, allow cyclists to be safe, and force motor vehicle drivers to slow down.

2. North Lamar's bike lanes are a joke. I either avoid biking on North Lamar, even taking a longer route to do so, or bike on the sidewalk. In my opinion, it would be best to remove the lanes from road surface of North Lamar and create grass- or tree-separated bike lanes along the north and south sides of N. Lamar. And anytime a bicycle facility crosses with a road intersection, parking lot entrance, or any other car facility, the bicycle and sidewalk facilities should not dip down, but be raised to function as "speed bumps" and make North Lamar transit people-first.

3. The recommendations I've listed above for North Lamar apply to Guadalupe Street, especially from the Triangle to MLK. Guadalupe and Lamar are simultaneously roads and streets, making it dangerous to use either road as a destination because of the high volume of traffic. Separated bike lanes that cut into the width of the roads can help slow cars down and positively induce bike demand.

4. The bike network between Sunshine, North Lamar, the Triangle, and Guadalupe is disjointed and unreliable, where the red and green bike lanes just end and becoming a street in the Triangle and continue again.

5. Curb- or bollard-separated bike lanes are the best way to solve many of the problems with utility vehicles, trash cans, Uber drivers, or anyone else parking in bike lanes.

Would be good to have volunteers to be able to ticket illegally parked vehicles in bike lanes, as this happens all the time and makes it unsafe. Also, Austin Police Department should enforce the law and give citations to distracted drivers that hit bike riders and pedestrians. I've been hit twice and APD did nothing.

Don't put speed humps on bicycle routes. They are jarring and are especially troublesome for young cyclists.

Smooth over the curb / road interface, especially on designated bike routes. Nothing like navigating the seam between the concrete and asphalt -- and the weeds poking through the seam -- while car traffic is whizzing by.

Please consider fully separated / projected East/West bike lanes for South Austin. The current crosstown routes are not acceptable for an all ages / all abilities network. They are not projected, often have parked cars and are incomplete from one direction to the other. We need safe secure bike paths that allow bike and ped users the same East / West access that cars and commuters have. Please make this a priority for South Austin bike lanes going forward.

In support of an earlier comment, 175 pages is too long for effective communication. Since I moved to Windsor Park, 78723, in East Austin, I have never been tempted to ride a bicycle even within my own, large neighborhood. In Windsor Park, there are NO designated HIGH COMFORT TRAILS. The so-called medium comfort trails would never tempt me: too narrow, not safely set apart from auto traffic, dangerous intersection for leaving and entering Windsor Park from any direction, traffic that uses the one uneven bike lane along Berkman for a second traffic lane. There are no safe lanes to neighborhood schools or the soon-to-open Marshall Middle School. What I would like to see happen: Create north-south bikeways on Westminster Drive and Glenwood - Belfast. The Westminster trail would connect with the excellent trail that dead-ends at E.51st St. and provide safe entrance into the Mueller neighborhood. Such a trail would have a pedestrian beacon at East 51st and Tille, cross through Bartholomew Park, continue on Greenbrook to Blanton elementary school, Windsor Park Library, Harris elementary school, Pomerleau Pocket Park on Patton Lane. It would be well-worth the investment to provide safe family, student, and older people access to schools, library, parks. Such a trail would be a high priority item as the Marshall Middle School opens in August, 2023. Supporting the trail with educational opportunities like adding bike trains that would teach students safe, responsible techniques. Golden Rollers for the older cyclists would be an awesome addition. The second trail on Belfast would connect the West side of Berkman with Mueller amenities to the south. I would love to restore the mobility experimental complete street along Belfast that was (and still is) popular even though the barriers were removed in late 2021. To make Belfast even safer, 4-way stops should be installed at through streets: Glencrest, Northridge, Corona, Broadmoor. Watershed Protection would install a bridge across Tannehill Branch Creek at Broadmoor, which would connect to the designated right of way through new construction and emerge at a traffic light at East 51st St. and provide a safe entry into the Mueller neighborhood amenities. Safer bike ways parallel to Berkman would make life much easier for those of us on the West side of heavily trafficked Berkman Drive. In transformational city-planning, the pedestrian and bicyclist access and safety should always be considered first. These two bike routes would vastly improve the quality of life in Windsor Park. Partnering with bicycle safety organizations to educate riders would truly be transformative. (Golden Rollers, Safe Routes to School, Violet Crown Junior cycling, bike trains, Sunday bikeways to highlight different neighborhoods)

To address the difficulty of East-West connectivity in Windsor Park and beyond, safe, all age friendly routes need to be established in Windsor Park. Two possibilities are: Rogge Lane in the south and/or Wheeler Lane/ Northeast Dr. in the northend of the neighborhood. All of Windsor Park should have High Comfort trails for all. Sidewalks aren't really a safe option for anyone. That's all at the moment, but Windsor Park has a goal to try out a Sunday bikeways/walkways from Bartholomew Park to Pomerleau along Greenbrook, Westminster and then cross the neighborhood great divide of Berkman and along Belfast to Broadmoor and back to Bartholomew for a celebration. Financing safe cycle routes within our neighborhood will be a challenge, but Windsor Park has 10 developments in varying stages of construction and the City of Austin has been collecting street impact and parkland dedication fees that are to be spent in our neighborhood. I always can think of more, which I will share at the open house on the 22nd.

Overall, I truly appreciate the time and thought that has gone into this plan. As someone who bikes an average of 4000 miles each year in Austin, my life is literally in your hands. Consequently, I spent hours reviewing this plan, and have sprinkled comments throughout. Here are a few that didn't find a home elsewhere:

1) cease using curb-to-curb speed bumps, both on streets and in private developments (such as parking lots, housing complexes, etc.). These are a hazard to cyclists, esp. at night. All speed bumps should have gaps to allow safe passage for cyclists.

2) bus stops should never coincide with a bike lane. Such designs push cyclists either onto a sidewalk (if there is one) or into traffic. Transit stops must be designed to be fully separate from bike lanes.

3) Austin should implement the "Idaho law" (or whatever you want to call it), so that, when vehicle traffic is not present, a) stop signs become yield signs, and b) traffic lights become stop signs for cyclists.

4) Austin should implement roundabouts instead of stop signs or traffic lights wherever possible. This should be the default mode of intersection control.

Thanks...Tex

Don't force bicycle lanes on narrow streets. Surely y'all have a minimum width requirement????

A general comment: I found this to be a difficult 170+ page document to navigate when all I'm looking for is the proposed bike map. I'm assuming this is what shows on Ch. 2, p. 63. In the absence of any ability to pin comments there, here are a few specifics: 1) you absolutely need a connection from Olmos dr. (dead end stub off of Walnut creek drive) to the Walnut Creek Trail just east of I-35. Otherwise the creek is still a barrier and riders from south of Walnut Crk have only a dangerous Dessau Rd. for access. 2) Connector from West Cow Path to Riata Vista Circle allows 5000+ Apple employees access to point south without tempting fate via US183 3) No "Calle Verde Drive Trail Connector" shown as completed and paved on your map exists, although it's a good idea. 4) Further, connection from said trail connector and Balcones Woods Drive to points south along proposed MoPac trail would provide key access for all of northwest Austin into the city; proposed MoPac trail should be more than a proposition and should not end at Braker Lane / Domain. One more general comment: I proposed over 10 yrs ago that the city prioritize street sweeping for the maintenance of bike lanes to no avail. Now the existence of many bollards and, especially, vertical delineators means that many bike lanes are never swept at all. Bike lanes throughout our community are in horrible shape with respect to accumulation of debris. Our street sweeping crews are small and yet downtown / urban core get swept NIGHTLY! what does it take to change this policy and move priorities toward users who are genuinely and adversely affected by street debris? thanks....

Safe cycling isn't about cyclist education it's about driver education. Drivers are guiding weapons of mass destruction. The "Dutch Turn" should be law for drivers. 6 feet space. Signs to drivers about giving right of way and space to cyclists should be everywhere.

Also, stop throwing cyclists onto sidewalks it's reckless that's not infrastructure.

Make driving huge blind vehicles around Austin's urban center pragmatically stupid because there's never parking. Make parking for normal vehicles that don't block bike lanes and run people over.

Roundabouts everywhere like they put out fires (because they put out a dozen types of fires).

More to say but out of time, I made more extensive comments elsewhere on Austin's public commenting.

I have been injured in crashes with cars. These injuries have left me less capable of riding than I used to be.

March 20, 2023

From: Austin Outside

Re: ATX Walk Bike Roll draft mobility plans presented to the public during February - March 2023

Austin Outside's mission is to champion outdoor places for all throughout Greater Austin. We are a coalition of 61 member organizations focused on parks, open space, active transportation, and the environment.

In this document, we offer our own input on the draft Urban Trails Plan, Bicycle Plan, and Sidewalks, Crossings, and Shared Streets Plan based on the drafts shared with the public during February-March 2023. This input is based on our collective professional experience. Our perspective is both distinct from and complementary to the input gathered through public surveys and community ambassador reports. We have a big-picture perspective drawn from our work advocating for outdoor spaces and the people who use them – including the tens of thousands of diverse community members collectively served by our organizations.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

– Joanna Wolaver, Board President

AO Board Members: Drew Carman, Melinda Chow, Marianne DeLeon, Priya Patel, Nina Rinaldi, Ted Siff, Kari Spiegelhalter, Tom Wald

AO Trails & Active Transportation Committee Chairs: Nina Rinaldi & Darron Jurajda

Urban Trails Plan

We appreciated the clarity and organization of the Urban Trails Plan. The GIS maps of the proposed Urban Trail network made it convenient to review.

Implementation Scenarios & Timeline

Tier 1, the highest priority tier for Urban Trails projects, includes 84 miles of trail with a projected completion timeframe of 20 years (p 35). The Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP) aims for 50% of Austinites to be commuting without a single occupancy vehicle by 2039. This target date for 50/50 modeshare is only 16 years away – what we build in the next 10 years, not the next 20, will determine whether or not we meet it. Given the timeframe for our ASMP goals, policymakers would benefit from clear scenarios showing what resources the City would need to build out our priority trails on a faster timeline. We ask staff to consider including several alternate build-out scenarios and timelines and elaborate on the resources necessary to support each one.

Trail Easements & Trail Width

The Urban Trails Plan should set out a process for increasing the standard width for requested trail easements. The default request should be for trail easements that can comfortably fit dual-track trails at widths that reflect a lifetime of usage projections, e.g. 80 years. This often means a 14' bikeway and a 10' walkway, plus buffer on either side and in between the trails. The cumulative buffer space should be adequate to allow for shade trees. These requirements would necessitate closer to a 50' easement rather than 20'.

Sidewalks, Crossings, and Shared Streets Plan

Shared Streets

We are supportive of and optimistic about the proposal to utilize Shared Streets as a means to rapidly expand our pedestrian network. The Shared Streets approach has tremendous potential to accelerate buildout of our pedestrian network, and we commend staff for their thorough work to identify the streets that are appropriate for a shared street treatment. We also appreciate the need for iterative development and real-time testing of Shared Streets infrastructure. Although that process will be ongoing, we believe it is important that the Sidewalk Plan establish basic safety criteria to determine the success of shared street configurations. This criteria would distinguish Shared Streets' contribution to Austin's pedestrian network from traffic calming efforts, i.e. the City's existing Speed Management program.

In order to fulfill its potential and meaningfully serve pedestrians, the Plan should incorporate the following considerations into the Shared Street Program:

1. In order to succeed, Shared Streets must offer safety benefits to pedestrians that are on par with what sidewalks offer. Sidewalks keep people safe by separating them from car traffic. To achieve a comparable level of safety in a Shared Street context where pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers are expected to encounter one another, car speeds must be slowed to the point where the risk of serious injury is extremely low.
2. The target range for car speeds should draw on evidence about vehicle speed and the risk of severe injury. According to a 2011 study by the AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety,

Results show that the average risk of severe injury for a pedestrian struck by a vehicle reaches 10% at an impact speed of 16 mph, 25% at 23 mph, 50% at 31 mph, 75% at 39 mph, and 90% at 46 mph. The average risk of death for a pedestrian reaches 10% at an impact speed of 23 mph, 25% at 32 mph, 50% at 42 mph, 75% at 50 mph, and 90% at 58 mph.¹

3. The Plan should establish clear, consistent metrics of success in order to determine whether a given Shared Streets configuration provides adequate levels of safety.
4. The neighborhoods where this treatment is planned for should be able to repurpose the areas that are reclaimed from vehicle right-of-way, with vegetation, planters, and other desirable uses.

