



City of Austin Environmental Summary for 12.45-acre Tract Located at 4806½ Trail West Drive; Austin, Texas

April 28th, 2012

Scott E. Hiers, P.G.; Nico Hauwert; P.G., Ph.D., and Erin Wood

1.0 Purpose

The purpose of this report is to summarize the development status and environmental information for an undeveloped 12.45-acre tract located at 4806½ Trail West Drive within the Travis Country Subdivision. The site is owned by the Austin Independent School District (AISD) and is currently proposed to be rezoned from P-NP to SF2-NP for zoning case C14-2012-0016; Estates at Travis Country. This report is a review of existing information and no additional on-site assessment or investigation has been completed by City staff.

2.0 Subject Area Location and Information

The tract is in the Barton Creek watershed and completely within the Barton Spring Segment of the Edwards Aquifer (Figure 1). The site is generally located north of Southwest Parkway and west of Loop 1 (MoPac). Sycamore Creek, a tributary to Barton Creek, is located approximately 340 feet southwest of the tract.

3.0 Topography, Slopes and Drainage

According to the City of Austin GIS, the elevation of the tract ranges from 726 to 736-feet above mean sea level (Figure 2). The topography is gently sloping hillside with an average slope of 1.48%. The topographic high point of the property is located on the western side of the property. Surface water runoff has a radiating drainage pattern. The surface flow direction is from the north-northeast to the southeast and discharges into Sycamore Creek. No floodplain is located on this property according to COA GIS. There is a fully developed 100-year floodplain along Sycamore Creek. This floodplain is located no closer than 250-feet from the property. A critical water quality zone and a water quality transition zone are located along Sycamore Creek. The critical water quality zone does not encroach onto the property. However, the water quality transition zone encroaches up to 200-feet on the southern end of the property.

4.0 Groundwater

The regional groundwater flow is toward the northeast. City of Austin/Barton Springs Edwards Aquifer Conservation District cooperative dye trace studies of Edwards Aquifer in this area indicate that the site is within the Cold Spring groundwater basin. The nearest known local springs occur along Barton Creek, which is 4,000-ft north-northeast of the site. The source areas of these relatively small springs are unknown. Dye injected in a well in Williamson Creek, about 1.6 miles south of this site, was recovered in the Travis County park well, about 1,000 ft east of this site as well as in Cold Springs to the northeast along the south bank of the Colorado River (Hauwert, et al, 2004). From these observations, a groundwater flow path, the Cold Springs flow route, is interpreted to pass underground in the vicinity of this site.

5.0 Geology

According to the Geologic Map of the Barton Springs Segment of the Edwards Aquifer the regional surface geology of the site is underlain by the Leached and Collapsed members and Kirschberg members of Edwards Group (Small, and others, 1996). The Kirschberg Evaporite member consisting of a crystalline limestone and chalky to pulverulitic mudstone is 65 to 70-ft thick. Most of the cave development in the Barton Springs Recharge Zone occurs in this member (Small and others, 1996). The Leached and Collapsed members are 30 to 80-ft thick and generally consist of wackstone to mudstone. Cave development in the Leached and Collapsed member is typically occurring laterally with large room development (Small and others, 1996).

Faults are common geologic features in this area and are not necessarily recharge features, but are vertical planes of weakness and crushed rock that may favor preferential groundwater flow and cave development (Hauwert, 2009). Faults with large offsets are less common. The larger the offset, in general the more likely the fault will influence groundwater flow and cave development. Two faults are interpreted by Small and others (1996) to cross the site. Two faults are shown on site. One observed fault with a strike of about N 35° E bisects the property about 150-ft west of eastern property line. The Kirschberg member is on the upthrown block on the western side of fault and Leached and Collapsed members are on the downthrown block on eastern side (Figure 3). The fault displacement, the relative movement of the two sides of the fault, is roughly 100 ft. The second inferred fault is generally in the southeastern corner of the site and is within the Leached and Collapsed members. The fault has a strike of approximately N 5° W and is estimated to have about 20-ft of displacement.

