

City Council Special Called Meeting Transcript –09/27/2017

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 9/27/2017 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 9/27/2017

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[1:44:21 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: All right. I'm going to go ahead and convene today's special called meeting. Today is Wednesday, September 27th, 2017. It's 1:45 P.M. We're in the boards and commissions room here at 301 west second street. We have two items on the agenda. The first one is the codenext. We were looking for staff reports and to talk to us about the -- about the watershed analysis issues. Related to codenext. And then second we wanted to talk about small area planning. Both in the context of codenext and also with respect to councilmember kitchen's resolution, which the council is considering on tomorrow's agenda. We had also put on the agenda the opportunity to talk among ourselves about the -- the ifc, the item from council tomorrow, about asking staff to -- to advance the analysis of the downtown-related issues or downtown issues. And -- and I see that -- that I'm -- I now have two things in front of me. One appears to be from mayor pro tem tovo and the other one from councilmember kitchen. We want to make sure that we get to that. So I would suggest that we start with the codenext. In order to make sure that we get to the next issue, that we have a hard stop at 3:30, so that we can move then to the downtown issues. And we have a hard stop at 4:00. >> Tovo: Mayor, if I could just spend one minute explaining what I handed out. The amendments actually are -- are -- I did in conjunction with councilmember Garza. There is one that she didn't have an opportunity to vet, that's why it has my name on it. Also, councilmember pool and I worked together on some of them as well.

[1:46:21 PM]

So I distributed it, but I want to credit my colleagues on that. I just wanted to explain that there are two pages of proposed amendments, then I printed out the questions that I had submitted to the q&a, so those would be -- would be in one place. Some of them have been responded to. Some of them have not been. I did submit some of the questions to law a few weeks ago, but didn't get -- hadn't yet gotten responses and thought it would be useful to have them in the q&a process for tomorrow. I don't have responses to those yet, I don't know whether those will be under attorney-client privilege or not. But anyway all of the questions that I submitted are the back part of the package, again just for reference. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Garza: -- >> Mr. Mayor. The document that I passed out is the update from what we talked about on Tuesday. It's styled as just a replacement resolution. What I tried to do is incorporate -- because of quorum, I didn't talk to other people, but I tried to incorporate the

conversations that we had at work session. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you for handing those out. Then we'll go ahead and proceed with codenext until 3:30. Hard stop. And we have two presentations. We'll begin with the -- with the watershed issues, please proceed. >> All right, thank you, mayor. Good afterferring. >> , Mayor and council, Joe pantalion, assistant city manager. We do have an overview of the watershed analysis and the drainage-related components of codenext. We do have a full contingent of watershed staff here. We have acting director Mike Personette, chuck Lesniak, at the table we have Matt Holland acting planning division manager and Kevin shunck manager of the watershed engineering division. With hurricane Harvey and

[1:48:22 PM]

Irma, bringing really a national focus just on water management, I thought it was important to remind the mayor and council that here in Travis county, over a three year period, we recently came off of four presidential disaster declarations. And if I can remember these correctly, it's the Halloween flood of 2013, the memorial day flood of 2015, the Halloween flood of 2015 and then the may/june floods of 2016. So within a three-year period, we here in Travis county had four disaster declarations. So, again, it's not always a -- another community. It has been Austin very recently. So with that, I think this is a very timely discussion and I think you will see the benefits of what's being proposed through codenext. So with that, I think I'm going to turn it over to meat Holland. >> Thank you -- to Matt Holland. >> Thank you, Joe, thank you mayor and council for your time on this key issue. So I'm going to give a brief overview of the presentation. We will -- throughout I'm going to be recognizing the crucial need to balance the priorities here. We, of course, in watershed protection are all about the drainage, environmental aspects. We're very focused on public safety. On property protection, on environmental values. We also know that there are very important housing choice and housing affordability, other elements being wrapped into this proposal at the same time in codenext, so that's the context that we're operating in. I'm going to start off by briefly talking about an impervious cover analysis that we did a couple of months ago. We were using the first round of mapping, the codenext offered -- the codenext team. We just recently received the mapping for the second round. And we are -- we are in the midst of -- of working on that right now. We actually should have some results of that here very soon. We will talk about that