Safe Crossings

Austin Outside wants to reiterate how important safe crossings are to the network. Roadways with high traffic volumes, moving at high speeds, are significant barriers to people walking, biking, and rolling. We appreciate that this plan focuses on safe crossings and includes strategies such as pedestrian refuge islands, leading pedestrian / bike intervals and specialized signals, pedestrian hybrid beacons, and other strategies to create safe crossings and a connected network.

¹ *Impact Speed and a Pedestrian's Risk of Severe Injury or Death*, Brian C. Tefft, September 2011

Design Standards

The life of a sidewalk is approximately 75 years, meaning each new sidewalk will be serving the community for several generations. It's important to get the design right! The Plan should consider enhancing the minimum standards for future sidewalks, as outlined in the "Policy Redesign Recommendations" from the attached *Taylor's Path* document. If/when necessary, the Plan should propose a process for updating the Transportation Criteria Manual as needed to implement upgrades to design standards.

Currently, the Transportation Criteria Manual sets a 5 foot minimum width for sidewalks plus a 7 foot tree zone along Level 1 roads. The width of both zones increases as the level of street increases. Sidewalk width standards should be 6' even on Level 1 roads, especially to allow for social walking, and for two people to pass each other in opposite directions. This 6' minimum should also be reflected in other documents, for situations not covered by the TCM. Sidewalk turns should include tapering to reflect real-world usage. This helps with social walking, running, wheelchair movements, and stroller use.

Bicycle Plan

We are pleased that the Bicycle Plan is on the path to completion. However, the current draft is missing the central elements that typically form the substance of an infrastructure plan. As such, we are not able to offer feedback on its content at this time.

The draft Bicycle Plan should be completed with the following components. It should then be re-released for a phase of community input in order to allow the public to engage with the substantive elements of the draft Plan.

1. **Proposed network map.** According to the draft Plan, “The AAA Bicycle Priority Network updated through this planning effort has grown to over 1,200 miles of protected bicycle lanes, neighborhood bikeways, and shared use paths...” (p. 10). The 2014 AAA Bicycle Priority Network includes 400 projected miles, of which 250 miles have been completed. The [AAA buildout status map](#) is offered in the draft Bicycle Plan as “living network” (p. 64) that will be added to as new bikeway projects are prioritized. We offer that this is not sufficient documentation to back up the ambitious and exciting proposal to add 800 miles to the AAA Bicycle Priority Network.
2. **Buildout scenarios that include cost estimates and timeframe.** The draft Plan offers a cost of \$1 billion to complete the additional 800 miles of proposed AAA bikeway. A placeholder appendix that would presumably include further detail is empty. “Appendix D: Cost Estimate of the AAA Bicycle Priority Network”. Bikeways are essential infrastructure, and this plan should present a transparent methodology for identification of cost and timelines.
3. **Upgraded standards for future segments in the AAA network.** According to Austin’s 2014 Bicycle Plan, “the ‘8-80’ framework is a good test for all ages and abilities where an 8-year-old or an 80-year-old should be able to navigate by bicycle comfortably and safely.” A look at the bicycle facilities included in the [AAA buildout status map](#) shows only select portions of the network where young children or the elderly could reasonably be expected to navigate safely. As the Bicycle Plan is updated, the City should take this opportunity to update its definition of the “All Ages and Abilities” standard to be more consistent and transparent. Standards should allow for context sensitivity while also maintaining clear benchmarks as to which facilities may qualify as AAA.
4. **A process for exploring incremental quality improvements to existing bikeways.** The completed portions of the bikeway network have made tremendous progress by setting aside street space for cyclists – a critical first step in establishing the network. However, the existing network falls short in terms of adequately protecting cyclists in bikeways and at intersections. It’s time to protect the space we have created for people on bikes in order to make our network truly accessible to all ages and abilities. Most of our existing bikeways classified as “protected” in the AAA network are only separated from car traffic with concrete buttons and/or plastic flex posts, both of which are designed to accommodate motor vehicles entering into the bikeway. Until these bikeways are fully protected with a physical barrier such as concrete curb stops or bollards, they should not be considered suitable for all ages and all abilities – particularly when installed on streets where drivers routinely travel 30+ mph. When this critical element is incorporated into the Plan, accompanying metrics should also be added to meaningfully measure our progress towards improving existing bikeways.

Overall: Input Across All Three Plans

Interactive Map Feedback

During the second phase of community engagement, members of the public were invited to pinpoint desired pathways and indicate trouble spots in the active transportation networks on an [interactive map](#). This process garnered over 3,100 comments. This type of crowd-sourced information about transportation networks can be extremely valuable and we commend staff for incorporating this public engagement tactic. Each draft plan should be explicit about how this feedback informed the plans, and how it has influenced project selection/prioritization in particular.

Microconnections

Across all three draft Plans, we would like to see a proactive approach to identifying existing “microconnections” and taking advantage of them to open up new bike/ped routes. By “microconnection”, we mean an informal pathway, usually less than 200 feet in length, that cuts across or between private property to provide connectivity to people on foot and on bike. For example, the City could prioritize acquiring high-traffic microconnections in locations where they are most likely to disappear due to redevelopment or repurposing of adjacent property.

Non-Infrastructure Barriers

While public infrastructure should remain the primary focus of the Walk Bike Roll plans, we recognize that the plans may be a useful setting to highlight certain additional barriers to walking, biking, and rolling. The draft Bicycle Plan has already made an effort towards identifying such obstacles, such as the End of Trip Facilities explored on page 109. Because many of these challenges transcend any particular active transportation mode, we advise staff to consider them holistically and include a unified set of general issues in all three plans. This issue summary could take the form of a simple table like the one below:

Issue Description	Partner Departments/Entities	Potential Solutions
<i>Lack of bike parking at local businesses</i>	<i>Housing & Planning</i>	<i>Revive bike parking retrofit program for local businesses, ...</i>
<i>Loose dogs</i>	<i>Animal Protection</i>	<i>Review education & enforcement protocols</i>
<i>Substandard or unmaintained bike/ped pathways through construction staging</i>	<i>Development Services, Austin Transportation ROW Management Division</i>	<i>...</i>
<i>Example 4...</i>	<i>Example 4...</i>	

From: Wilkes, Nathan
Sent: Thursday, March 30, 2023 3:21 PM
To: Nina Rinaldi
Cc: Dierenfield, Laura
Subject: RE: Followup on Bicycle Plan Feedback

Thanks Nina, those are all good ideas and helpful. I'll be working on it.

Nathan

From: Nina Rinaldi <nina@shoalcreekconservancy.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 30, 2023 1:44 PM
To: Wilkes, Nathan <Nathan.Wilkes@austintexas.gov>
Cc: Dierenfield, Laura <Laura.Dierenfield@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Re: Followup on Bicycle Plan Feedback

*** External Email - Exercise Caution ***

Hi Nathan,

Appreciate your response, and thank you for sharing what you're planning to clarify. I've included notes below in red on further additions that would provide more context and clarity to the reader. Thanks again for all your work.

On Wed, Mar 29, 2023 at 10:02 AM Wilkes, Nathan <Nathan.Wilkes@austintexas.gov> wrote:

Nina,

Thanks for your review of the section I noted and your afterthoughts; it help me understand what you feel is missing. The following is what I'm planning on doing to be more clear in these areas. Let me know if this sounds complete:

- Information on the total AAA network buildout goals (full build + quick build) is already in the plan. I will be adding cost as well. This is the metric for the initial build of the network which includes a mix both quick build and full build. About the mix:
 - Full build: This applies to projects with dedicated funding (e.g. 3rd street), built by others (Urban Trails, developers, TXDOT / CTRMA, Project Connect), or at locations where full build approaches are necessary / warranted are built at a high quality (e.g. the intersections on Zach Scott or Shoal Creek Boulevard). Neighborhood bikeways would typically be built close to full build quality. - I would clarify here what elements distinguish a Neighborhood Bikeway's quick build vs full build status. Pictures would be helpful.
 - Quick Build: Mostly apples to protected bicycle lanes using flex posts and concrete buttons initially instead of more permeant tools like concrete barriers or planted areas if it would significantly slow down and fragment the implementation of the AAA Bicycle Network.

- In addition to the above goals, provide a clear picture of our **existing** infrastructure, ideally displayed in a table: miles of existing quick build and full build, and within full build, a breakdown of the types of facilities by mileage (i.e. SUP, urban trail, full-build bikeways). This is important for establishing context for the reader as well as establishing a baseline for the Plan's proposed metrics.
- Add upgrade goals for protected bicycle lanes from quick build to full build (miles and cost) -
 - Please include intersection treatments in these goals. Either clarify that the mileage goals are inclusive of intersection upgrades, or parse out intersection upgrades as a distinct goal category.
 - Are neighborhood bikeways represented here?
- Forecast funding needs (known resources vs. recommended funding levels to achieve X buildout in 20 years. This would be in terms of total AAA network and miles (full build + quick build) and miles of network at full build quality.
 - Please ensure that this includes funding for intersections. Anything you can do to clarify existing funding sources for intersection treatments that also serve the bikeways program (i.e. Vision Zero?) will be very helpful.
 - Again, clarify whether full-build neighborhood bikeways are represented in the funding estimates.
- Something else to potentially address as part of the quick build vs. full build discussion: consider exploring different quick build materials besides buttons and flex posts. This could involve upgrading existing quick build segments as an intermediate step before a full build is pursued, or could be techniques that you put into practice just for new quick build projects. In my opinion, the 3600+ signatures on the [petition for more protections](#) on Barton Skyway is just one sign of the public appetite for upgrading barriers sooner rather than later. If quick build infrastructure is going to stick around for YEARS before the full build can be implemented, it's probably worth it to raise the bar. This concept moderates the QB vs FB dichotomy somewhat, in that it may create a "medium build" type of facility that provides more protection than flex posts and therefore can be left in place longer pending full build. **In terms of how to address this in the Plan: page 93 has a table that evaluates different types of barriers, would be great to add further barrier types. Specifically,**
 - Large Bumps: great that you included this novel barrier type, but important to distinguish from the type of concrete buttons that we currently use in our bikeways. As a side note, not clear why trash collection is precluded by this barrier type when it can be done with concrete buttons?
 - Barriers to add to table: Concrete buttons (i.e. Shoal Creek), Rubber curb stops (i.e. Congress Ave Bridge, Zicla Zipper/Zebra), concrete curb stops NOT cast in place (the ones you'd see in a parking lot), water filled jersey barriers (as used for construction staging in the ROW).

I'm speaking here to just your comments on the approach to get to full build quality and am tracking the other AO comments.

Thanks, Nathan

From: Nina Rinaldi <nina@shoalcreekconservancy.org>

Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2023 3:19 PM

To: Wilkes, Nathan <Nathan.Wilkes@austintexas.gov>; Dierenfield, Laura <Laura.Dierenfield@austintexas.gov>

Subject: Followup on Bicycle Plan Feedback

*** External Email - Exercise Caution ***

Hi Nathan,

Thanks for the conversation last week regarding AO's feedback on the draft Bicycle Plan. I wanted to close the loop on one section of the plan that you referred us to:

You referred me to the "Quick Build vs. Full Build Quality" section and links to the associated design techniques. Respectfully, this review reaffirmed that the section does not address a plan to meaningfully upgrade the AAA standards or lay out a process for exploring incremental upgrades to existing bikeways.

I really urge you to take seriously the importance of articulating a clear, concise vision and process for implementing the AAA network in plain language and with lots of visuals showing what we have vs. where we are trying to be. You've been in the weeds on this work for a long time, and that can make it all the more challenging to communicate it to other people who don't have your shared context. This plan is an opportunity to record your institutional knowledge, and we want the important stuff in your brain to make it out clearly to the page. As committed as you and Laura have been to the AAA vision for many years now, the reality is that turnover does happen, and it's one of the reasons that explicitly documenting the AAA vision and process is so critical.