6.0 Available Environmental Information

Section 25-8-1 of the City Austin LDC defines critical environmental features (CEFs) as “features that are of critical importance to the protection of environmental resource”. No CEFs, such as wetlands, rimrock, bluff, springs, and point recharge features have been identified on this site, although no geologic assessment has been conducted by either the land owner, agent or the City of Austin. The nearest known significant karst feature is Seibert Cave, which is about 2,000-ft northeast of the site.

Two City of Austin geologists; Nico Hauwert, P.G. and Scott Hiers, P.G. have randomly walked the site and encountered no open cave features on site. However, several clay filled features of interest have been identified. These features may or may not conceal a point recharge features. The location of these features is shown on Figure 4. Additional investigation and excavation of these features is warranted to determine if they are significant recharge features or not. This will occur during the development review process.

On March 20, 2012, after an approximate 2.5-inch rainfall event, City of Austin staff; Mike McDougal and Scott Hiers, completed a second cursory investigation of several of the depressions to see if rapid infiltration of runoff was occurring on site. No signs of rapid infiltration were observed and water was ponded in all of the depression features visited. The clay fill within three of features was probed to a depth of 1.5 to 2-ft below ground surface before rock substrate or boulder was encountered (Figure 5). This test is not definitive for identifying whether or not recharge features are present, since clay fill in an actual sinkhole could impede infiltration. The test is just a rough measure of minimum thickness of clay infilling.

If future geologic and environmental assessments determine that these potential features are significant recharge features and critical environmental features as defined by the City Land Development Code, then the typical protective setback of 150-ft is required. It is possible other features are present on the site which have not been observed or investigated. A thorough environmental assessment will be required prior to development of the project during subdivision or site plan review.

7.0 Development Regulations and Required Assessments

The site is currently owned by AISD and is subject to the City of Austin's Land Development Code except where modified by the City's Land Development Standards Agreement with AISD. The property was originally planned for an AISD elementary school. If developed by AISD as an elementary school, the agreement would allow 50 percent impervious cover net site area. However, the agreement would still require non-degradation water quality controls, prohibit impervious cover in the water quality transition zone, and protection of critical environmental features.

If AISD sells the property, as currently proposed, and developed as a new project, the site would have to comply with current City Code (including the SOS Ordinance), which would require 15 percent impervious cover net site area, non-degradation water quality controls, prohibit impervious cover in the water quality transition zone, and protection of critical environmental features.

All development projects, including AISD projects, requesting a development permit within the Edwards Aquifer and within the City of Austin's city limits and ETJ, must submit an Environmental Assessment (EA) to the City of Austin with their development application. In addition, a Water Pollution Abatement Plan (WPAP) with a geologic assessment is required by Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ). An EA and WPAP typically occur after the zoning process during the site development process. The Watershed Protection Department (WPD) reviews and evaluates both the City and TCEQ-WPAP assessments. WPD staff will also complete a karst field survey at the site after reviewing the assessments to determine if any karst features were missed. If the WPD assessment indicates additional investigation is needed to evaluate a possible karst feature, then WPD staff often excavates those features to determine if a feature warrants protection as a CEF.

The City requires that a Texas licensed professional geoscientist be present on site during trenching activities over the Edwards Aquifer to inspect trenches for voids. Any karst features not visible at the surface encountered during construction are mitigated according to a void mitigation process which is reviewed by WPD and TCEQ.

Development in the transition zone on the property is limited to a fence that does not obstruct flood flows; public or private park facilities, golf courses, or open spaces, other than a parking lot. In addition, utility line crossings, arterial streets and a minor drainage facilities or water quality controls are allowed in the transition zone. All of these facilities must comply with the floodplain modification guidelines of the Environmental Criteria Manual.

