Austin Strategic Mobility Plan

Comparative Performance of Indicators

Mobility Consideration	Goal	Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C
Commuter Delay	Reduce the amount of time workers spend traveling between home and work	**Best** Scenario A has the highest amount of roadway capacity improvements resulting in the lowest delay per vehicle trip. Scenario A has the lowest amount of investment in dedicated transit facilities resulting in the highest amount of vehicle trips generated, vehicle miles traveled and vehicle hours traveled.	**Better** Scenario B has fewer roadway capacity improvements resulting in a higher delay per vehicle trip than Scenario A. There is an increase in investment in dedicated transit facilities, accounting for fewer vehicle trips generated, vehicle miles traveled and vehicle hours traveled.	**Good** Scenario C has the lowest amount of roadway capacity improvements resulting in the highest delay per vehicle trip. Scenario C has the highest amount of investment in dedicated transit facilities resulting in the lowest amount of vehicle trips generated, vehicle miles traveled and vehicle hours traveled.
Travel Choice	Promote a balanced transportation network and the ability to make informed choices based on personal needs and preferences	**Good** Scenario A provides the least amount of access to travel choices and has the lowest number of schools, medical facilities, and grocery stores within ¼ mile of premium bicycle facilities and high-capacity transit. 1% of the population is within ¼ mile of high-capacity transit stops and 61% is within ¼ mile of the premium bicycle network.	**Better** Scenario B provides more people with access to travel choices and has a higher number of schools, medical facilities, and grocery stores within ¼ mile of premium bicycle facilities and high-capacity transit. 7% of the population is within ¼ mile of high-capacity transit stops and 73% is within ¼ mile of the premium bicycle network.	**Best** Scenario C provides the highest level of access to travel choices and has the highest number of schools, medical facilities, and grocery stores within ¼ mile to premium bicycle facilities and high-capacity transit. 13% of the population is within ¼ mile of high-capacity transit stops and 81% is within ¼ mile of the premium bicycle network.
Affordability	Lower the cost of traveling in Austin by providing affordable travel options	**Good** Scenario A has the lowest number of existing affordable units within ¼ mile of premium bicycle facilities and high-capacity transit. 53% of existing affordable units are within ¼ mile of premium bicycle facilities and 1% of affordable units are within ¼ mile of high-capacity transit stops.	**Better** Scenario B has a higher number of existing affordable units within ¼ mile to premium bicycle facilities and high-capacity transit than Scenario A. 63% of existing affordable units are within ¼ mile of premium bicycle facilities and 8% of affordable units are within ¼ mile of high-capacity transit stops.	**Best** Scenario C has the highest number of existing affordable units within ¼ mile of premium bicycle facilities and high-capacity transit. 79% of existing affordable units are within ¼ mile of premium bicycle facilities and 18% of affordable units are within ¼ mile of high-capacity transit stops.
Economic Prosperity	Promote economic growth for individuals and the City through strategic investments in transportation networks that meet the needs of the 21st century	**Good** Scenario A has the lowest investment in areas where individuals have the least access to opportunities to succeed compared to other neighborhoods.	**Better** Scenario B has more investment than Scenario A in areas where individuals have the least access to opportunities to succeed compared to other neighborhoods.	**Best** Scenario C has the most investment in areas where individuals have the least access to opportunities to succeed compared to other neighborhoods.
Placemaking	Build a transportation network that encourages social interaction through quality urban design and connects users to the many places that make Austin unique	**Good** Scenario A has the lowest percentage of projects along Imagine Austin Activity Corridors and the fewest number of parks and community centers within ¼ mile of premium bicycle facilities. In Scenario A, 17% of Activity Corridors have premium bicycle facilities.	**Better** Scenario B has a higher percentage of projects along Imagine Austin Activity Corridors and more parks and community centers within ¼ mile to premium bicycle facilities than Scenario A. In Scenario B, 30% of Activity Corridors have premium bicycle facilities.	**Best** Scenario C has the highest percentage of projects along Imagine Austin Activity Corridors and the highest number of parks and community centers within ¼ mile of premium bicycle facilities. In Scenario C, 93% of Activity Corridors have premium bicycle facilities.
Health and Safety	Protect Austinites by lowering the risk of travel-related injury and promoting public health	**Good** Scenario A has the fewest miles of walking/biking trails and premium bicycle facilities along high crash and high risk corridors. Scenario A has the highest number of roadway projects along high crash and high risk corridors and intersections with high crash rates. Scenario A maintains current efforts to reduce emissions.	**Better** Scenario B has more miles of walking/biking trails and premium bicycle facilities along high crash and high risk corridors than Scenario A. Scenario B has fewer roadway projects along high crash and high risk corridors and intersections with high crash rates than Scenario A. Scenario B experiences an improvement in air quality compared with Scenario A based on fewer vehicle miles traveled.	**Best** Scenario C has the most miles of walking/biking trails and premium bicycle facilities along high crash and high risk corridors. Scenario C has the fewest roadway projects along high crash and high risk corridors and intersections with high crash rates. Scenario C experiences an improvement in air quality beyond that seen in Scenario B based on further reductions in vehicle miles traveled.
Sustainability	Promote integrated designs and quality additions to the built environment while reducing impacts and promoting efficient use of public resources	**Good** Scenario A continues the trend in making progress toward sustainable design and reducing impacts to the environment but builds more miles of roadways than Scenario B and C, which contributes to higher fuel consumption levels due to higher vehicles miles traveled.	**Better** Scenario B makes more progress towards sustainable design and reducing impacts to the environment by building fewer roadways than Scenario A and focusing more on sustainable modes of transportation such as walking, bicycling, and using public transit.	**Best** Scenario C builds the fewest miles of roadways and incorporates sustainable design into every project, focusing the most on sustainable modes of transportation such as walking, bicycling, and using public transit.
Innovation	Draw inspiration from forward-looking cities around the world, change the way we think about what's possible, and set an example for the rest of the country	**Good** Scenario A maintains the current effectiveness of Transportation Demand Management through voluntary programs and application of Transportation System Management through Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and operational improvements.	**Better** Scenario B increases the effectiveness of Transportation Demand Management through incentive programs and sees increased improvements in Transportation System Management through new technology.	**Best** Scenario C experiences the highest effectiveness of Transportation Demand Management through required programs and enhanced levels of Transportation System Management for high-capacity modes of transportation.