Thanks for all your work on this Plan and everything else you do for our bikeways. Please don't hesitate to reach out if you have any questions or concerns for me.

--

Nina Rinaldi

Projects & Policy Manager

[Shoal Creek Conservancy](https://www.shoalcreekconservancy.org/)

m 541-908-0759

From: [Tom Wald](#)
To: [Wilkes, Nathan](#); [Dierenfield, Laura](#); [DeSanctis, Ann](#); [Johnstone, Dylan](#); [Schofield, Mike](#); [McColloch, Craig](#); [Eastman, John](#); [Spence, Janae](#)
Subject: Additional input on ATXWBR
Date: Monday, March 20, 2023 10:28:21 PM

You don't often get email from tom@redlineparkway.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

*** External Email - Exercise Caution ***

All,

I'll keep this (relatively) brief.

I understand that developing updated plans is a huge undertaking. Despite my criticisms below, plus ones submitted online and via other channels (e.g. organization letters), there is so much good stuff in these plans, and I am thankful that they are being updated.

Due to time constraints, I was only able to closely review the draft Urban Trails Plan. I focused on this one, since it is most closely aligned with the needs of the Red Line Parkway. I skimmed the other two plans, but not systematically.

Overall, I would like to say that these plans would have benefitted from closer collaboration with local practitioners throughout the development timeline, including me and perhaps dozens of others. The focus on equity for this round of planning does not preclude also working with practitioners on the development of the plans, and shouldn't be used as a reason to obstruct collaboration. (I'm ready to have that conversation, if that's the reason.) My hope is that the next round of planning will make more use of available and untapped local knowledge and expertise. Having been through several rounds of planning, I think that the common paradigm of city-consultant planning leaves an incredible amount of potential untapped.

Neighborhood Bikeways and Urban Trails connectors across barriers: I have found mentions of this tool in both the trails and bikeways plans, but have not found a map or list where the planned projects will be. I'm not sure that there was any systematic planning done on this, but if there was, please point me to where I can find a list or map of the combination of tools used. This is one of the most powerful and cost-effective tools used by Portland OR and Vancouver BC (along with diverters) to reach some of the highest concentrations of everyday bicycle use on the continent. We have many missed opportunities locally, and we miss more of them almost every month.

Connections to single-track trail system: Our city has a series of disconnected single-track natural surface trails that can be used for walking or mountain biking. I couldn't find any systemic reference or integration with those trails. (The closest that I found was what seemed like including the Barton Creek Greenbelt Trail within the Urban Trails system.) I understand that it may have been outside the scope of any of these three plans. If that's the case, then it's not clear why it would both be excluded (from these plans) and that there are no action steps to integrate with the natural surface trail system in the future. I may have missed the discussion in the plans, so direct me to where I can find this, if it's in one of the plans.

Equity: The plans are evidently equity-driven in important ways, but much of the latter part of the timeline of developing these plans suggests that equity played a much lesser role. E.g. it seems that Community Ambassadors played a much more minor role and that equity was less of a consideration. I don't have inside knowledge, but rather this is my impression from reading the draft plans and reviewing many of the draft conclusions and decisions. I welcome a conversation to gain a better understanding of how racial equity was part of the process from start to the near-end (i.e. now).

Greenways: Related to the topics above about Neighborhood Bikeway and the single-track trail system, greenways can play an important role in an active transportation network. Greenways can provide a decent substitute for urban trails, once the remaining underdeveloped corridors are exhausted for urban trail implementation. I'm using the term "greenways" for the tool being used in other cities to transform an existing car-oriented street into a ped-bike focused (or ped-bike only) corridor, where landscaping, trees, and amenities are added. Such greenways facilitate longer distance travel, i.e. 1-5 miles. Greenways can also opportunistically connect existing park assets and existing urban trails. These go beyond the elements added to Neighborhood Bikeways. I didn't see any mention of this tool in the plans, but I welcome any discussion that I may have missed.

How to integrate active transportation into other city departments: There was some mention of this in the bikeways plan, and may have been some mentions in the sidewalk/crossings/shared-streets plan. I believe that our city's potential (city as the holistic 1MM-person place) for active transportation is hampered by inertia at many City of Austin departments that actively promote car use and hurt active transportation and transit. Some various examples include, the health department only providing COVID testing services to people with access to cars, ATD engineers (of course no one here) treating car users as the normal and ped-bike-transit users as some optional bother that should be intentionally marginalized, systemic city policy structures that support building more roads faster than more walk/bike/transit facilities, waste services with locations only in several locations many miles from the city center, and more. The City of Austin is fighting against its own goals to increase the modal split for walk/bike/transit. I would not expect these plan updates to take on that burden, but I do think it's important for these plans (perhaps the bikeways and the sidewalks plans) to make a plan to create a plan that addresses these counterproductive practices within other departments and programs at the city. If you think you need City Council to direct you to do this, please let me know.

Personal obstacles to bicycling and walking: The three plans touch on some of the personal obstacles to bicycling and walking (many of which are highly dependent on background, and I'm very thankful for the equity focus with that discussion), but these plans really only touch the surface of this challenge and opportunity. I understand that it may have been too ambitious to address all of the many personal obstacles raised during this planning process, but I certainly hope that the next iteration of these plans (or related plans) creates clear actions to help resolve these limitations in order to make our city more accessible. The traditional infrastructure will continue to be important, but we are leaving so much potential on the table by continuing to punt this down the road.

I have lots more to add, but will keep it at that for now, since I'm not sure when/if these ideas will be actionable by city staff.

Please feel free to share this with other members of your teams.

Thanks,
Tom

--

Tom Wald
Executive Director
512-203-7626

=====

[Red Line Parkway Initiative](#) is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit founded in 2017 that empowers diverse communities to enjoy, develop, and enhance the Red Line Trail and Parkway corridor to serve Central Texas mobility, recreation, parks, arts, affordability, social equity, physical & mental health, public space, and economic needs.

[Facebook](#) / [Twitter](#) / [Instagram](#)

CAUTION: This email was received at the City of Austin, from an EXTERNAL source. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious and/or phishing email, please forward this email to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

Austin Strategic Mobility Plan

From: Kitten, Cole
Sent: Thursday, October 5, 2023 10:28 AM
To: Austin Strategic Mobility Plan
Subject: Fw: ASMP Public Hearing_Fwd: ATP_Title VI_IRS 501(c)(3) Complaint_TX House Rule 17 Complaint against Mayor Kirk Watson_ATP Executive Director Greg Canally (HB 3899 Perjury)
Attachments: IRS-ATP 501c3_Title VI Complaint (Cc Planning Commission-ASMP_Walk-Bike-Roll Amendment)_30May2023-946am-631pm_zcj.pdf

See below. We can add this to the Phase 4 Public Comment Summaries document.



TRANSPORTATION
PUBLIC WORKS

Cole Kitten

Systems Development Division | Division Manager

Austin Transportation and Public Works Department

Direct (512) 974-6442 | Main (512) 974-1150



From: Rivera, Andrew <Andrew.Rivera@austintexas.gov>

Sent: Thursday, October 5, 2023 10:24 AM

To: Kitten, Cole <Cole.Kitten@austintexas.gov>

Cc: zcjsph@aol.com <zcjsph@aol.com>; Harden, Joi <Joi.Harden@austintexas.gov>

Subject: FW: ASMP Public Hearing_Fwd: ATP_Title VI_IRS 501(c)(3) Complaint_TX House Rule 17 Complaint against Mayor Kirk Watson_ATP Executive Director Greg Canally (HB 3899 Perjury)

Hi Cole,

I understand that the ASMP item was postponed today. When the item is rescheduled for a public hearing, could you please make sure that the attached document and the email below from Ms. Joseph are included as part of the supporting materials?

Thank you,
Andrew

From: zcjsph@aol.com <zcjsph@aol.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2023 6:35 PM

To: edi.civil.rights.division@irs.gov

Cc: Rivera, Andrew <Andrew.Rivera@austintexas.gov>

Subject: ASMP Public Hearing_Fwd: ATP_Title VI_IRS 501(c)(3) Complaint_TX House Rule 17 Complaint against Mayor Kirk Watson_ATP Executive Director Greg Canally (HB 3899 Perjury)

*** External Email - Exercise Caution ***

Planning Commission Public Hearing 1: ASMP (Walk, Bike, Roll)

Austin Strategic Mobility Plan Amendment: Against equity language without improving equitable transit access for Northeast Austin Blacks crossing high-speed roadways exceeding 30,000 vehicles per day.~zcj

-----Original Message-----

From: zcjsph@aol.com

To: edi.civil.rights.division@irs.gov <edi.civil.rights.division@irs.gov>

Cc: andrew.rivera@austintexas.gov <andrew.rivera@austintexas.gov>

Sent: Tue, May 30, 2023 6:31 pm

Subject: ATP 501(c)(3)_Title VI_IRS 501 (C)(3)_TX House Rule 17 Complaint against Mayor Kirk Watson_ATP Executive Director Greg Canally (HB 3899 Perjury)

May 30, 2023 Public Hearing 1: Against Austin Strategic Mobility Plan Walk-Bike-Roll/Imagine Austin Amendment

Memorandum for IRS Commissioner Danny Werfel, Attention: Civil Rights Division Trial Attorney | edi.civil.rights.division@irs.gov

Subject: Title VI Complaint against Austin Transit Partnership Ex Officio “Dottie” Watkins and Board for Project Connect/Light Rail Propaganda, Lobbying, and Collusion with Mobility for All PAC, 501(c)(3) Nonprofits, and Developers to Deny Blacks Transit Equity

Re: Planning Commission Testimony against ASMP Amendment THRU Liaison Andrew Rivera (andrew.rivera@austintexas.gov)

Please see attached PDF for text in its entirety. Thanks.~zcj

Austin transit leaders point to public, legal support after AG opinion on Project Connect

by: [Daniel Gravois](#)

Posted: May 23, 2023 / 07:18 AM CDT

Updated: May 23, 2023 / 07:46 AM CDT

AUSTIN (KXAN) – Austin transit leaders Monday said the strength of public and legal support will keep them moving ahead with Project Connect despite funding issues brought up in a opinion released Saturday by Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton.

As KXAN reported, Attorney General Paxton’s [opinion](#) highlighted two potential issues. One related to debt and tax structure. It pointed to the city’s intention to use the maintenance and operation tax to pay down debt. The attorney general concluded that the

Texas tax code “does not authorize a municipality to “ earmark” use of a voter-approved increase in its maintenance and operation property tax revenue for debt service.”

Texas Attorney General Opinion: [Attorney General Opinion No. KP-0444 \(texasattorneygeneral.gov\)](https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/opinion-files/opinion/2023/kp-0444.pdf)

- <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/opinion-files/opinion/2023/kp-0444.pdf>
<https://www.kxan.com/news/local/austin/austin-transit-leaders-point-to-public-legal-support-after-ag-opinion-on-project-connect/>

-----Original Message-----

From: zcjsph@aol.com

To: Chloe.Maxwell@atptx.org <Chloe.Maxwell@atptx.org>

Sent: Thu, May 18, 2023 3:04 pm

Subject: Thanks!_Re: 5/24 ATP: Remote Speaker Registration_Fwd: Title VI _IRS 501 (C)(3)_TX House Rule 17 Complaint against Mayor Kirk Watson_ATP Executive Director Greg Canally (HB 3899 Perjury)

To: Chloe Maxwell

Board Relations Manager

Austin Transit Partnership

chloe.maxwell@atptx.org

1. **Pending:** I'll await your reply with speaker details.

2. **Topic Clarification:** Respectfully, I did not forward my May 18, 2023 email to you but included the thread subject for ATP testimony context as a courtesy. Thanks.~zcj

-----Original Message-----

From: Maxwell, Chloe <Chloe.Maxwell@atptx.org>

To: zcjsph@aol.com <zcjsph@aol.com>

Sent: Thu, May 18, 2023 12:55 pm

Subject: RE: 5/24 ATP: Remote Speaker Registration_Fwd: Title VI _IRS 501 (C)(3)_TX House Rule 17 Complaint against Mayor Kirk Watson_ATP Executive Director Greg Canally (HB 3899 Perjury)

Hello,

Thank you for registering for public comment. I'll get back to you next week with additional instructions.