8.0 Considerations for Water Quality Protection Lands Acquisition

Minimizing development over the aquifer is always the optimal solution, however, this property is relatively small, poorly located, and lacks the variety of environmental features the City looks

for when considering property for purchase for water quality protection. A variety of factors are considered in evaluating properties for the City's Water Quality Protection Lands (WQPL). Below are these criteria and implications for this property:

1. Creek and Aquifer Protection – There are no creeks on this property and the groundwater migrates to and discharges from Cold Springs on Lady Bird Lake and possibly Backdoor Spring on Barton Creek. This property does not directly feed to Barton Springs.
2. Avoid Pollution – Property that would be developed under the SOS Ordinance, our strictest water quality ordinance, would not score high.
3. Contiguity – This property is not close or adjacent (like sharing a fencing line) to existing WQPL properties.
4. Management Considerations – Property adjacent to dense suburban housing would be more difficult to manage, especially if the neighbors are accustomed to regular unrestricted access.
5. Public Use Value – Considers trail potential or other recreational qualities, this property probably has some local public use value, but limited.
6. Financial Feasibility – COA would not pay more than an appraised value for the property. AISD has a bid of \$1.1M for the property, or almost \$92,000/acre, which is well above what the program generally pays in more rural areas. The WQPL program does not currently have any funding for additional land purchases.
7. Size - The program does not usually try to acquire property in the 12 ac range, generally acquisitions are in the 100's to 1,000's of ac unless there are extenuating conditions such as filling ownership gaps between existing properties.

City funding for purchasing property is very limited. The City generally targets properties that meet most of our criteria and usually in more rural areas where more acreage can be acquired per dollar cost.

9.0 References

Hauwert, Nico, David Johns, Thomas Aley, and James Sansom, 2004, Groundwater Tracing Study of the Barton Springs Segment of the Edwards Aquifer, Southern Travis and Northern Hays Counties, Texas: Report by the Barton Springs/Edwards Aquifer Conservation District and City of Austin Watershed Protection and Development Review Department. 110 p. and appendices.

http://www.ci.austin.tx.us/watershed/publications/files/2004maintracingreport_Part1.pdf

<http://www.ci.austin.tx.us/watershed/publications/files/2004maintracingreportappG.pdf>


Hauwert, Nico M., 2009, Groundwater Flow and Recharge within the Barton Springs Segment of the Edwards Aquifer, Southern Travis County and Northern Hays County, Texas: Ph.D. Diss., University of Texas at Austin, Texas. 328 p

<http://www.ci.austin.tx.us/watershed/publications/files/FinalDissertationNH2009710.pdf>

Small, Ted A., John A. Hanson, and Nico M. Hauwert ; 1996, (revised) Geologic Framework and Hydrogeologic Characteristics of the Edwards Aquifer Outcrop (Barton Springs Segment), Northeastern Hays and Southwestern Travis Counties, Texas; U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 96-4306, 21p, plate 1.


<http://pubs.er.usgs.gov/publication/wri964306>

Figure 1: Site Topography and Drainage According City of Austin GIS.




Source: City of Austin – GIS
 This map is intended for planning purposes only. All map data is preliminary and subject to confirmation

Figure 2: Site Topography and Drainage According City of Austin GIS.




Source: City of Austin – GIS
 This map is intended for planning purposes only. All map data is preliminary and subject to confirmation

Figure 3: The Published Regional Geology – Site Geology Not Field Verified.



Source: City of Austin – GIS
This map is intended for planning purposes only. All map data is preliminary and subject to confirmation

Figure 4: Approximate Locations of Features of Interest Requiring Additional Evaluation. Formal Environmental Assessment Per City of Austin/TCEQ Requirements Has Not Been Conducted



Source: City of Austin – GIS
This map is intended for planning purposes only. All map data is preliminary and subject to confirmation

Figure 5 – Photographs and Location of Features of Interest with Ponded Water as Observed on March 20, 2012.