[1:50:23 PM]

analysis. We will talk about maintaining our current watershed protections which we think are extremely important and valuable for the company. We wanted to assure the community we are not going to be back sliding on our environmental and drainage regulations. And we have two important new initiatives in codenext that we are proposing. The first one has to do with flood mitigation for redevelopment properties and we will go into some detail on that one, we will also go into some detail about our green infrastructure and beneficial use of storm water proposal. Then we will talk a little bit about next steps. Because I know you guys have had a lot of really good questions. Some of the things that we're working on are still in motion, we are probably not going to have answers on every component, but we really want to acknowledge some things that we are working on for draft 3. All of

the things that we might be tweaking would be coming out in draft 3 in November. So we will start with the impervious cover analysis. This is pretty straightforward. We're just using -- basic mapping exercise with a lot of moving parts in terms of, you know, tens of thousands of properties that we are evaluating at once. We are basically looking at all of the properties within the city limits. We're trying to figure out what impervious cover levels do they currently have and let's compare that with the impervious cover levels that they are currently entitled to go to if they wanted to maximize their impervious cover and how far could they go with the codenext levels. And we'll -- and this actually had very important floodplain implications and drainage implications. We -- we will dive into this more, especially if you guys want to get more detail on this. We currently and for a long time have been using ultimate conditions buildout assumptions in our flood modeling, which is different than most communities. [Phone ringing]. Oops, pardon me. That won't happen again. Okay. And the ultimate -- the ultimate conditions means that we are assuming that every single property maximums out its impervious

[1:52:23 PM]

cover when we draw up our floodplains. That is not the case. Usually the impervious cover is somewhat lower. It takes a really long time, maybe never to get to those absolutely maximum impervious cover levels. But for a factor of safety we want to put that in on our floodplain models are showing boundaries and limits for the 100 year floodplain that are as safe and protective as possible. So that's an important thing to keep in mind. And so if -- if the proposed codenext impervious cover limits were to change, were to increase, we would actually literally have to do remodeling of these floodplains in response because we want to make sure that we keep up with that impervious cover, those possible impervious cover maximums. As you will see in a second, we're not going to have to do that. The impervious cover does not change, does not increase for the impervious cover maximums. We basically also wanted to understand where the differences are in the impervious cover proposed. Just a real quick map that shows this is just the city limits. Doesn't show the etj, shows the city limits of Austin. And in that purple polygon in the middle, kind of blob in the middle is the urban core but what we affectionately know as the urban watersheds, the most heavily developed and longest developed watersheds in Austin, developed in large part pri to the protective ordinances we now know and love being put into place. That's kind of a special area of focus, because the drainage structure there is a little frequently undersized, antiquated and environmental protections are not as wide-spread. So when we refer to urban watersheds, that's what we're talking about. >> Could I ask a quick question? >> Absolutely. >> Kevin: You looked at all of the watersheds, right? >> All of them within the city limits, yes. All 10 council districts, et cetera, are completely represented. So this next table -- walks through a very high level. We actually look at individual watersheds. I want to emphasize again, we just looked at map 1.

[1:54:25 PM]

We also didn't do, because we were trying to get early out results for the environmental commission, we looked at things just at a very high level. We didn't look at things like stream buffers, floodplain protections, those things are -- those are -- those are protections such that you actually can't, you know, you can't actually always maximize the impervious cover on your site because you need to stay out of

the floodplain and so forth, out of the stream buffer. These numbers are all going to be too high in terms of the maximums. In our second round of investigations, we are actually going to fold that in and make sure that you guys have the benefit of that information. Just takes a lot longer to crunch the numbers, when we do it that way. This -- this first effort is going to show the relative -- relative possibilities. So I'm going to -- I'm now highlighting the -- the allowed maximums there. So we go from what started as today city-wide, again, going back to our map here, if you look at that, you can see actually the impervious cover is kind of hard to see there, squint, you can see the little bitty impervious cover representations on that map, you can kind of see there's not a lot going on in the green areas, more going on in the purple area. That's because there's about 25% impervious cover on average across that whole area. But actually almost 50% in the urban watersheds already. And we're projecting the -- again, with a little bit unrealistically high expectations, we're looking at maybe almost 50% impervious cover city-wide in the future. And we are looking for the urban watersheds for that to creep up to around 64%. Again, that's not going to happen in all likelihood, but that's with our analysis showing, the main thing that we are trying to show is the difference between what we concurrently go to versus what codenext would allow us to go to. >> Mayor, I have a quick question, if I could. Does this -- is the 49.6, is that an average over -- >> Yes, that's an average over the whole area. >> Pool: That includes those areas where it's 90% or 100% impervious cover -- >> That's right. Then parkland and some other