The below email references attachments. Please be aware that I did not receive them.

Thank you,

Chloe



Chloe Maxwell
Manager, Board Relations
chloe.maxwell@atptx.org
330.256.3839

From: zcjsph@aol.com <zcjsph@aol.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 18, 2023 12:00 PM

To: Maxwell, Chloe <Chloe.Maxwell@atptx.org>

Subject: 5/24 ATP: Remote Speaker Registration_Fwd: Title VI _IRS 501 (C)(3)_TX House Rule 17 Complaint against Mayor Kirk Watson_ATP Executive Director Greg Canally (HB 3899 Perjury)

EXTERNAL Email

To: Chloe Maxwell
Board Relations Manager
Austin Transit Partnership
chloe.maxwell@atptx.org

May 24, 2023/2PM Austin Transit Partnership Meeting

Remote Speaker Registration: Zenobia C. Joseph

Topic: Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; IRS 511(c)(3) Noncompliance
- Request Removal of ATP Executive Director Greg Canally and Entire Board.

Please email the code at your convenience this week. Thanks in advance.~zcyj

-----Original Message-----

From: zcjsph@aol.com

To: edi.civil.rights@irs.gov <edi.civil.rights@irs.gov>; Dade.Phelan@house.texas.gov <Dade.Phelan@house.texas.gov>

Sent: Thu, May 4, 2023 9:45 am

Subject: Title VI _IRS 501 (C)(3)_TX House Rule 17 Complaint against Mayor Kirk Watson _ATP Executive Director Greg Canally (HB 3899 Perjury)

Memorandum for IRS (edi.civil.rights@irs.gov) and The Honorable Dade Phelan, Speaker (Dade.Phelan@house.texas.gov)

Subject: Title VI, Internal Revenue 501(c)(3) Complaint against Mayor Kirk Watson Lobbying (Violating House Rule, Sec. 17) and ATP Director Greg Canally False Testimony against HB 3899 Using Project Connect Propaganda to Deny Blacks Transit Equity

Re: Austin Transit Partnership Articles of Incorporation, signed December 18, 2020

Pending: Submit first two pages as written testimony to Austin City Council (May 4, 2023/10AM Meeting).

Attachment: Title VI _IRS (501-C-3)_Rule 17 Complaint against Mayor Kirk Watson _ATP Exec. Dir. Greg Canally (HB 3899 Perjury)_4May2023-940am_zcyj

CAUTION: This email was received at the City of Austin, from an EXTERNAL source. Please use caution when clicking links or opening attachments. If you believe this to be a malicious and/or phishing email, please forward this email to cybersecurity@austintexas.gov.

Memorandum for IRS Commissioner Danny Werfel, Attention: Civil Rights Division Trial Attorney | edi.civil.rights.division@irs.gov

Subject: Title VI Complaint against Austin Transit Partnership Ex Officio "Dottie" Watkins and Board for Project Connect/Light Rail Propaganda, Lobbying, and Collusion with Mobility for All PAC, 501(c)(3) Nonprofits, and Developers to Deny Blacks Transit Equity
Re: Planning Commission Testimony against ASMP Amendment THRU Liaison Andrew Rivera (andrew.rivera@austintexas.gov)



1. **Statutory Authority:** Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VI") "is a Federal statute and provides that no person shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance" (FTA C 4702.1B, 2012, Ch. I-7). Additionally, "Every transportation agency receiving Federal aid financial assistance must be unbiased in its actions" (FHWA, 2016).

2. **Federal Funds:** \$11.6B Project Connect/Light Rail funding is contingent on minority ridership, yet Austin City Council ("Council") and Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority ("Capital Metro") continue to circumvent Title VI saying one thing, doing another. ATX Walk Bike Roll Process Summary (2023) acknowledged discrimination, but equity propaganda uses minorities to get funding. May 20, 2023 Texas Attorney General's HB 3899 Opinion noted 2020 rail tax rate "misstatements to the voters of Austin" (p. 7).

I. Acknowledgement of Austin's History of Discriminatory Practices

City policies have forced segregation, guided funding away from communities of color, discouraged participation, and allowed gentrification to create displacement.

Policies and Public Investment

The Austin Strategic Mobility (ASMP) Plan's Equity Policy 1 acknowledges that "communities of color, low-income communities, and people with disabilities have been most negatively impacted by transportation and land use policy and infrastructure due to barriers leading to a lack of representation and institutional power".¹

Some negative effects of past transportation and land use decisions come from disinvestment rather than from the construction of large-scale infrastructure projects. Decades of neglect have had negative effects on neighborhoods such as Dove Springs and North Lamar where residents have had to make do without much investment in transportation infrastructure and other public and private services. Acknowledging this kind of long-term discriminatory disinvestment is just as important as acknowledging devastation caused by new construction projects.

For example, the City refused to pave roads or construct sidewalks in neighborhoods where people of color chose to remain instead of relocating to the 1928 designated "Negro District." Additionally, the City has spent more money on roadways and cars historically, serving those who had access to vehicles, leaving a huge unbuilt portion of sidewalk network today. Much of the emphasis for sidewalks came later, in the 1990s, after the federal government passed the Americans with Disabilities Act.

North Lamar: Race Discrimination Research

Minority Preventable TxDOT Deaths: Fatalities are preventable on Loop 275/North Lamar Blvd. 2009: North Lamar Pedestrian Study. For 20 months, the Texas Transportation Institute ("TTI") with Capital Metro, Austin Transportation Department ("ATD"), Austin Police Department ("APD"), the Neighborhood Planning Programs, and Texas Department of Transportation ("TxDOT") found that, "Midblock locations account for over 70 percent of pedestrian fatalities."¹ Yet, the City of Austin still refuses to construct a sidewalk from 801N-Chinatown for wheelchairs to safely get to 392-Braker. Despite fatalities, CEO "Dottie" Watkins refuses to move 801S midblock to CVS (N. Lamar/Braker). 2016: Donald Norton killed in wheelchair. 2019: David John Medrano was killed at 801N-Fairfield.



¹ Hudson & Ding (2009): North Lamar Pedestrian Safety Study (team results): Final Report. <https://nlct.files.wordpress.com/2011/06/final-report-n-lamar-ped-safety-study-010709.pdf>

Subject: Title VI Complaint against Austin Transit Partnership Ex Officio "Dottie" Watkins and Board for Project Connect/Light Rail Propaganda, Lobbying, and Collusion with Mobility for All PAC, 501(c)(3) Nonprofits, and Developers to Deny Blacks Transit Equity

3. Legislative History: Texas Sunset Commission (2011) found Capital Metro to be "tone deaf" to public concerns" (p. 3).

Customer Satisfaction Advisory Committee
Wednesday, July 8, 2020

Zenobia Joseph – PC will segregate the City Of Austin for Centuries. Says the more frequent, more reliable & better connect service. Her comments are in context of Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Route 339 Tuscany is 60 mins for Black Riders. Would like CSAC to do an opportunity cost resolution that goes to council when they consider the ballot language. Says there was a reduction of service on almost every route north of 183/North Lamar Transit Center. Where there are 45/60 mins routes, would like to see zoning language that would exempt the homeowners that are north of North Lamar Transit Center. In the area of 183/969 isn't live/work/play. There are 28,000 vehicles per day. There is no continuous sidewalk and she has a picture of a white man in a wheelchair in the road with the cars Says it is disingenuous to say that it's more frequent, more reliable and better connected and talk about safety. She says the public service announcement on KAZI equates to propaganda. It's 24-30 years before the area north of North Lamar Transit Center will be considered. Also says that CAMPO has voted to reduce & defer some of the roadway projects and that includes Project Connect. Says it is disingenuous to get on Black radio station & promote that these buses and rail lines are coming their way when it isn't. She wants an apology issued on the radio and to remove the information. She says that because it is underwritten KAZI closes their eyes. She calls it propaganda because she listens to KUT too & says that it doesn't air on KUT. The KAZI spot plays from 5 am to 11 pm every 4 hours. She says that the spot on KUT runs for 15 seconds. KUT says when buses are delayed, someone dies from Covid-19 and gave information in June when the fare was free. Says 801 S. Bound Chinatown stop ID 5857, Dottie Watkins has heard her ask for this many times. There is no reason why we need to cross a 5-lane highway mid-block. A 2009 study says mid-block crossings is where people get killed. Stop needs to be at CVS Pharmacy. Wants the 392 to move back to Arboretum.

4. Disparate Impact: January 28, 2019 Then-Chair/lawyer Wade Cooper admitted disparities then codified race discrimination.

"It is also undeniable that individuals may have seen, in particular areas, changes that did not help those individuals and maybe disadvantaged those individuals. . . . We hear the pain and challenge, particularly, with respect to the Eastside community."

August 7, 2020 FTA funding requires "implementing the least discriminatory alternative," but Cooper maintained Black inequities.

Title VI FHWA Transit Precedent
In Reply Refer To: HCR-1
JUN 26 2013 DOT #2012-0020

Dayton Blacks v. Beavercreek, OH

**Denying Blacks equal access
on federally-funded roadways
run by TxDOT violates Title VI!**

Actors falsely conflate
Ridership (white: rail)
& coverage (Black: bus).

Cap Remap maintains
the racist status quo:
infrequent, unreliable,
disconnected NE buses!

**Before 2018, 35-min Peak
"New" Route 339 was a restored
number from ServicePlan2020
Worsened: 60 min all day only
for Blacks, but fooled the FTA!**

RESOLUTION

OF THE

CAPITAL METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF TRAVIS

Approved: June 10, 2020

RESOLUTION (ID # AI-2020-1297)


Funding and Commitment Resolution for Project Connect

WHEREAS, Project Connect is a vision for how we move people today and plan for tomorrow, and will create an integrated transit system that eases traffic, brings jobs to our region, improves the environment and better connects people so everyone in our community can thrive; and

WHEREAS, the existing local and regional bus network and MetroAccess service are the backbone of the transit system that will provide equitable connections to all members of the community to meet their essential needs and to connect to the high capacity transit network, and the service hours to make that local service successful should be maintained; August 7, 2020 Project Connect False Resolution AI-2020-1297 (p. 34).

id Commitment Resolution for Project Connect

Desired minimum frequency			
RED FLAG			
	Peak	Midday	Night
Radial	30	60	60
Crosstown	30	60	60
Limited	20	30	Based on demand
Feeder	30	60	Based on demand
Express/Flyer	20	-	-
MetroRail	40	60	-
UT Shuttle	20	20	40



Subject: Title VI Complaint against Austin Transit Partnership Ex Officio "Dottie" Watkins and Board for Project Connect/Light Rail Propaganda, Lobbying, and Collusion with Mobility for All PAC, 501(c)(3) Nonprofits, and Developers to Deny Blacks Transit Equity

a. Complaint: January 27, 2023 Capital Metro 8-Member Board of Directors secretly appointed "Dottie" Watkins as President/CEO in Executive Session with no public input. **Watkins married a Black man but treats Black people like second-class citizens.** June 3, 2018 Cap Remap changed 52 routes, undergirding \$11.6B Project Connect/light rail, for 72% whites per ≈ 5K surveys. Her Fiscal Year 2021 title changed from Bus Operations Vice President to Chief Customer Officer, \$38K raise—now \$357.5K, lying. Like former CEO/ATP Director Randy Clarke, Watkins forces Blacks to wait 60 minutes on faux new routes—10 times longer than South/West/Central whites and Southeast Hispanics. Austin City Council ("Council") and Capital Metro fund ATP, 501(c)(3) local government corporation. January 28, 2019 Cooper admitted Cap Remap disadvantaged the Eastside. February 25, 2019 Commissioner (now, Chair) "Jeff" Travillion (sole Black) and Clarke renamed the boardroom Rosa Parks. After the rail permanent ad valorem tax election November 3, 2020, salaries doubled/tripled. Deceiving voters, planners got \$28K+. Watkins then posted Rosa Parks flyers, disingenuously. Ignoring Cap Remap Northeast 1-seat ride eliminations May 17, 2023, she said ridership "depends on the day and the weather," double-/triple-counting minority boardings—cooking the books with new white 1-seat rides. January 30, 2023 ATP secretly appointed Executive Director Greg Canally then falsely said rail will serve North/East May 24, 2023.