Source: City of Austin - Watershed Protection Department - Scott Hiers, March 20, 2012

Source: City of Austin - GIS
This map is intended for planning purposes only. All map data is preliminary and subject to confirmation.

Ordinance No. 20060216-045 – AISD Agreement

ORDINANCE NO. 20060216-045

AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO THE SCHOOL DISTRICT LAND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, INCLUDING AMENDMENTS THAT APPLY TO SCHOOLS IN THE BARTON SPRINGS ZONE.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

PART 1. FINDINGS.

- (A) The City and the Austin Independent School District ("School District") entered into that certain School District Land Development Standards Agreement on September 22, 1994 ("Original Agreement"), in accordance with Section 212.902 of the Texas Local Government Code.
- (B) The City and the School District amended and restated the Original Agreement in February 1997.
- (C) The City and the School District desire to further amend the standards that are applicable to the development of schools by executing the Second Amendment to the School District Land Development Standards Agreement ("Second Amendment"), attached to this ordinance and incorporated for all purposes as Exhibit A.
- (D) Some of the provisions of the Second Amendment affect development of schools in the Barton Springs Zone and amend Chapter 25-8, Article 12 (*Save Our Springs Initiative*) as it applies to those schools.

PART 2. APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT.

The Council approves the Second Amendment to the School District Land Development Standards Agreement, including the provisions that amend Chapter 25-8, Article 12 (*Save Our Springs Initiative*) as it applies to schools in the Barton Springs Zone, and directs the City Manager to execute the Second Amendment on behalf of the City.


PART 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This ordinance takes effect on February 27, 2006.


PASSED AND APPROVED

February 16, 2006

§
§
§


Will Wynn
Mayor

APPROVED:


David Allan Smith
City Attorney

ATTEST:



Shirley A. Gentry
City Clerk

EXHIBIT A

SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE SCHOOL DISTRICT LAND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

STATE OF TEXAS

§

§

COUNTY OF TRAVIS

§

KNOW ALL

BY THESE PRESENTS:

This Second Amendment to the School District Land Development Standards Agreement ("Second Amendment") is made and entered into by and between the City of Austin, Texas, a home-rule city and municipal corporation in Travis County, Texas ("City"), and the Austin Independent School District ("School District") under the provisions of the Local Government Code, Section 212.902.

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the City and the School District executed the School District Land Development Standards Agreement ("Original Agreement") on September 22, 1994, in accordance with Section 212.902 of the Texas Local Government Code; and

WHEREAS, the Original Agreement was amended and restated in February 1997 by the School District Land Development Standards Agreement executed by Jesus Garza, City Manager, on behalf of the City, and by James H. Fox, Jr., Superintendent, on behalf of the School District (as amended and restated, the "Agreement"), which Agreement was received for filing in the City Clerk's Office on February 11, 1997; and

WHEREAS, the Agreement provides that it may be amended if the amendment is approved and signed by both parties; and

WHEREAS, the City and the School District desire to further amend the Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the foregoing premises and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, the City and the School District agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

1. Section 2.3 is deleted and replaced with the following:

Section 2.3. City Review and Comment of Site Development Plan and Building Permit Application.

Section 2.3.1 Review Schedule.

- A. The City Liaison shall notify the School District Liaison by telephone or facsimile transmission within five (5) working days of site development plan submittal if the submitted site development plan and reports do not meet the minimum submittal requirements of this Agreement and applicable City ordinances and rules. If the Site Development Plan is insufficient for review, then the City Liaison shall provide written explanation of the application's deficiencies. After the submittal of a sufficient and complete application, the City shall have twenty-eight (28) days to review a site development plan, each subsequent phase of an approved phased site development plan, and accompanying reports, if any, and respond with complete comments from all reviewing City departments to the School District Liaison regarding the site development plan's compliance with this Agreement. Should complete comments not be returned within said twenty-eight (28) days, then the City Liaison shall give a written response to the School District with a copy to the City Manager. Said response shall contain a detailed explanation of the reasons for the delay and an accurate timetable for when complete comments regarding the Site Development Plan will be issued.
- B. After submittal of a sufficient and complete application, the City shall have nine (9) days to review a small project site development plan and respond to the School District Liaison with written comments from all reviewing City departments regarding compliance with this Agreement and applicable City ordinances and rules.