[1:56:26 PM]

areas would draw that back down, so forth. Single family residential. So you can see that there's really only a .25% difference between the theoretical maximums under current code versus -- versus codenext. Really honestly that's kind of within the margin of error of what we're looking at in terms of our analysis ability. But basically what that says is codenext is not increasing impervious cover on average across -- across Austin as proposed. Oh, yeah, then the -- the reason that actually goes up at all is because you've got some large properties, we'll actually show you a map out in the kind of the outskirts, mainly parks that have been zoned interim rural residential, kind of a holding passenger zoning classification. Eventually those are going to change with or without codenext. When those change, we expect 7 those to be sort of Normal park levels, but higher than that very low rural residential. So kind of an artificial bump on those. Yeah, that's right. We only have -- we have basically have -- if you really want to dive in, we actually have a map of it. We have seven properties that are actually driving that entire increase for that city-wide increase. They account for 94% or so of the increase. .>> Casar: Mayor, are we asking questions during this or wait until the end. >> Mayor Adler: Let's wait until the end so someone following this can see the whole presentation. >> Okay. So then you see the same dynamic with the urban watershed. Actually a slight decrease. I think that our understanding is most of that is coming from some of the very highest commercial zoning classifications like commercial services, cs zoning, are going from 95 down to 90, so forth, so on. A few things shifting down, we actually see a minor decrease. Really kind of blends in, in terms of the act crease.

[1:58:28 PM]

The bottom -- accuracy. The bottom line is we are not seeing entitlements with codenext. Diving in again and again to another detailed table, this one shows by individual different land use types, single family, public, commercial, multi-family, so forth, what the different current versus current entitlements versus proposed maximum impervious cover are. Again, you see the same two numbers we saw earlier. Starting around 25, going up to about double that at most. Again unrealistically high, but shows they are similar. The take away on this one is we are really seeing with codenext that the commercial and multi-family and actually puds, the planned unit developments are -- will be the focus of the place that the most of this impervious cover, the entitlements, are going to be when we talk about our flood mitigation efforts and our green infrastructure efforts that's where we're really targeting, trying to make sure as those things increase in impervious cover that we're getting really good outcomes environmentally and from a drainage perspective. This next map just shows which properties with the initial analysis are going up. We zoom in a little bit and we can see -- actually, I know there's been a lot of discussion in the planning commission and in the zap and with council about whether or not the consultants were considering environmental and drainage possibilities in their analysis when they were doing this work. And at a high level they absolutely were. We had conversations about thetic packets of impervious cover and what would happen if things went up and what would happen to the floodplains and to environmental and drainage outcomes. And opticos and their team held the line. There were some initial discussion where things were actually going to go higher. So this was not an accidental thing. This didn't just happen that these things are the same. It actually was very much part of the plan.

[2:00:28 PM]

They understood the importance of this from a watershed protection perspective. Here we are on this map. It shows a lot of green properties that are dropping a lot of impervious cover entitlements and a lot of other colors going up. You can see they are almost on the outskirts of towns, the ones going up a lot. These were the ones that we mentioned were the artifacts of the rural residential going up a bit. I'm going to draw up the local flooding areas on this map, the polygons on the map. And they show areas where we have a concentration of citizen flood reports. And these are reports that are not just -- that we go out in the field and verify and we can take credit for them and we see which ones are in close proximity to the others and we create these boundaries that are sort of the first step toward making a flood project or capital project or other type of structural upgrade. So these areas, you will actually note, have very few of those actually have any kind of increase. They don't have a lot of red and Orange going on in them. There are a couple of exceptions. One is the downtown area, the nueces street drainage basin is, and we actually have a longer range capital project scheduled for that area. And then down south I've got little labels on these. We have an active project working in the delcuerto area of west Bouldin creek and here in the direct drainage to lady bird lake or it might be part of shoal is a planned project for the nueces area. So there are really only two of these that are showing major increases. That does not mean that there's not the possibility of increased impervious cover within these blue polygons. Again, we've got existing impervious cover that could rise up on the theoretical maximums, but codenext is not further piling on

[2:02:28 PM]

in these areas except for these couple of areas where we actually have planned projects in. >> Kitchen: Could I ask a quick question? On that back map is that everything or do you need to pull out and show things further? >> I don't have the slide for this, but we do show it citywide. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> I'll dive next into our proposal. Again, we are going to maintain the long-standing protections that Austin has enjoyed since, frankly, 1974. I'll even show you a geekish timeline of all the different major environmental protections that we've put into place over the long period of time. But the things that we have absolutely protected our environment and protected our drainage system and protected lives and property, frankly, are listed here. These are some of the highlights, floodplains and drainage standards. In a second I've got a little -- a graphic that kind of illustrates that on an individual site. So here's this timeline. There's many, many more ordinances that have been passed than these, but these are the major ones in blue. I've written in waterway ordinance in 1974. We were one of the first places in the United States to come in and say we want natural creeks. We don't want to fill in our creeks with concrete or pipe them. We want to have natural open drainage ways with national traditional character. It was a big deal and also controlled understanding at the 25 year level. And -- flooding. And from that point where Austin has stayed on the cutting edge, we had floodplain ordinance protections in 1983. In a second you will see a major difference that made in the -- frankly, the danger and workload that we've got out there in terms of people building in the floodplain. Our major comprehensive watershed ordinance in '96 and our save our springs ordinance which we're not proposing any changes for codenext, and ending more recently with the watershed protection ordinance. All those changes when he in those ordinances we are maintaining in