FY2018 Capital Metropolitan Transportation Auth	Watkins, Dorothy L.	2655	08/25/2003	15.1	Full Time	\$180,145.54	Vice President Bus Operat	F	White
FY2021 Capital Metropolitan Transportation Auth	Watkins, Dorothy L.	2655	08/25/2003	17.9	Full Time	\$218,400.00	Chief Customer Officer	Female	White

In addition to excessive salaries, the Contract with Voters falsely stated Project Connect will help "underserved and underrepresented communities." National Science Foundation ("NSF") awarded \$1M for a 2021 Northeast transit desert that got \$1M Byrne Grant in 2012. 1/27/2023 Watkins' **\$357.5K** salary (KUT): <https://www.kut.org/transportation/2023-01-27/capital-metro-new-ceo-randy-clarke-dorothy-watkins> 5/17/2023 (OPS 1:00:02): https://capmetrotx.granicus.com/player/clip/788?view_id=1&redirect=true&h=f72fa9b21cdb8e22b43b92e483f6ca93 5/20/2023 **Texas AG questions Project Connect funding**: <https://www.kxan.com/news/local/austin/texas-ag-opinion-questions-project-connect-funding/>

b. Propagandist "Dottie" Watkins: Webster (2023) defines propagandist as "someone who produces or spreads **propaganda**: a person who spreads ideas, facts, or allegations deliberately to further a cause or to damage an opposing cause[.] . . . also: a public action having such an effect[.]" May 24, 2023 ATP staff recommended \$5B truncated light rail from 38th Street in Central Austin to The University of Texas at Austin ("UT-Austin") to Pleasant Valley Southeast Hispanics—excluding Blacks. Watkins concluded:

We all have lots of thoughts and opinions and technical perspectives, but I think it's important that while this is the ATP Board Meeting and we've been presented to you by ATP staff, that **I speak up as an ex officio member** and call out that this was a collective effort. . . . (um) and just want to be out there for the record that don't want anyone to think, well, ATP thinks it's—it's the right think to do. What's gonna happen when it goes to the Council or when it goes to the CapMetro Board? (um) Because the staffs of **all three parties wholeheartedly support this.**

- May 24, 2023 ATP Meeting: North falsity (40:54); Watkins (54:52). <https://austintx.new.swagit.com/videos/232315>



September 21, 2016: Capital Metro falsely advertised frequency for all. "City transit agency aims to boost frequency" By Amy Denny: *Community Impact* <https://communityimpact.com/austin/news/2016/09/21/city-transit-agency-aims-boost-frequency-2/>

June 3, 2018 Cap Remap recodified the 1928 City Plan! Minority/Black Northeast-west connectivity eliminated. July 27, 2020 Samsung to Apple BRT unilaterally eliminated.

\$0: Now, 30-minute transfer to white side!

Subject: Title VI Complaint against Austin Transit Partnership Ex Officio "Dottie" Watkins and Board for Project Connect/Light Rail Propaganda, Lobbying, and Collusion with Mobility for All PAC, 501(c)(3) Nonprofits, and Developers to Deny Blacks Transit Equity

c. Marketing Fraud (2015-2022): Capital Metro's **\$23M+** propaganda stated, "More frequent, More reliable, Better connected."



Norwood Transit Center - E https://www.capmetro.org/current_schedules/pdf/339.pdf

339 Tuscany: 60 min [Black route starts late, less runtime = fewer job options]

Eastbound, Weekday: Blacks earn less, fewer opportunities by design ☹️

Crystal Brook/Loyola


Tannehill/Webberville

1	2	3
6:10a	6:25a	6:52a
7:10a	7:25a	7:52a


d. Praxis: Capital Metro's target audience is white. Only 0.02% (\$1.5M) of Project Connect funds inequitable Pickup on-demand which forces minorities north of US 183 to wait on-hold 5 to 60 minutes unlike 5AM-nearly midnight South/West/Central routes. Discriminatory bus network undergirding rail functions exactly as designed for 72% college whites (25-35), \$100K who have 2 cars.

Question 21: Gender
Responses: 3,597

Focus: White Millennials




Question 23: Which race/ethnicity best describes you? Please select only one.
Responses: 3,544



ABSTRACT

This Community Survey Summary provides an overview of survey responses received as part of Capital Metro's Connections 2025 transit study. The survey, posted online via SurveyMonkey.com, was available between Dec. 21, 2015, and Mar. 13, 2016, and was publicized via the project website, emails, online and print ads, at stop outreach, partner cross-promotion and public meetings/events. The survey included a range of questions designed to capture respondents' travel patterns, demographic information, priorities, and opinions on transit in Central Texas.

Ethnicity Bus, Rapid, Rail 2015



January 25, 2016: Item III. Public Comment
Anthony Walker (Black driver, 2[6]-years). "Urban Rail" reflections: "The leaders is blind ... Capital Metro Board, in general, it's not respecting the City of Austin ... taxpayers. As leaders, ya'll got to do a better job." Stop protecting the rail. Pflugerville and Cedar Park "voted CapMetro out of the service area, but you're catering [to them]." (06:47-12:20)

Item IX: **Origins and Destination Study: Chart (left)** shows 70% of MetroRail riders are white. 24-hour ticket = \$7 vs. Bus = \$2.50. Rail is nearly three times more, too costly for Black transit-dependent "essential workers" to enjoy.
Video: <https://austintx.new.swagit.com/videos/45288>


July 25, 2016: Item III. Public Comment (12:32)
Susan Pantell, PhD (white): "The survey had about 5,000[;] ... survey responses were (uhm) slanted toward (uhm) white people and also higher income than the bus ridership. I'm concerned ... [consultant's] service study... will be biased."
Video: <https://austintx.new.swagit.com/videos/45296>

Subject: Title VI Complaint against Austin Transit Partnership Ex Officio “Dottie” Watkins and Board for Project Connect/Light Rail Propaganda, Lobbying, and Collusion with Mobility for All PAC, 501(c)(3) Nonprofits, and Developers to Deny Blacks Transit Equity

“We begin with the local bus service. This is the fundamental glue to the entire system.”

Meg Merritt (Nygaard Consulting) ~October 30, 2019 Joint Project Connect Meeting

CAMPO/Capital Metro/Austin Plans Work Together



September 14, 2015 Special Mtg: "How Our Transit Plans Work Together" (pp. 9-13): <http://capmetrotx.igm2.com/Citizens/FileOpen.aspx?Type=1&ID=1592&Inline=True>

Coverage (Lifeline access: Local Bus) vs. Ridership/High-Capacity Transit (e.g., MetroRapid, rail)

5. State Action: The City of Austin (“City”), Capital Metro, Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (“CAMPO”), and TxDOT Federal funding plans work together. I, therefore, note cross-jurisdictional Northeast Black/minority disparate impacts. I testified 2015-2023 and now request the Internal Revenue Service (“IRS”) revoke Austin Transit Partnership’s (“ATP”) 501(c)(3) status. To get votes, Council/Capital Metro interfered with the November 3, 2020 permanent ad valorem tax election conflating ridership (MetroRapid, rail) and coverage (lifeline bus) in the August 7, 2020 Contract with Voters and 2021 Joint Powers Agreement (“JPA”). The May 20, 2023 Texas Attorney General Opinion confirmed the “misstatements to the voters of Austin” [e.g., equity propaganda]:

financing is to be modified as necessary to comply with conditions imposed by the Attorney General of the State of Texas. *See id.* There are no limitations in the Resolution on what conditions in the Attorney General may impose (other than those limitations as imposed by the Constitution and applicable statutes). In other words, if necessary to get the financing done, the financing would not just be subject to the authority of the Public Finance Division, but also the Attorney General’s authority to regulate corporations like ATP generally under the Constitution, but also the specific authority the Attorney General has to regulate not-for-profit corporations. Whether the Attorney General can come up with a way to reform ATP to make it legal is beyond the scope of this opinion. Until the Attorney General’s applicable divisions see the complete plan as how the City of Austin and ATP intend to correct the mistakes they made in the Resolution, Interlocal Agreement, and their misstatements to the voters of Austin, it is unknown whether the Attorney General will be able to impose sufficient conditions to remedy all the mistakes that have been made.

6. Relief: Revoke ATP’s 501(c)(3). Article XIII states, “the Corporation . . . shall not direct any of its activities to attempting to influence legislation by propaganda or otherwise” (p. 10). April 20, 2023 Mayor/ATP Vice Chair/lawyer Kirk Watson posted a letter on facebook noting, “We negotiated new bill language” for HB 3899 which passed by two-thirds in each chamber to allow voters to determine November 7, 2023 whether to issue debt for rail. May 25, 2023 *Austin American-Statesman* reported Watson lobbied Rep. John Bucy; his point of order killed HB 3899 Senate Amendment. As senator, it took 35+ years to get a sidewalk from North Lamar Transit Center (“NLTC”) north of US 183 to affordable units in Watson’s area: 75 people were hit in 3 miles (KVUE, 2018). Midblock stops still endanger our lives daily as Watkins turns a blind eye seeking Federal Transit Administration (“FTA”) funds. In 1997, Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”) subpoenaed Capital Metro due to corruption. March 17, 2021 Then-Director Randy Clarke said, “ATP doesn’t exist as an entity from a federal point of view.”² Please fire ATP’s Board and remove ex officio Watkins.

ARTICLE XIII. TAX MATTERS; DISSOLUTION

In accordance with the provisions of Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the “Internal Revenue Code”), and regardless of any other provisions of these Articles of Incorporation or the laws of the State of Texas, the Corporation: (i) shall not permit any part of the net earnings of the Corporation to inure to the benefit of any private individual (except that reasonable compensation may be paid for personal services rendered to or for the Corporation in effecting one or more of its purposes); (ii) shall not direct any of its activities to attempting to influence legislation by propaganda or otherwise; (iii) shall not participate in or intervene in (including the publication or distribution of statements) any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office; and (iv) shall not attempt to influence the outcome of any election for public office or to carry on, directly or indirectly, any voter registration drives. Any income earned by the Corporation after payment of reasonable expenses, debt, other obligations, and such reserves as may be necessary as set forth in the authorizing documents related to the issuance of debt by the Corporation shall accrue to the City and Capital Metro as agreed to by the City Council and the Capital Metro Board.

² ATP (2021, March 17). Clarke’s Executive Director Report (2:04:02). <http://capmetrotx.igm2.com/Citizens/SplitView.aspx?Mode=Video&MeetingID=1926&Format=Agenda>

Subject: Title VI Complaint against Austin Transit Partnership Ex Officio “Dottie” Watkins and Board for Project Connect/Light Rail Propaganda, Lobbying, and Collusion with Mobility for All PAC, 501(c)(3) Nonprofits, and Developers to Deny Blacks Transit Equity



7. **History (1891):** “Disparate impact refers to a facially neutral policy or practice that disproportionately affects members of a group identified by race, color, or national origin, where the recipient’s policy or practice lacks a substantial legitimate justification and where there exists one or more alternatives[.]” (FTA C 4702.1B, 2012, Ch. I-2)



a. Segregation: Project Connect will segregate Austin for centuries. May 24, 2023 ATP approved light rail from 38th Street to The University of Texas at Austin (“UT-Austin”) to Pleasant Valley, excluding Northeast Blacks and minorities—Samsung to Apple. To fool FTA, however, ATP, Council, and Capital Metro document equity while oppressing Blacks with 1- to 5-mile walk to buses. May 24, 2023 Engineer Lindsay Wood’s ATP Light Rail Recommendation intentionally misled Austin taxpayers and FTA: “This first phase provides coverage to the North, the South, and the East. That lays the foundation for future extensions in all three directions.”

b. Fact: Rail starts at 38th Street in Hyde Park which was developed “exclusively for white people” by Col. Monroe Shipe in 1891-1941. Austin Independent School District (“AISD”) sold Baker School (oldest public school) to Alamo Drafthouse in 2017 with a promise of Hyde Park “affordable house,” requiring 120% AML—exceeding a teacher’s salary. In 2020, Council approved a \$3.7M detention pond onsite—maintaining segregation on the Orange Line. Now, ATP’s rail starting point which excludes Black people.