- C. The City shall have fourteen (14) days to review submitted updates to a site development plan.
- D. The School District shall give the City Liaison at least two (2) working days prior notice of the School District's intent to submit a site development plan for initial review or a site development plan update based on prior City review.
- E. The School District shall include with all update submittals a summary sheet listing each comment issued by the City and a brief description of how the comment was addressed.
- F. If, after the City has issued comments to the second update to the site development plan the City has not approved the site development plan, the School District and City Liaison shall meet to resolve the remaining issues preventing site development plan approval. Unless otherwise agreed on by the Liaisons, the above described meeting shall occur within ten (10) days of the City issuing comments to the second site development plan update.
- G. Site development plans for educational facilities shall have priority review by the City.

Section 2.3.2. Final Approval of Site Development Plan.

The site development plan shall be approved if the site development plan complies with this Agreement and all applicable City ordinances and rules.

Section 2.3.3. Effect of Approved Site Development Plan.

- A. A site development plan approved pursuant to this Agreement shall satisfy all City requirements necessary for the School District to begin site construction of all development features shown on the site development plan.
- B. If required, a building permit shall be issued by the City to the School District when the building construction plans are approved as

complying with the applicable building code and the approved site development plans.

- C. The School District may begin site construction and utility construction in accordance with the site development plan after:
 - 1. the approval of the site development plan;
 - 2. a preconstruction conference; and
 - 3. installation of required environmental controls.
- D. If applicable, water and wastewater tap(s) from the City may be purchased after approval of the Site Development Plan.

Section 2.3.4. Minor Revision to Approved Site Development Plan Prior to or During Construction.

- A. The School District shall transmit to the City Liaison copies of proposed minor revisions to an approved site development plan.
- B. Within four working days of the School District's request for a minor revision, the City shall approve the request, if, subject to modifications required by the City, the minor revision is consistent with this Agreement and applicable City ordinances and rules.
- C. Minor field revisions involving temporary erosion controls may be approved by City environmental field inspectors.

Section 2.3.5. Building Construction Plan Review and Building Permit Issuance.

- A. After the City building official has received information, all applicable City building permit review fees, and adequate evidence of the future availability of water and wastewater service, the City shall have twenty-one (21) days to review a building permit application for a new building and issue to the School District either a Building Permit or a complete written list of changes needed to bring the

building construction plans into compliance with the Building Code and this Agreement.

- B. After making the changes necessary to bring the building construction plans into compliance with the Building Code and this Agreement, as noted in the written list of changes provided by the City, the School District may resubmit the building construction plans to the City.
 - C. The City shall have ten (10) days to review the resubmitted building construction plans and issue to the School District either a building permit or a second written list of changes needed to bring the building construction plans into compliance with the Building Code and this Agreement. The ten (10) day review period by the City shall apply to each additional resubmittal of the building construction plans.
 - D. If the City fails to provide written comments to the School District Building Official within the required ten (10) days, or if more than two resubmittals have been required without a permit being issued, then the City and School District liaison shall meet or communicate as quickly as possible to resolve outstanding issues. The City and School District Building Official may mutually agree to extend any of the required ten (10) day review periods.
2. A new Section 2.9 is added to read:

Section 2.9 Building Height Regulations.