[2:04:29 PM]

codenext. Code will not change and will not fall back. So this is just a quick graphic. I'll just graft through this. Here's a sample site. This is more in west Austin because the buffers are different than in east Austin, but they're pretty similar. For this site when they were developing had to to respect and fall back from the 100 year floodplain. They had to look at the critical water quality zone creek buffers to make sure they weren't getting to the creek. Buffer again, lighter development there. They had to respect impervious cover limits. They had to identify key environmental features like springs and we had lands, carts, bluffs. They had to make sure they respected cut and fill limits and sought special protection for that which prevents a lot of harm. They made sure that they maintained their erosion sedimentation controls during construction which is a big deal. This particular site didn't have any flood detention ponds. Many do, but they have to put in structural controls like water detention ponds that. Is a huge part of our protection arsenal and we have the tree direction and steep slope protection. A lot of that stuff is being maintained. I want to make a quick plea to in a. In the late '70s and early '80s we had our first ordinances protecting watersheds and they focused on our water supply, the Barton springs zone. And in 1986 we had the privilege watershed ordinance that came in and it frankly left things in east Austin. We did not have the exemplary buffers in 2013 which actually closed that gap. So we now have exemplary buffers that are very much -- very equally protected around the whole city, which was a big deal. We protected over -- about 400 miles of creeks in one pen stroke with that ordinance. Very big deal. And that again is maintained by this new

[2:06:29 PM]

codenext ordinance. I wanted to underscore the fact that we have -- we have exemplary floodplain mapping and modeling and pro no, sirfication and this ties into a whole network of safety and flood early warning system expertise. And with our emergency services sister departments. I know there's been a lot of news especially with hurricane Harvey about a lot of people flooding, people outside the floodplain flooding. I think in a lot of the cases some of those people frankly may have been included in the 100 year floodplain. It's very important to map these things very actively and over a period of time from the late '70s to the present we've done we think a very exemplary job mapping the floodplains and making sure that folks who need to be aware of this are aware of this. >> I think one thing to point out is an example of a postcard we sent to people in the floodplain when we were doing some floodplain changes, but not only do we send it if you're in the floodplain, but we buffer it. If you're in within say 150 feet of the floodplain you get a postcard too so those people in the floodplain or near floodplain get notices that there are flood risks in their neighborhood. >> Thank you, Kevin. This is an interesting chart to shows you how many structures were introduced into what is today the floodplain over time. You look at the 40s and 50s and 60s and 70s. As you talk about our demography, Ryan Robinson, he talks about how consistent our development is. You can actually see this. This is not all development, this is just development that today turned out to be in the floodplain. You can see their increasing and increasing through the 70s. And then when we started implementing our floodplain ordinances, especially the 1983 floodplain ordinance, that really started dropping off. You can see way down here until the 2010 range we're basically

[2:08:31 PM]

almost entirely illustrating those. As you look at it a different way this is the cumulative approach. And it shows we just level off and we're not putting yet more people in harm's way by permitting folks to be in floodplains. And then we send this red line on which basically shows here's what would have happened with this hypothetical trend if we had -- we had blown that off and kept going at our old rate and we would actually instead of having around 5,000 folks in the floodplain, almost all of which were placed there in the '60s, '70s, early 80s, we would have 12,000 and that's a big deal and our programs have also sought to further decrease that number so we're very proud of that. Those protections will remain in place. And will actually be augmented by the flood mitigation proposal we're going to talk about in a second. We still have challenges. This map is one we show frequently to neighborhood groups and so forth. This basically shows the highest ranking problems in town from a creek flood and local flood perspective. Creek flood meaning the bigger large systems that have floodplains. Pipes and so forth and so again central city, a little harder hit than areas, but other areas will be built at a lower standard so we have some issues there. So those are all things we're concerned about and we know that frankly it's probably a billion dollar price tag to fix all those things or maybe more. And so we wanted to basically use -- really fold in codenext as a partner to the work we're doing the capital side to help resolve these flooding issues in a reasonable amount of time for our citizens. So here's where we are today. We've got a lot of sites like this one shown in picture. It just shows kind of a basic commercial site with a big old

parking lot and that water is just running right off about any kind of slowing down. No attenuation, going right into the creek