“Black Americans are more likely to depend on public transit to get somewhere.”³

~Transportation Secretary Pete Buttigieg

“HYDE PARK IS EXCLUSIVELY FOR WHITE PEOPLE.”

HYDE PARK

The most beautiful, healthful, and practical place for homes in the city of Austin. It's the safest place for investment. The terms offered are remarkably easy. The prices are very reasonable. Any person buying two lots will be given ONE LOT FREE OF COST. There are six miles of beautiful graded streets in HYDE PARK, and a magnificent

SPEEDWAY FROM THE PARK TO THE CITY.

THE FINEST DRIVE IN TEXAS.

HYDE PARK IS EXCLUSIVELY FOR WHITE PEOPLE.

The main line of Electric Street Cars run into and around a belt in the Park. Free Mail Delivery twice a day. There is no limestone dust. The soil is the best for fruits, flowers and lawns. No one thinks of taking a carriage drive without going to Hyde Park. The drives are free from mud and dust. The scenery is interesting. The altitude of Hyde Park is 88 feet above the river. Hyde Park is cool, clean and beautiful. Invest while YOU CAN SELECT, and SECURE ONE LOT FREE. If you wish to buy on the installment plan the terms are \$3.00 per month on each lot. If you pay all cash a discount of 8 per cent will be allowed. If you wish to invest and do not live in Austin, we will pay your fare both ways, if the distance is not over 300 miles. Strangers who wish to see the city can have a Free Carriage by calling at our office.

Extraordinary Inducements Are Offered

To persons who will agree to erect good houses. If parties wish to build in Hyde Park, we will trade lots for other Austin property on a fair basis, and DONATE ONE LOT as a Premium. Beautiful Views of Hyde Park, and of THE SPEEDWAY sent free upon application. Write to us, or call at 721 CONGRESS AVENUE, AUSTIN, TEXAS.

M. K. & T. LAND AND TOWN CO.

M. M. SHIPE, General Manager

<https://www.austinchronicle.com/news/2020-12-11/historic-baker-school-site-among-items-on-final-2020-council-agenda/>

³ Ryan, A. (2021, July 22). How Biden's infrastructure plan targets billions for Black communities. *theGriot*. <https://thegrio.com/2021/07/22/bidens-infrastructure-black-communities/>

Subject: Title VI Complaint against Austin Transit Partnership Ex Officio “Dottie” Watkins and Board for Project Connect/Light Rail Propaganda, Lobbying, and Collusion with Mobility for All PAC, 501(c)(3) Nonprofits, and Developers to Deny Blacks Transit Equity


8. **Discrimination (2016-2023):** Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority (“Capital Metro”) caters to whites, oppressing Blacks.

Cap Metro fields updates on Project Connect WEDNESDAY, JULY 21, 2021 BY [SETH SMALLEY](#)

During the July 19 meeting of the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority [“Capital Metro”] Board of Directors, members fielded a discussion and presentation regarding Project Connect. The presentation covered prominent dates; Blue, Orange and Red rail line updates; and MetroRapid bus line updates. . . .

During the public comment period, Zenobia Joseph, a longtime advocate and Northeast Austin resident, drew attention to Capital Metro leadership’s apparent surface-level devotion to equity and diversity, a discrepancy between their language and actions. While the board packet mentions equity 83 times and diversity 87 times, Joseph pointed out that Black people in Northeast Austin still regularly wait over 60 minutes for the bus.

“And so, I get that you have the right words on paper. For the Federal Transit Administration – unless they come to Austin and do an investigation – it will look as though everything is well and good in Austin when it’s not,” Joseph said to the board, as members looked at screens and fiddled with writing utensils. “You have language here saying that you’re committed to connecting people and communities to jobs and opportunities, when in fact you eliminated north, east, west connectivity on routes 392, 323, 325. Walmart to Walmart.” Joseph pointed specifically to an Aug. 7 resolution, passed by the Capital Metro board last year, that left many people with longer wait times. <https://www.austinmonitor.com/stories/2021/07/cap-metro-fields-updates-on-project-connect/>



a. History (1891-1941): Col. Monroe Shipe developed Hyde Park “exclusively for white people,” bordered by 38th Street (map, left). On March 12, 2020 Austin City Council (“Council”) usurped Alamo Drafthouse affordable housing at Hyde Park’s old Baker School. Council paid \$3.7M for onsite 1-acre detention pond, instead, which equated to pretextual racial segregation.

b. 501(c)(3): Austin Transit Partnership (“ATP”) is a local government corporation overseeing \$11.6B Project Connect/light rail—approved on November 3, 2020 based on equity propaganda. June 28, 2021 I thanked Republican senators for killing HB 3893 due to Title VI noncompliance. May 24, 2023 ATP approved the \$5B truncated light rail map which intentionally excludes Blacks.

Capital Metro CEO/Ex officio “Dottie” Watkins said “the staffs of all three parties wholeheartedly support this.” May 26, 2023 Austin Mayor Kirk Watson successfully lobbied Rep. John Bucy to kill HB 3899 intended for voters to decide whether to issue debt for rail.

ATP has revealed its pick among several Project Connect options, and it’s the choice with flexible options (Photo by Courtesy of ATP)

c. Falsity: May 18, 2023 Council allocated \$780K for a Northeast Austin 4-plex, not on a Project Connect Corridor using part of ATP’s \$300M anti-displacement funds with intent to fund community ambassadors in unfunded Colony Park and Dove Springs.

The Austin Transit Partnership will disperse \$300 million in funds over the 13-year buildout period of Project Connect. The Project Team will coordinate with this effort to identify opportunities to coordinate investments where Project Connect facilities are planned.

For More Information:

Rosie Truelove, Treasurer, Austin Housing Finance Corporation, 512-974-3064; Mandy DeMayo, Deputy Director, Housing, 512-974-1091.

Additional Backup Information:

If approved, the Austin Housing Finance Corporation will enter into a loan agreement with the Austin Revitalization Authority (ARA), or an affiliated entity, to assist ARA with the acquisition of a fourplex located at 3306 Vintage Hills Cove, Austin, Texas 78723 in Council District 1.

Funding provided through the loan will require that ARA rent the four two-bedroom units to households earning no more than 50 percent of the area median family income, for not less than 40 years. The loan will be funded from Project Connect Anti-Displacement Funds approved by the voters in November 2020.

ARA’s mission is to engage in commercial, residential, and cultural development that promotes community well-being while respecting the people, institutions, and history of East Austin and other underserved communities. ARA has more than 25 years of experience developing commercial and residential real estate in Austin.

Subject: Title VI Complaint against Austin Transit Partnership Ex Officio “Dottie” Watkins and Board for Project Connect/Light Rail Propaganda, Lobbying, and Collusion with Mobility for All PAC, 501(c)(3) Nonprofits, and Developers to Deny Blacks Transit Equity

9. **Historical Context:** I-35 and U.S. 183 are lines of demarcation between the haves (whites) and have-nots (Blacks, minorities).

a. Federal Law: Title VI; Fair Housing Act of 1968. Capital Metro's June 28, 2021 Title VI Triennial Update relied on the 2010 Census rather than 2020 decennial data. Redlined Central East Austin-area is gentrified, but data likely showed African-Americans benefitting.

b. Recodifying Redlining: October 17, 2019 “Austin City Council”'s vote to rezone 1,308 affordable apartment units gave the greenlight for the **largest tenant displacement project along the East Riverside corridor** — and one of the largest in Austin's history!⁴ July 14, 2020 (9 months later): Presidium asked Travis County Commissioners for ⅔ of units at 80-140% area median income (“AMI”), \$55K-\$96K, for gentrifiers twice (p. 340). Blacks, however, earn \$42K (COA, 2020).


c. 501(c)(3) Propagandist: 1891-1941 Col. Monroe Shipe developed Hyde Park/38th St. “exclusively for white people,” approved faux north end of rail. July 27, 2020 Council/Capital Metro unilaterally eliminated Samsung-Apple BRT Northeast-west, denying Black job access (map). May 24, 2023 Austin Justice Coalition (“AJC”) João Paulo Connolly Organizing Director remained complicit in ATP light rail discrimination, ignoring 2019 East Riverside rezoning and, instead, invoked Blacks to sell light rail. In part, “it's a choice that reaches census tracks in our community in East Austin that have some of the highest (uh) population of Black people and people of color in city limits.” The City of Austin underwrites AJC. Substantial lobbying justifies 501(c)(3) revocation.

d. Treasury Federal Register (May 17, 2021): **Building Stronger Communities through Investments in Housing and Neighborhoods** provision notes, “Housing vouchers . . . to facilitate household moves to neighborhoods with high levels of economic opportunity.” Council, however, refuses to build affordable housing north of MoPac/Loop 1. Northwest 80% AMI (now, \$61K) workforce housing excludes Blacks.

e. **1928-2022: Segregationist Redlining Housing/Transit Policy.** April 5, 2022 Austin City Council Work Session: Then-Mayor/lawyer Steve Adler admitted segregation—twice contradicting himself. “As we go through the PUD [Public Utility District],” he reiterated, “I have the one; I think that we need to drive as much affordable housing as we-as we can. (um—you know) The conversation I always have with respect to putting affordable housing in-in the most expensive locations in our City (uh) is that (um) I'm-I'm not (uh)—I'm not (uh) **convinced** that that's the way to-to best **help the greatest number of people and to put people in the community where there's (uh) a critical mass** of-of others (uh) that are-uh **sharing a similar experience** (uh) in an environment (uh) where-where **people can afford to-to live**. So (um) I've always wanted us to take a look at (uh) housing that might be a stop or two stops, bus stops, away to see if that enabled us to-to be able to provide for greater-greater number of people.”⁵ He also “made the creation of a ‘strike fund’ for workforce housing a piece of his 2014 mayoral campaign,” targeting 80% AMI (\$55K then), segregation proxy/income discrimination. Blacks earn \$42K. April 7, 2022 Adler reiterated his false bus stop housing comments.


f. Bottom Line: The Housing Authority of the City of Austin (“HACA”), Capital Metro, Council, and Travis County Commissioners intentionally discriminate against Blacks. Inequitable transit requires 1- to 5-mile walk.

1928 City Plan (East Austin Negro District); 1934 Redlining Map



From redlining to gentrification, Blacks live in green areas: Samsung (no bus); Rogge (7A-7P Pickup); walk 1-3 miles.

AUSTIN AFRICAN AMERICAN POPULATION GROWTH AND DECLINE: 2000 TO 2010



Source: City of Austin/Data sources: Census 2000 SF1; Census 2010 Redistricting File

⁴ Way, H., Mueller, E., & Wegmann, J. (2019, October 23). Halting displacement on the East Riverside corridor must become city priority. *UT News*. <https://news.utexas.edu/2019/10/23/halting-displacement-on-the-east-riverside-corridor-must-become-city-priority/>

⁵ ATXN (2022, April 5). City Council Work Session [S. Adler 2:49:49]. <https://austintx.new.swagit.com/videos/158053>

Subject: Title VI Complaint against Austin Transit Partnership Ex Officio “Dottie” Watkins and Board for Project Connect/Light Rail Propaganda, Lobbying, and Collusion with Mobility for All PAC, 501(c)(3) Nonprofits, and Developers to Deny Blacks Transit Equity

10. **ASMP Walk-Bike-Roll Amendment:** Noting “more public transit” ignores Northeast-west route eliminations since June 3, 2018.

Attachment 2: Plan Insights

Group A

The plans identified under Group A have holistically considered and framed equity as a core driver, both qualitatively and quantitatively. All these plans have also outlined tangible steps to advance equity as part of their respective strategies, action items, implementation timelines, etc.

Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (2019)

Organizing Agency: City of Austin

Department: Transportation Department

[Document link](#)

The Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (ASMP) stems from the “Transportation Vision” in *Imagine Austin*. Eight mobility goals guide the ASMP: commuter delay, placemaking, travel choice, economic prosperity, affordability, sustainability, health and safety, and innovation. From an equity perspective, the plan focused on engaging four groups that historically have been underrepresented in past public engagement processes: youth (people aged 15 to 24 years), seniors (people aged 65 years or older), people with mobility impairments, and people of color. One high-level finding is that “both the overall and focus populations” chose “[providing] more public transit service and [enhanced] connections to/from public transit” as their top priority.


a. **Lobbying Definition:** “In general, no organization may qualify for section 501(c)(3) status if a substantial part of its activities is attempting to influence legislation (commonly known as lobbying). A 501(c)(3) organization may engage in some lobbying, but too much lobbying activity risks loss of tax-exempt status. Legislation includes action by Congress, any state legislature, any local council, or similar governing body, with respect to acts, bills, resolutions, or similar items (such as legislative confirmation of appointive office), or by the public in referendum, ballot initiative, constitutional amendment, or similar procedure.” (IRS, 2022)

b. **Bias:** November 3, 2017 *The Austin Chronicle* noted, “Supporters of the plan, including Cap Metro itself, acknowledge that every policy has certain casualties ... only small parts of the city would lose access, notably in the North and Northeast” where Blacks live. Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (“ASMP”) Walk-Bike-Roll PDF states a need for more transit but excludes northeast-west elimination June 3, 2018 when Cap Remap changed 52 routes for white choice riders. Request IRS revoke 501(c)(3) status of nonprofits that registered against HB 3899 and those that lobbied in support of Proposition A (“Prop A”) via equity propaganda on KAZI 88.7 FM and other resources to include Austin-Area Urban League, Austin Justice Coalition (“AJC”) & Housing Works Planning Commission members, Transit Forward, and Downtown Austin Alliance. Review substantial lobbying “activities [used] to influence legislation” then revoke nonprofit status, accordingly. Both AJC Organizing Director João Paulo Connolly and Awais Azhar endorsed ATP’s \$5B revised rail plan from 38th Street to Pleasant Valley May 24, 2023. Connolly said, “it’s a choice that reaches census tracts in our community in East Austin that have some of the highest (uh) populations of Black people and people of color in city limits.” The 1928 City Plan relegated Blacks east of East Avenue/Interstate 35 (“I-35”). October 17, 2019 “Council’s vote to rezone 1,308 affordable apartment units gave the greenlight for the **largest tenant displacement project along the East Riverside corridor** — and one of the largest in Austin’s history!”⁶ Connolly’s testimony equated to perjury. See May 4, 2023 IRS Complaint for Azhar’s letter.

c. **Rail Discrimination:** 1891-1941 Col. Monroe Shipe developed Hyde Park which 38th Street borders, “exclusively for white people” and is ATP’s approved faux north end of light rail. July 27, 2020 Council/Capital Metro unilaterally eliminated minority Northeast-west MetroRapid (Samsung to Apple), denying Black job access (map). The City of Austin underwrites the nonprofits noted above to include \$79M to DAA February 23, 2023 Item 10. Executive DeWitt Peart’s Project Connect lobbying on KAZI to get Black votes during four 2-hour ad-free mobility panels through testimony against HB 3899 equates to substantial lobbying which justifies 501(c)(3) revocation. DAA also received \$1.12M Federal grant to reconnect I-35 with Black support after using the 1928 Plan and East Austin nostalgia with Dr. Colette Pierce Burnette on KAZI. East Austin is gentrified, so reconnecting east-west provides no Black benefit. <https://www.austintexas.gov/departments/city-council/2023/20230223-reg.htm#010>

d. April 5, 2023 HB 3899 Witness List: ATP Executive Director Greg Canally, Downtown Austin Alliance, Transit Forward, Farm & City Jay Crossley Blake (p. 11). November 3, 2017 *The Austin Chronicle* noted Blake’s AURA Study showing a loss of bus service in North and Northeast Austin where Blacks live in Colony Park and Craigwood, illustrating ASMP knowingly codified race discrimination.

AUSTIN AFRICAN AMERICAN POPULATION GROWTH AND DECLINE: 2000 TO 2010



⁶ Way, H., Mueller, E., & Wegmann, J. (2019, October 23). Halting displacement on the East Riverside corridor must become city priority. *UT News*. <https://news.utexas.edu/2019/10/23/halting-displacement-on-the-east-riverside-corridor-must-become-city-priority/>

Subject: Title VI Complaint against Austin Transit Partnership Ex Officio “Dottie” Watkins and Board for Project Connect/Light Rail Propaganda, Lobbying, and Collusion with Mobility for All PAC, 501(c)(3) Nonprofits, and Developers to Deny Blacks Transit Equity


11. **Penal Code, Ch. 37, Perjury and Other Falsification.** Felony Criminal Offense (2016-2023): Watkins continues “to deceive” taxpayers, making false equity statements under oath in violation of state law and Capital Metro’s Code of Ethics integrity provision.

a. Propaganda: July 8, 2020 In Customer Satisfaction Advisory Committee (“CSAC”) Title VI testimony, I noted KAZI 88.7FM aired rail falsity juxtaposed with Austin Energy [550 times] to get Black votes. Watkins also ignored unsafe 801S midblock stop.

because it is underwritten KAZI closes their eyes. She calls it propaganda because she listens to KUT too & says that it doesn’t air on KUT. The KAZI spot plays from 5 am to 11 pm every 4 hours. She says that the spot on KUT runs for 15 seconds. KUT says when buses are delayed, someone dies from Covid-19 and gave information in June when the fare was free. Says 801 S. Bound Chinatown stop ID 5857, Dottie Watkins has heard her ask for this many times. There is no reason why we need to cross a 5-lane highway mid-block. A 2009 study says mid-block crossings is where people get killed. Stop needs to be at CVS Pharmacy. Wants the 392 to move back to Arboretum.

b. Falsity: May 17, 2023 Watkins said at Capital Metro Operations, Planning, & Safety Committee, “We’re slightly overachieving. . . . We’re so laser-focused on improving the service. . . . If you look at like last year to this year, we’re running the same amount of service. Routes, however, still disconnect Northeast minorities from St. David’s Hospital, HEB stores and jobs—violating Title VI. “A large portion of why people are riding and riding more often,” Watkins added falsely, “is because the service we are providing is of a higher quality.” Ridership means “thinking like a business, choosing the target audience,” Jarett Walker, PhD told the Board July 25, 2016. Capital Metro, Council, and ATP chose white choice riders but document minority coverage to get Federal funding.

Dottie Watkins Retweeted



Sec. 37.02. **PERJURY.** (a) A person commits an offense if, with intent to deceive and with knowledge of the statement's meaning:

(1) he makes a false statement under oath or swears to the truth of a false statement previously made and the statement is required or authorized by law to be made under oath; or

(2) he makes a false unsworn declaration under Chapter 132, Civil Practice and Remedies Code.

(b) An offense under this section is a Class A misdemeanor.

Acts 1973, 63rd Leg., p. 883, ch. 399, Sec. 1, eff. Jan. 1, 1974. Amended by Acts 1993, 73rd Leg., ch. 900, Sec. 1.01, eff. Sept. 1, 1994.

Sec. 37.03. **AGGRAVATED PERJURY.** (a) A person commits an offense if he commits perjury as defined in Section 37.02, and the false statement:

(1) is made during or in connection with an official proceeding; and

(2) is material.

(b) An offense under this section is a felony of the third degree.

Acts 1973, 63rd Leg., p. 883, ch. 399, Sec. 1, eff. Jan. 1, 1974. Amended by Acts 1993, 73rd Leg., ch. 900, Sec. 1.01, eff. Sept. 1, 1994.

Sec. 37.04. **MATERIALITY.** (a) A statement is material, regardless of the admissibility of the statement under the rules of evidence, if it could have affected the course or outcome of the official proceeding.

(b) It is no defense to prosecution under Section 37.03 (Aggravated Perjury) that the declarant mistakenly believed the statement to be immaterial.

(c) Whether a statement is material in a given factual situation is a question of law.

Acts 1973, 63rd Leg., p. 883, ch. 399, Sec. 1, eff. Jan. 1, 1974. Amended by Acts 1993, 73rd Leg., ch. 900, Sec. 1.01, eff. Sept. 1, 1994.

Subject: Title VI Complaint against Austin Transit Partnership Ex Officio "Dottie" Watkins and Board for Project Connect/Light Rail Propaganda, Lobbying, and Collusion with Mobility for All PAC, 501(c)(3) Nonprofits, and Developers to Deny Blacks Transit Equity

c. Prohibited Lobbying: August 26, 2022 Transit Forward said, "Project Connect will bring rapid transit bus services to major transport corridors in the area, connecting Downtown with Colony Park and South Austin, and all of Pleasant Valley. The service will be implemented by next year." In fact, 60-minute headway only serves Colony Park and Craigwood, forcing Blacks to wait 10 times longer than South/West/Central whites and Dove Springs Hispanics. MetroRapid-Expo, electric bus procurement delay, is merely restored fixed route 37 which Cap Remap 52 route changes eliminated June 3, 2018 to improve service for 72% whites who completed about 5,000 surveys. Planner Roberto Gonzalez unilaterally restored 339-Craigwood; falsely called it new after reducing runtime 3 hours, changing 35 minutes Peak to 60 minutes all day below Service Standards, creating Black disparities. Bangle should resign from Capital Metro's Board since Transit Forward, 501(c)(3), falsehoods counter its goal to, "Provide a ready source of credible and honest information to rapidly counteract any misinformation propagated by groups or individuals opposed to transit."

WITNESS LIST

HB 3899

HOUSE COMMITTEE REPORT

Pensions, Investments & Financial Services Committee

April 5, 2023 - 8:00 AM

For :

Aleshire, Bill (Self)
 Antoni, EJ (The Heritage Foundation)
 Barrientos, Gonzalo (Self)
 Daugherty, Gerald (Self)
 Joseph, Zenobia (Self)
 Nemir, Mark (Dirty Martins Place)
 Quintero, James (Texas Public Policy Foundation)
 Sierra, Karla (Self; The LIBRE Initiative)
 Spataro, Susan (Self)
 Wood, Ellen (Self)

Against :

Canally, Greg (Austin transit partnership)
 Crossley, Jay (Farm And City)
 Langmore, John (Self)
 McCamley, Bill (Self; Transit Forward)
 Meed, Alex (Self)
 Peart, Dewitt (Downtown Austin Alliance)
 Rose, Patrick (Self; Transit Forward)

On :

Polumbo, Carol (McCall, Parkhurst & Horton L.L.P. For Austin Transit Partnership)

Registering, but not testifying:

For :

Bresnen, Amy (Self)
 Buddin, Adrienne (Self)
 Calm, Adam (Self)
 Duchon, Marc (Self)
 Falk, Roger (Self)
 Kohler, Walker (Self)
 Lewis, Fred (Self)
 Miller, Skeeter (Self; The county line restaurants and Flyrite chicken)
 Parsons, Brad (Self)
 Reynolds, David (Self)
 Sheetz, Samuel (Self; Americans for prosperity)
 Smith, Mark (Self; Hunt Companies Inc)
 Thornton, Brian (Self)
 Wassdorf, Trey (Self)

Against :

Alloway, Leroy (CapMetro)
 Amps, Emily (Texas AFL-CIO)
 Boyer, Victor (San Antonio Mobility Coalition)
 Carnahan, Alina (Real Estate Council of Austin)
 Cranston, Cathy (Self; PERSONAL ATTENDANT COALITION OF TEXAS AND ADAPT OF TEXAS)
 Cranston, Ron (Self; ADAPT of Texas)
 Cuellar, Guadalupe (City of El Paso)
 Davis, Thomas (Self)
 Dochen, Sandy (Self)
 Franco, Brie (City of Austin)
 Greenfield, Adam (Self)
 Guzman, Sandy (Self; Austin Area Research Organization)

Subject: Title VI Complaint against Austin Transit Partnership Ex Officio "Dottie" Watkins and Board for Project Connect/Light Rail Propaganda, Lobbying, and Collusion with Mobility for All PAC, 501(c)(3) Nonprofits, and Developers to Deny Blacks Transit Equity

"You have figured out how to circumvent Title VI: Say one thing; do another; document what is said to fool the Feds."

