

**Response to Data Requests**

Request	Resource	Response
CIP for area (CM Cole)	CPO	<p>See attached map for projects listed in IMMPACT.</p> <p>Regarding infrastructure capacity: It is cheaper to serve more people by investing in and maintaining infrastructure in denser, more urban development, so targeted development in Imagine Austin centers and along corridors accommodates population growth in a way that is less expensive, while at the same time meeting the goals of Imagine Austin.</p> <p>Basic Infrastructure need always outweighs available funding resources. This is and will be true for a long time into the future.</p> <p>Infrastructure is repaired or replaced on a cycle; infrastructure upgrades for increased capacity and/or best practice material upgrades are less expensive to make when done at the same time as basic condition-based infrastructure rehabilitation and replacement.</p>
Timeline for upgraded water infrastructure (CM Morrison)	<p>AWU</p> <p>Contacted Marisa Flores-Gonzales 10/8</p> <p>Response on 10/30</p> <p>Spoke with Margaret Lake (AWU) 10/30</p>	<p>Williamson Creek Interceptor is in CIP for 2020. AWU's Long Range Plan is underway and accounts for future population projections for areas of the city (courtesy of R. Robinson).</p> <p>Current: heavy rain events result in overflow from system (although this isn't stormwater, some infiltration occurs).</p> <p>From M. Flores-Gonzales: The Williamson Creek Interceptor will only handle wastewater. Texas does not have the combined wastewater and stormwater sewer systems that you'll find in the northeast US. The existing 48" Williamson Interceptor is at capacity, and requires the replacement of 18,000 LF with a 66" interceptor to prevent sanitary sewer overflows and ensure adequate capacity. As far as other CIP in the area, this is the largest 5-yr CIP project in the area, with one smaller water distribution pressure zone conversion project along William Cannon that I do not think will have much of an impact on your planning area.</p> <p>Regarding density increases: AWU responds to increases in density in a variety of ways and each case is different. Some of the more frequent responses include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing infrastructure is evaluated and has adequate capacity for increased density sometimes relating to previous planning</li> <li>• The Service Extension Request SER process is used to determine infrastructure needs and an agreement with developers about who will build / pay for infrastructure on an appropriate timeline</li> <li>• Capital Improvements Program Projects may be planned or already underway to increase water and / or wastewater</li> </ul>

		system capacity
Use of secondary apartment infill option in adopted NPs (CM Spelman)		230 permitted garage apartments – about 130 (56%) built in areas that <b>did not</b> opt into secondary apt. infill tool; 100 (44%) built in NPA that <b>did</b> opt into secondary apt infill tool.  Of the 100 units in NPAs with the secondary apt. option, 30 units have been constructed citywide on SF-3 lots between 5,750-7,000 sq. feet since 2007. These are concentrated mostly in Holly, Chestnut, and east Austin. See map.
Opt-in by neighborhood for infill options (CM Martinez)		All registered neighborhood associations were contacted by email to ask if the neighborhood association is satisfied with the current proposal or if they would like to create a subdistrict for one or more infill option. A third option of adding infill through a contact team amendment was also provided. Staff offered to meet with associations for further discussion. Responses are summarized below:
Neighborhood Assoc.	Proposed Options (1 <sup>st</sup> Reading Results)	NA Response
West Gate Planning Area		
Southern Oaks	<b>No infill options are proposed.</b>  Design tools:  • parking placement and impervious cover restrictions  • garage placement for new construction  • front porch setbacks  • mobile food vending restrictions  • front yard parking restrictions	Satisfied with current recommendation.
Western Trails	<b>No infill options are proposed.</b>  Design tools:  • parking placement and impervious cover restrictions  • garage placement for new construction  • front porch setbacks  • mobile food vending restrictions  • front yard parking restrictions	Satisfied with infill; would like to remove the 15-ft setback tool.