[2:10:31 PM]

next to it. If there's a big flood that's a problem. And so if you redevelop this site, you would -- and a lot of these sites are actually in the urban core where we had the smallest, most overwhelmed drainage infrastructure, unfortunately. So basically what we say today is with today's code is okay, you're at 90% impervious cover, got the old k-mart there. You want to redevelop. Lower, come in at 89 or no greater and don't change your drainage patterns and okay you wouldn't have to do anything better. You would have to build a water quality control since it's been the 80s and you need to less than up your water and not have that discharge into our creeks. But interestingly we have not asked folks to mitigate for flooding in these high impervious cases or any impervious case on a redevelopment side. As long as you're not doing any worse you're off the hook. So we're asking or recommending a change in that here. So there's lots of different areas of ground that have redeveloped and they might have put a water quality control in or usually do. But they may have -- they haven't been putting flood mitigation in and we believe that's a lost opportunity and we would like to change that with this ordinance. So what would that look like? It would look like each property would need to look at their situation. They're going to be a little different depending on where each one is located and given a watershed and what kind of drainage it has downstream. I know there's been some concern and interest certainly by the development community of how to get this done. Where do we get this new flood pond or how does this work? We believe there are a lot of new opportunities to accommodate these flood situations into a site even as you're building maybe pretty intensively. We talk about detention, we talk about conveyance and we have a number of options with our regional storm water management plan

[2:12:32 PM]

depending on the case. I'm going to go through a couple of case studies that we showed to do a series -- in a series of public workshops we've done on this. That's the site in white there and it drains down there that pipe system. This is an area with a lot of flooding downstream from it. Neighbors were mobilized and interacted with the developer so like I mentioned earlier they are going to have to put a water quality pond in and control the small levels of storms, maybe the two year in addition has some positive impact on. It doesn't do as much for the bigger floods. So the neighbors were saying, look, we're having trouble downstream. How can you help us? We negotiated a deal where the guys would put in a flood detention pond as part of their zoning case. This is similar to what would happen to the codenext proposal that people retrofit flood mitigation in the case. In other cases they might have rebuilt that downstream pipe or chipped in money for the downstream pipe. So that actually ended up helping. Did it resolve the problem entirely? No, but it definitely helped and was going to reduce the nuisance flooding and flooding frequencies that you will see. Here's another for example, also in south Austin, this one is near eastside drive and oltorf. It's the soco apartments, what are now the soco apartments. All kinds of drainage problems here. This is a neighborhood built in the 60s and they were overwhelmed with drainage issues. The city actually -- watershed designed and

[2:14:32 PM]

installed the long bow project that cleared up a lot of the problems, but not all of them, and you can see from this photograph here's during construction phase and you can actually see that there is -- you can see the path of the water coming off of this site on to its neighbors. It's a church next door, causing all kinds of potential problems there. And so these guys again like MARIA's taco express case, came in and said we're willing in this zoning case in this case, we're willing to come in and put in this detention pond in both cases. The detention was put in subsurface. It had no impact on their footprint, but it has a lot of impact on the drainage coming off the site. Here's just a picture. I think this is just off the internet, but it shows the kind of system they put in and that would be covered up by in this case a parking lot. I guess you could put it under a building. So that was our flood -- that's our flood proposal. Sorry. I'm going to advance ahead. So now let's talk about green infrastructure and beneficial use of storm water. Again, we're really proud of how good a job Austin has done in terms of environmental watershed protections since the late 70s. And all through the '80s and 90s. But we really think we have more ground to pick up. We're seeing lots of pressure on our environmental systems through heat and drought and our increase in pop population and urbanization. Those are all pressures. Some are good, some are difficult. And all of them are challenging for environmentally. So we believe that if we can collect rainfall and use it as a resource instead of shunting it off site quickly, we can offset some of our potable water consumption and we could keep the sites healthier and more resilient and we could have really good watershed outcomes where we have water coming in through base flow. Sorry, I'm stealing the thunder from this slide. So we're trying to -- we're basically doing a lot of different important things environmentally and also