Zenobia C. Joseph, March 11, 2020; June 28, 2021 Capital Metro Meetings

How Cap Metro's Multibillion-Dollar Transit Expansion Hinges On Federal Racial Equity Standards | KUT Radio, Austin's NPR Station | By [Nathan Bernier](#) Published July 6, 2021/6:11 AM CDT (excerpt)



Title VI advocate Zenobia Joseph says Cap Metro should do more to reduce service-level disparities between people of color and white riders.

"Capital Metro's own 266-page analysis, while finding itself in compliance with Title VI, also reveals some obvious disparities. The makeup of the organization's two advisory panels is disproportionately white. Commuter rail service, which costs Cap Metro significantly more per trip than bus service, has 70% white ridership and caters to the agency's wealthiest riders. During the midday, buses on routes that serve larger percentages of minority riders are more full and less punctual."

###

12. Consolidated Appropriations Act 2021, § 735 Violation: "None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used in any way, **directly or indirectly**, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress[.]" December 17, 2021 Capital Metro awarded \$1,087,400 to Blank Rome Government Relations for Federal lobbying, including Infrastructure and Jobs Act and Build Back Better Act. Chambers, Conlon & Hartwell lobbied since 2008 then joined Blank Rome using public funds, violating § 735. In Washington DC, Clarke and Travillion lobbied U.S. Senator John Cornyn for 50% discriminatory Project Connect funding.

APTA Legislative Conference

- Emphasizing bringing funding back to Central Texas for Project Connect and transit programs
- Learning and exchanging ideas with peers about opportunities to ensure full implementation of Bipartisan Infrastructure Law

Top right: Erika Mazza, VP Government Affairs, moderated **AND THE CHAIR -- I THANK HIM, HE TOOK A FEW DAYS OUT OF HIS TIME TO GO TO D.C. AND WE MET SOME**

Bottom right: Jeff Travillion

CapMetro

PROPUBLICA | [Sign Up for Alerts](#) | [Represent](#)

LEGISLATION | FILES | NOTES | STATEMENTS | LOBBYING | TRAVEL | DATA

LEGISLATION | LOBBYING BY CAPITAL METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

LEGISLATION

Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority

BLANK ROME GOVERNMENT RELATIONS

Grant applications at EOJ and FTA, PL 117-58 - Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) - support for transit funding.
PL 117-103 FY22 Consolidated Appropriations Act) - support transit funding, including funding for two of Capital Metro's FTA Capital Investment Grant (CIG) Small Start projects, FY23 Appropriations - support Community Project Fund ing.
Grant applications at FTA.

Duration: April 1, 2021 to present

General Issues: Transportation, Budget/Appropriations, Railroads

Spending: about \$190,000 (Est. (complicated, here's why))

Agencies lobbied since 2020: House of Representatives, U.S. Senate, Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Transportation Dept of (DOT), Federal Railroad Administration, Office of Management & Budget (OMB), Housing & Urban Development: Dept of (HUD), Executive Office of the President (EOP)

Bills mentioned

H.R.3684: Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act	H.R. 5376: Build Back Better Act
Sponsor: Peter A. DeFazio (D-Or.)	Sponsor: John Vanaman (R-Ky.)
H.R.6550: Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	H.R.1318: American Rescue Plan Act of 2021

<https://projects.propublica.org/represent/lobbying/301032707>

a. Lobbying Opacity: "This contract specifically, though, is for consultant support inside of DC which part of that could be related to Project Connect grant opportunities, but it's also CapMetro's regular Federal business," Clarke said. Then-Board Member/lawyer Ann Kitchen asked for clarity on "lobbying efforts . . . at the Federal government (uh) level."
(49:35 and 52:30): <https://austintx.new.swagit.com/videos/150659>

b. Travillion Resignation Requests: March 28, 2022 "I would submit to you that it would be the best thing for you to **resign** because, respectfully, you have not improved the transit service for the constituents in Northeast and North Austin. . . . Randy Clarke, you are more than a marketing man." March 27, 2023 Watkins sat on the dais: "My comments, as it relates to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 . . . Respectfully Mr. Chair, I would ask once again that you **resign** because the **service in Northeast Austin is substandard.**" 3/28/2022 (13:55): <https://austintx.new.swagit.com/videos/157608> 3/27/2023 (10:13): <https://austintx.new.swagit.com/videos/223058>

Subject: Title VI Complaint against Austin Transit Partnership Ex Officio "Dottie" Watkins and Board for Project Connect/Light Rail Propaganda, Lobbying, and Collusion with Mobility for All PAC, 501(c)(3) Nonprofits, and Developers to Deny Blacks Transit Equity

13. **Regional Congestion Solution:** MetroRapid Eliminated: Capital Metro CEO in 2014 stated, "Project Connect has partnered with communities in need of transit solutions to come up with a plan for the North Corridor that will provide more connectivity within Central Texas," Capital Metro President/CEO Linda S. Watson said. "We now have a plan to develop real, attainable, high-capacity transit tools that can give North Corridor commuters more options for getting around within this **most congested area in our region.**" April 16, 2014 posted video: <https://www.roundrocktexas.gov/news/project-connect-reveals-plans-for-north-corridor-transit-options/>

a. Lack of Regional Focus: WMATA seeks "equitable access to jobs" as do Black Austinites excluded from the 30-year rail plan.



July 27, 2020 Capital Metro/Austin City Council ("Council") unilaterally eliminated three Northeast regional MetroRapid (53-74% minority) where 58% of all jobs in the 5-county region will be located. November 3, 2020 Ballot said Project Connect will "address traffic congestion." North of US 183 will, in fact, increase traffic, but Clarke falsely marketed regional transit.

Of the 100 most congested roadways in Texas (TxDOT, 100 Most Congested Roadway Segments in Texas, 2010), six are in the North Corridor. As of 2004, nearly 30 percent of all jobs in the Austin region were in four central Austin zip codes (78701, 78703, 78704, and 78705). These four form the southern part of the North Corridor (Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG, Revised Commute and Labor Shed by Zip Code, 2012). Existing transportation rights of way and funding for transportation improvements in the region are limited. Fourteen of the regional growth centers identified in CAMPO's long-range transportation plan are in the North Corridor; the most in any corridor studied in Project Connect. From 2005 to 2035, the region's population and employment are forecast to increase by 123 percent and 135 percent, respectively (CAMPO, CAMPO 2035 Regional Transportation Plan, 2010).

- Almost half the population (1.5 million people) of the two most populated counties in the region will reside in the North Corridor by 2035.
- Almost two-thirds of jobs in the two most populated counties will be located in this corridor by 2035 and will account for 58 percent of all jobs in the five-county region.

b. Bad Actor: June 13, 2022 Planning Director Roberto Gonzalez (Hired 11/28/1995: \$143K) briefed August 2022 Service Changes unilaterally expanding South/West transfers, creating 1-seat rides to grocery stores for low-density white neighborhoods (2.9 to 5.4 boardings/hour) and Hispanics. Blacks wait 60 minutes with no east-west connectivity north of US 183 to Project Connect North Corridor jobs noted in 2014. Like Clarke, Gonzalez's briefing touted "17-month straight ridership increase," never admitting his lie about faux "new" Route 339, restored ServicePlan2020 number with 3 hours less runtime—worsened to 60 minutes all day.

c. Land Use Policy: Capital Metro Service Standards exist on paper, not in practice. April 20, 2018 I met with Clarke and invited Councilmember Ora Houston, Commissioner "Jeff" Travillion. October 22, 2018 I testified, "We all sang the Samsung song."



Subject: Title VI Complaint against Austin Transit Partnership Ex Officio “Dottie” Watkins and Board for Project Connect/Light Rail Propaganda, Lobbying, and Collusion with Mobility for All PAC, 501(c)(3) Nonprofits, and Developers to Deny Blacks Transit Equity

14. **Policy and Practice Don’t Match:** Austin Strategic Mobility Plan (“ASMP”) specifies the City’s commitment to Title VI in theory.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

Section 106 of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states the following: “No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” This has since been clarified to apply to both Federal entities (like the Federal Transit Authority or U.S. Department of Transportation) and all their operations and activities, and to entities that receive Federal financial assistance (such as public transportation providers like the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Administration or for construction projects where the City receives Federal grant funding). The City of Austin is committed to non-discrimination in the provision of our transportation network and will continue to work to ensure that the principles outlined in Title VI of the Civil Rights Act guide the projects we implement and the programming we provide.

a. Praxis: ASMP noted disinvestment in Dove Springs and North Lamar (p. 220). Southeast Councilmember Delia Garza (now County Attorney) created a southeast-west 15-minute bus network offline with Capital Metro Board/ Councilmember Ann Kitchen for constituents by eliminating northeast-west connectivity at the expense of Blacks still waiting 60 minutes.

b. Falsity: Cap Remap falsely states, “More frequent, more reliable, better connected” to fool Federal Transit Administration (“FTA”) to get 50% Federal funding for \$7.1B light rail.

c. ASMP Transit Enhancement Program: January 2023 Capital Metro Service Changes created 1-seat rides for whites in West Austin (e.g., 19-Bull Creek, 30-Walsh Tarlton). Since 2013, planner Roberto Gonzalez said a 1-seat ride is most beneficial but, again, Northeast Blacks and minorities north of US 183 transfer more on high-speed roads, inflating ridership—cooking the books.

Transit Enhancement Program

The purpose of the Transit Enhancement Program is to improve mobility and access to opportunity for those living in and around Austin, by fostering collaborative relationships with public transportation providers, working directly with communities to understand needs and opportunities, and systematically enhancing areas of the built environment identified as transit-supportive.

This program formed out of an earlier initiative, the Transit Priority Working Group, which was organized to implement small-scale projects that would improve the speed and reliability of public transportation. The work of the Transit Priority Working Group highlighted a need for dedicated funding toward transit-priority projects. In April 2018, the City of Austin and Capital Metro executed an interlocal agreement that committed \$3 million, spread over three years, towards transit-priority projects. Additionally, both the City of Austin and Capital Metro dedicated staff to oversee the program and to manage the progress of individual projects.

The Transit Enhancement Program is a collaborative program by nature. Because of this, a framework has been developed that allows the City of Austin and Capital Metro to maintain realistic expectations of one another. Within this framework, tools and processes exist that allow individual projects to be identified, prioritized, and implemented in a systematic and inclusive manner.

The City/Capital Metro’s \$3M collaboratively segregated Northeast Blacks/transit-dependent minorities and whites.

2013: Short-Range Planning Manager Roberto Gonzalez said, “In terms of ridership (um), some of our largest areas (uh) of activity outside of a major transit center do occur in and around (uh) shopping areas, particularly the HEBs and the Walmarts. . . . We found that (you know) a 1-seat ride is what’s most beneficial for folks as well as a high-frequency service.” Five years later, he eliminated HEBs.

2018: Cap Remap reflects intentional race discrimination. Gonzalez unilaterally eliminated east-west 1-seat rides: Walmart-Norwood to Northcross; 240: 2 HEBs, 392: HEB. 2021: Capital Metro/Council eliminated Parmer-3 HEBs.

2019: ASMP adopted Cap Remap race discrimination. “Transportation choice and freedom of movement can be powerfully beneficial or powerfully obstructive forces in access to basic services and support” (p. 224).

d. **Solution:** Make travel safe for Northeast Blacks/transit-dependent minorities north of US 183. Move midblock 801-MetroRapid Chinatown north of CVS at Braker/North Lamar (Loop 275); uncouple 392-Braker/243-Wells Branch; restore 392: 1-seat rides to essential jobs (e.g., HEB, Target-Great Hills terminus 1.9 miles); uncouple 339 Craigwood Blacks/237 Community First! Village. Restore 240-St. David’s; 339: 1-seat ride, 35 minutes Peak (old 323W/white side runs 30 minutes; Black side: 60 minutes all day). Restore 325: 1-seat ride, Walmart-Norwood to Walmart-Northcross. (Planners falsely called 324W new, forcing 30-minute transfer.) Counter to Vision Zero (2016), Blacks transfer more on roadways exceeding 36,000 vehicles per day (“vpd”), increasing fatalities. Request removal of Capital Metro Councilmembers Kitchen, Leslie Pool, and Sabino Renteria for endorsing disparate impacts.

15. **Closing:** Thanks for your time and consideration. Point of contact is the undersigned.

Very respectfully,



Zenobia C. Joseph
zcjsph@aol.com