South Manchaca Planning Area		
Southwood	<p>Infill options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• small lot amnesty area wide</li> <li>• secondary apartment area wide</li> <li>• corner stores, limited to the eastern side of Manchaca Rd.</li> </ul> <p>Infill options in the floodplain and in the Hilltop subdivision will be excluded.</p> <p>Approved design tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• parking placement and impervious cover restrictions</li> <li>• garage placement for new construction</li> <li>• front porch setbacks</li> <li>• mobile food vending restrictions</li> </ul>	<p>Mixed responses.</p> <p>1 board member: refer to written input</p> <p>2: support</p> <p>1: not in favor</p>
Salem Walk	<p>Infill options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• small lot amnesty area wide</li> <li>• secondary apartment area wide</li> </ul> <p>Infill options in the floodplain and in the Hilltop subdivision will be excluded.</p> <p>Approved design tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• parking placement and impervious cover restrictions</li> <li>• garage placement for new construction</li> <li>• front porch setbacks</li> <li>• mobile food vending restrictions</li> </ul>	<p>Satisfied with current recommendation.</p>
Garrison Park Planning Area		
Armadillo Park	<p>Approved infill options east of the railroad tracks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* small lot amnesty</li> <li>* secondary apartment</li> </ul> <p>Cottage lots and urban homes should be addressed through CodeNEXT.</p>	<p>No official stance—Armadillo Park NA became official on 11/2/2014.</p>

	<p>Approved design tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* parking placement and impervious cover restrictions</li> <li>* garage placement for new construction</li> <li>* front porch setbacks</li> <li>* mobile food vending restrictions</li> </ul>	
Cherry Creek Central	<p>Infill options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• small lot amnesty (small lot amnesty is adopted area-wide, but doesn't apply anywhere within boundaries)</li> </ul> <p>Design tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• parking placement and impervious cover restrictions</li> <li>• garage placement for new construction</li> <li>• front porch setbacks</li> <li>• mobile food vending restrictions</li> </ul>	Satisfied with current recommendation.
Cherry Creek SW	<p>Infill options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• small lot amnesty</li> </ul> <p>Design tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• parking placement and impervious cover restrictions</li> <li>• garage placement for new construction</li> <li>• front porch setbacks</li> <li>• mobile food vending restrictions</li> </ul>	Satisfied with current recommendation.
Cherry Creek Village	<p>The small lot amnesty infill option is also proposed and applies to 2 lots.</p> <p>Design tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• parking placement and impervious cover restrictions</li> <li>• garage placement for new construction</li> </ul>	No response.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• front porch setbacks</li> <li>• mobile food vending restrictions</li> <li>• front yard parking restrictions</li> </ul>	
Manchaca Estates	<p>Infill options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• small lot amnesty (small lot amnesty is adopted area-wide, but doesn't apply anywhere within boundaries)</li> </ul> <p>Design tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• parking placement and impervious cover restrictions</li> <li>• garage placement for new construction</li> <li>• front porch setbacks</li> <li>• mobile food vending restrictions</li> </ul>	Against all infill options. (None apply.)

## **Growth + Infrastructure**

A compact and connected approach to growth, as recommended in Imagine Austin, can have a significant effect on the CIP. As cities are challenged to bear increasingly more of the infrastructure burden without as much help as in the past from the state or the federal government, long-range plans for reducing the cost of ongoing services are necessary.

A recent study by Smart Growth America found that in 2010, approximately one-third of the \$1.6 trillion in funds raised and spent by local governments in the U.S. was expended on geographically-sensitive projects and activities that were affected by local development patterns.

---

Given the importance of assessing and addressing infrastructure condition, the City initiated a multi-year process in 2013 to conduct a coordinated, organization-wide infrastructure condition assessment. Although many City departments already have individual processes in place to determine CIP needs related to the status of facilities and infrastructure, this coordinated assessment will provide a common framework that can be used in cross-departmental CIP planning. Austin's Comprehensive Infrastructure Assessment process is being developed in three phases.

Phase 1 (2014): Review department infrastructure assessment processes and data resources including identification and organization of infrastructure assets.

Phase 2 (2015): Conduct an infrastructure inventory and condition assessment (using existing available information) to inform needs that will be incorporated into the Rolling Needs Assessment and Long-Range CIP Strategic Plan.

Phase 3 (Future Years): Further enhance linkage of infrastructure assessment to CIP needs identification, prioritization and decision making

(2014-15 Long Range CIP Strategic Plan)