[2:16:34 PM]

from water conservation standpoint if we can retain water on site. Right now we're catching water and filtering it through a sand filter and that goes away in about 48 hours. Does a great job of slowing water down, keeping the channel erosion down, felting out pollutants, but it doesn't do a lot of good for the soil and vegetation for the site and it doesn't do much for vegetation. We think we can do better and so we're producing this measure that is basically kind of a green infrastructure way forward. Here's an example seat. This site actually is pictured here did not do what we're hoping they would do. It's got some greenery on there. It's got some vegetation and landscaping that was required. That's good. I'm going to layer this on. Shows where the impervious cover went in. It shows they do have some green areas on their site that they could have put rain gardens in. They could have put other disconnections or downspouts and so forth. They could have also put rainwater harvesting on this site to great advantage. We think that is a really great prospect for Austin and -- this is not a new idea. This is something we've been as a community talking about frankly for 15 or 20 years. And we believe it's time to get it implemented. All right, next steps. We know there's a lot of discussion about residential infill and missing middle housing. We're in the middle of lots of discussions with our sister departments about this. This is an important issue to get right. We don't have a proposal on this today to share with you, but we wanted to acknowledge how hard we're working and that we're going to try to find a way

forward on this one as we know we're trying to balance these really important civic priorities. Let's see. And then we're also -- so where we're going to be headed next. I know a lot of you guys have been asking about the flood modeling that you know we're working on. We are going to be finishing up that flood modeling we hope in October. We are just kicking off

[2:18:36 PM]

a small contract to get somebody to really dive in deeply on this local flooding issue and what the benefits of the new proposal would be. So that's probably going to take about a month to get done, maybe a little bit longer. So we're nervously saying end of October for that particular analysis. We're also looking at our floodplain areas and we want to make sure as we're moving forward we're going to come forward with something you guys could say yes, we're supporting this new, important thing that's going to be a new ask for the development community, but we think it will have a real positive impact and we want to make sure we're getting that right with this modeling. I skipped the first bullet, which I've talked about the impervious cover analysis, and we do want to layer in the stream buffers and the floodplain protections and so forth. And so actually the next few days we're probably going to have that we're really working hard it trying to get that out, but we just got the maps very recently. So a little bit too much of a scramble. But anyway, that should be coming very soon. And then frankly, our department, one of our biggest jobs is to build things and to fix things. And so we have operating programs that we have a capital budget which puts in -- upgrades infrastructure and solves problems, so we're going to need to continue that work. And a lot of those blue polygons will need to be fixed with a cip project, but we believe that this ordinance will really help take pressure off those areas. And -- pressure off those areas, and frankly in the long period of time that it will take to implement our new solutions. And then we would also commit to -- we're trying to be very open to all the other departments as a city and really cooperating with each other to implement all of the values and priorities of the imagine Austin comprehensive plan and council's strategic objectives. With that, I hope I didn't talk too fast. That's me if you want to contact us. I'm kind of a point guard. [Laughter]. >> Mayor Adler: Let's open it up here for

[2:20:37 PM]

questions from people. This is really good work and I think you laid it out in a way that is comprehensive. I appreciate that. One question that I hear when I go out and talk to people, and I appreciate you taking a look at impervious cover, not only what the allowance is, but what is actually being built, and one of the questions that I hear is whether or not the code proposals incent individual tracts to go to the maximum impervious cover in ways that the existing code does not. So that's one thing that we need to look at. I don't know if you're able to speak to that yet or if that's something that you would be speaking to, but that's a concern that the allowance is 46%. We're at 26%. By doing the code are we going to encourage properties to redevelop in ways that they wouldn't have redeveloped and picking up impervious cover otherwise? >> Right. So there's a. >> Tovo: Mayor, if I may. I've certainly heard that concern and have voiced it as well. It's not really my turn to speak, but I would have questions about it later. >> So under draft 2, we have done some changes and worked with a consultant to, especially on

the residential lots to not encourage the tear down of the structures and to do additions or to add a smaller like an Adu in the back rather than doing a whole new structure. So there are some provisions that are in this draft that didn't exist before. I think the provisions, I know that councilmember pool pointed out at the last meeting the redevelopment ordinance is still part of draft

[2:22:38 PM]

2, that was part of draft 1. And that might actually cause some hesitancy, I think, of some to think twice before how much they would redevelop because they know what they have is grandfathered. So you might not see maybe as a significant change on some parcels that are already developed to the max. They might try to actually maintain the buildings they have because they are grandfathered. So you might have some interested of that. >> I think we talked about earlier that at least 70% of the impervious cover change that we expect is coming through this -- through the things that our proposals are directly aimed at. So we're getting for the first time forward progress in helping with flood solutions as people redevelop and we're of course layering in the beneficial reuse of water and we're doing a good job now and we think we will be doing an exemplary job with this. In a way the redevelopment is actually going to be helping move the ball forward in those cases. >> Mayor Adler: Okay.