- A. Except as provided in Subsection B of this section, the maximum height of a building located on a school site is 60 feet.
- B. In the zoning jurisdiction of the City:
 - 1. a building located 50 feet or less from a property that is used or zoned for a single-family residential use may not exceed a height of 30 feet; and
 - 2. a building located more than 50 feet but less than 100 feet from a property that is used or zoned for a single-family residential use may not exceed a height of 40 feet.

3. A new Section 2.10 is added to read:

Section 2.10 Parking Requirements.

- A. The minimum number of parking spaces required for a school facility constructed in the corporate limits of the City is:
 - 1. for an elementary or junior high school, 1.5 spaces for each faculty and staff; and
 - 2. for a senior school, 1.5 spaces for each faculty and staff and 1 space for every 3 students in the 11th and 12th grades.
- B. The minimum parking requirement for a school activity facility in the corporate limits of the City shall be determined by the City on a case by case basis. Shared parking shall be used when possible.
- C. Bicycle parking shall be provided as the School District deems appropriate.
- D. Except for landscaping requirements, the layout of a parking lot must comply with the Transportation Criteria Manual.

4. A new Section 2.11 is added to read:

Section 2.11 Site Development Plan Not Required for Certain Development.

A site development plan is not required for development on a school site that disturbs 5,000 square feet of land or less.

5. Section 3.1 of the Agreement is deleted and replaced with the following:

Section 3.1 Impervious Cover Limits

- A. This subsection applies in an uplands zone.

1. Except as provided in Subsections A.2., A.3., and A.4. below, the maximum impervious cover in an uplands zone is 50 percent of the net site area or 60 percent of the net site area if a transfer of impervious cover is available and used.
2. In an urban watershed, the maximum impervious cover is 65 percent of the gross site area or the impervious cover allowed by the zoning district, whichever is greater.
3. For development in the Barton Springs Zone for which a no discharge water quality control or alternative control approved by the Watershed Protection Utility is utilized:
 - a. except as provided in Subsection A.3.b. or Subsection A.3.c below, development of a school site shall be 25 percent impervious cover or comply with the impervious cover regulations established in Section 25-8-514 of the City Code (the Save Our Springs Initiative), whichever is greater.
 - b. for a school site described on Exhibit B, impervious cover may not exceed the impervious cover limit established in the exhibit.
 - c. for development of a school site on a tract of land subject to a Conservation Easement to Restrict Impervious Cover (or instrument having similar intent and effect) entered into in connection with a development or settlement agreement between a developer and the City of Austin after March 15, 2000, which includes an allocation of impervious cover to identified tracts of land within the area covered by such agreement, the School District shall be governed solely by the terms and provisions of the applicable Conservation Easement to Restrict Impervious Cover (or instrument having similar intent and effect) regarding the impervious cover limits for such school site.

4. Except in the Barton Springs Zone, for a site owned by the School District before May 18, 1986, the maximum impervious cover is the impervious cover established by the applicable watershed ordinance in effect on May 18, 1986 or the impervious cover established in this Section 3.1, whichever is greater.
- B. This subsection applies in a water quality transition zone.
1. Except as provided in Subsection B.2., the maximum impervious cover is 18 percent.
 2. In the Barton Springs Zone, development is limited to the development allowed in a critical water quality zone by Subsection C.
- C. Except as authorized in the Austin City Code, development is not permitted in a critical water quality zone.
- D. With respect to School Site Number Five (Kiker Elementary) described on Exhibit B, the School District is constructing an eight-classroom addition containing 16,049 square feet of impervious cover (the "Kiker Expansion"), for a total of 159,361 square feet of impervious cover on the Kiker Tract after completion of the expansion or 37.75 percent of net site area. To mitigate the square footage of developed area in excess of 15 percent of net site area (96,000 square feet), the School District will pay to the City the sum of \$230,400. The City shall use these funds to purchase and preserve land in the Barton Springs Zone.

The School District agrees to make the payment within one year following the effective date of this Second Amendment. The City agrees that the payment is a one-time payment and is required only in connection with the Kiker Expansion.