Councilmember kitchen? >> Kitchen: Thank you very much. So I have a few questions. I'll just ask one and leave it for others and I believe we can circle back around. So I'm curious about, I know we had a task force that made some recommendations, so I'm just wondering how what we're moving forward with relates to those recommendations. And I can pinpoint some of the things that we're doing that were discussed and recommended in the task force. I'm just wondering if there was anything that the task force recommended that perhaps we're not moving forward with that would relate to this in terms of codenext. >> A couple of the most key things are they were very supportive of this

[2:24:40 PM]

idea at the time, it was a draft idea about the redevelopment flood mitigation constitution. We're talking about the flood mitigation task force, 2015 through 2016. There were a number of recommendations. One of the main ones was let's get this done. They actually wanted that to move faster. They wanted us to move ahead of codenext. We're kind of in the middle of it. So we're moving forward in one piece. They also were wanting to make sure we were not introducing new construction and development in the 100 year floodplains. And honestly, we think we've been doing a good job of that for a long time. There were a number of other kind of -- other recommendations that they had. They were concerned about -- they had ideas about moratoriums and so forth. Unfortunately it ran kind of crosswise with state law and so forth. We actually literally are tracking all the different things they came forward with and to make sure that happens. We could do a deeper dive later if you wanted to talk about them more. >> It might be helpful if you can. I don't want to create a lot of extra work, but if you happen to have a document that you could send me that would show me -- that would track the recommendations against what we're moving on so far, that would be helpful. Then related to that, on the rsnp, I'm curious whether -- I don't know the answer to this. Whether there were recommendations about how we handled the rsmp that would relate to the code. I'm not entirely clear if the rsmp process

is actually written into the code or not. And if there were recommendations about any changes or analysis of that process that we need to discuss. >> So the rsmg program is not in the code, but is in the drainage criteria manual. >> And codenext is

[2:26:40 PM]

asking that that be added to the code. >> And so one of the recommendations from the the flood mitigation task force was to do that. We're doing that right now just to kind of step back and say what are we doing now with rsmg, can we do more and should we change it at all? That's what we're asking ourselves. >> Kitchen: Okay. So will that -- just for everybody else, you may know this. Rsmg, I don't know what it stands for, but this is the program where we kind of collect money instead of on-site. Is that the best way to describe it? >> Kind of like a fee-in-lieu. >> A fee-in-lieu kind of thing. >> It's regional storm water management program. >> Kitchen: Okay. So y'all are evaluating that. What is your timeline for that? In other words, if there are recommendations that come out of your evaluation will that timeline dovetail with codenext adoption in the spring or are y'all thinking that's a later activity? Do you have an idea at this point? >> I don't know what the timeline is off the top of my head. I'm sure that within the next six months for sure we'll have something. So I don't know exactly what the timeline is, but it's not a year long process. >> Kitchen: All right. Thank you. If you have a chance to check and if you have within a couple of months' window to let me know when you think it might come back to us, that would be great. >> I think there are some key statistics on the rsmg program that we would love the public to be aware of. I can't remember them off the top of my head. Jose Guerrero may have that. But there are many, many projects that come in and many ask for this. A small fraction are actually allowed to pay that payment as opposed to building on site. Most people build on site. I believe there's a bit of perception of a get out of jail free card, come in, pay some money, do your project. That's actually not at all how it works.

[2:28:40 PM]

You have to prove up that there's no adverse impact and only then can you actually pay into -- pay into that fee if you prove it up and so forth. So anyway, it's a longer conversation, but it's an important one and we appreciate you guys bringing it up. >> Kitchen: One last question related to that. So the proposed changes about the redevelopment change, would that impact the rsmg at all? >> Yes. >> Kitchen: To make that change, the redevelopment change, do you also need to go over and change anything about the rsmg? >> A lot more properties would be interested in rsmg or be affected by it because like you mentioned, a lot of properties now have a whole bunch of impervious cover, they just hold the line, don't do anything new. They don't do anything. Those folks would actually be looking to either do something on site or contribute to something downstream for a solution, directly or indirectly through a payment. So a lot more people would be brought in, but there would be a lot more solutions built as a result. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Garza and then councilmember pool. >> Garza: I'm sorry if I missed this, but on one of the last slides there's two different sides that speak to the -- one says opportunity to lessen review burden for missing middle housing and the next one says missing middle, drainage and environmental considerations. Did you say that that -- are you working

within the codenext process or with development services to do that of the? So would there be a proposal brought forward that gives options how we less 16 that burden for missing middle? >> We have a series of really important meetings between our staffs. The center are Dr. Have from are are are are eon -- the dsd and planning and zoning. That's in play right now. We're trying to come into something that's a reasonable time frame, not super complicated and we end up with a positive outcome in terms of environmental and drainage needs.