6. Section 3.2C. is amended to read:
 - C. Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, for every one acre of land or portion thereof in the Uplands Zone located within a buffer of

a Critical Environment Feature and left natural and undisturbed, the School District is entitled to an additional 20,000 square feet of Impervious Cover on lands elsewhere in Uplands Zones. Such buffer area may also be included in the Net Site Area calculations for the Uplands Zone. A transfer of impervious cover to an uplands zone of the Barton Springs Zone is not permitted.

7. Exhibit B to the Agreement is deleted and a new Exhibit B is adopted in the form attached to this Second Amendment.

ARTICLE 2 - GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. All provisions of the Agreement not specifically amended herein shall remain in effect.
2. This Second Amendment is effective after execution by the authorized representatives of all parties.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this instrument is made and executed to be effective as of the last date signed by the parties.

CITY OF AUSTIN:

By: _____
Toby Futrell
City Manager

Date: _____

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT:

By: _____
Doyle Valdez
President, Board of Trustees

Date: _____

By: _____
Pascal D. Forgione, Jr.
Superintendent

Date: _____

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Assistant City Attorney

EXHIBIT "B"

SCHOOL SITES SUBJECT TO SECTION 3.1.A.3.b.

School Site Number One

Intentionally Deleted

School Site Number Two (Travis Country Site)

Tract of land consisting of approximately 13.42 acres out of a certain 705.75 acre tract being out of the J. Trammel Survey No. 4, the E. Barton Survey No. 8, the E. Jenkins Survey No. 9; and the C. Arnold Survey No. 78 in Travis County, Texas being more fully described by deed of record in Volume 4046, Page 1490 of the Real Property Records of Travis County Texas; the said 13.42 acres being Lot 63, Block "6" of the Travis Country Section Two, Phase Two Subdivision.

Impervious cover limit: 50% of the net site area.

School Site Number Three (Village at Western Oaks Site)

Tract of land consisting of approximately 14.24 acres, described as Lot 38, Block A in the Village at Western Oaks, Section 28 and 29, approved preliminary subdivision plan #C8-84058.09.

Impervious cover limit: 50% of the net site area.

School Site Number Four (Boone Elementary)

Tract of land consisting of approximately 12.055 acres out of the Thomas Anderson League Survey #17, and also being out of a 14.11 acre tract as conveyed to A.I.S.D. by Deed recorded in Volume 5031, Page 1294, Deed Records of Travis County, Texas.

Impervious cover limit: 31% of the net site area.

School Site Number Five (Kiker Elementary)

Tract of land consisting of 11.727 acres, more or less, out of the Samuel Hamilton Survey No. 16, in Travis County, Texas, being more particularly described in a Special Warranty Deed from Circle C Development Joint Venture to Austin Independent School District, recorded in Volume 11278, Page 1333, Real Property Records of Travis County, Texas.


Impervious cover limit: 38% of the net site area.


Environmental Summary for 4806 1/2 Trail West (C14-2012-0016; Estates at Travis Country)

Presentation to Environmental Board
May 2, 2012

Site Summary

- 12.45 acres
- Surrounded by pre-SOS residential development
- Barton Creek watershed
- Barton Springs segment of Edwards Aquifer
- Groundwater discharges at Cold Springs
- Owned by AISD since late 1970's
- Informal survey found several features of interest





Applicable Development Regulations

AI SD

COA/AISD Agreement

- 50% impervious cover
- Non-degradation water quality controls
- Env. assessment
- TCEQ WPAP
- CEF setback

Private Development

SOS Ordinance

- 15% impervious cover
- Non-degradation water quality controls
- Env. assessment
- TCEQ WPAP
- CEF setback

Consideration for WQPL Purchase

Site doesn't meet criteria for:

- Pollution prevention – Subject to SOS
- Contiguity with other protected land - No
- Size- Small
- Cost per acre protected - High

Questions?