[2:30:42 PM]

So again, we'll have something ready to put in front of you and recommend yet because we're still having those important discussions. >> Garza: Do you envision as part of a next draft of codenext that being in there? >> That is our absolutely our intention. We want this as part of draft #. This has been a giant communication conversation and we want to have it not be delayed any further. >> Garza: Because I've heard when there are questions about reducing regulation, which results in fees sometimes that no, we're not changing any regulations. Everything is staying the same with codenext. But would this be more of like a waiver option or what -- I'm wondering what the change could be that you would be bringing forward? >> We're looking at things like simplifying the application process itself to it's not as onerous with the smaller projects such that the cost of the project itself or the complexity would be reduced. Again week balancing this. You won't want it to basic that something negative happens. How do we balance that? Because right now in some cases you have to come in with two different kinds of permitting and so frankly, we're looking at a brand new process on this, trying to bring these in more as a building permit than a site plan. And so that's just something that's pretty new to us and we're trying to make sure that we get it right before we come out, let you guys know what you think is best. >> Garza: I look forward to that. Last thing, I appreciate your comments on -- you said that during this conversation codenext has been -- I guess our codenext consultants have been a part of the conversation on impervious cover, that is something that they recognized and I guess any draft right now is a result of that recognition of concerns with increasing

[2:32:43 PM]

entitlements. And that connection doesn't -- I feel like doesn't get talked about enough because I would say that any proposals right now that would increase entitlements vertically are a direct relation to that means less impervious cover. So I think it's an important point to be made that as we increase entitlements to go up it's a way to mitigate adding more impervious cover because as your numbers showed, what we're entitled to know and what's coming up is almost exactly the same. So really the only option would be to lessen -- to decrease the amount of impervious cover, which could be an issue, but anyway, I appreciate you making that connection because it is an environmental -- a lot of people are concerned about more entitlements vertically, but in many ways it's an environmental concern, it decreases impervious cover. >> We agree that can be a really great tool. I think as you're going to see these projects become more vertical, the focus is going to be more on roofs and less on service parking. And I know you guys are looking at how to reduce basically excess parking. It's a lot easier to harvest water off a roof than get water off a parking lot and figure out what to do with it on ground level. So

there's some opportunities. In some ways, impervious cover is always going to be a little bit challenging from an environmental standpoint, but we're going to do more with the water and have better environmental outcomes and a lot of the designs than you would if you had the more conventional suburban design model. So it's going to go hand in hand. >> Garza: Just lastly, with the concern about localized flooding, like you said, it's not the most accurate thing because it just depends on who we know has told us they've had flooding. From my colleagues, localized flooding is a big issue in my district because people get

[2:34:44 PM]

flooded because they're not in the floodplain. That's the localized flooding. And even with all the entitlements we have now, one could make the assumption that even if we built out exactly what's allowed now that would increase localized flooding. So that's another reason why doing what we can to build vertically is a good thing as opposed to building more impervious cover. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool? >> Pool: So staying on rsmp, if the standard for rsmp is no adverse impact, then how do we ensure on-site mitigation rather than all fee-in-lieu? Because if we're all getting is fee-in-lieu then we're not doing anything to mitigate what could end up being an accumulation of runoff. Localized runoff. So we're not in fact helping even though we're talking about helping. >> I think part of the analysis of the evaluation process is looking at the fee, making sure we're charging the right amount. Once you bring that into market rate and compare it to the detention on your site, then it becomes more the question of well, I'm not going to pay the fee now because it's a lot more. >> Pool: Or if I'm going to pay more I'd rather have that benefit on my site helping me. >> Right. >> Pool: I'm going to ask a couple of questions as -- >> Ma'am, there's one follow-up so that. It's not always the solution to put it on-site. You may be better off in upgrading the conveyance or paying for a solution that's further up in the watershed. It's a really complicated topic that I don't totally understand and rely on my engineering friends here, but it's a big deal to try to get this right and to anything out what solutions go where. So most of the people we have something to do on-site and most of the time it is a good idea, but it's not an automatic thing. So we just want to kind of

[2:36:45 PM]

think beating that drum as we talk about this. >> Pool: So it's a case by case? >> That's what the program offers. I'm sorry, I cut you off. >> Pool: That's completely off. We need to understand it as well as possible. I think the point is that if everybody choose to do the fee-in-lieu because it ended up being cheaper to do that, then we wouldn't actually be necessarily even if we were to do all that money to fix the conveyance or some upstream detention where we may not have anyplace to put it, right? And it's cheaper to do on-site mitigation. And I'm thinking right now residential, for purposes of this discussion, I recognize that commercial would be a different thing. But I'm really interested in on-site detention in the neighborhood so that we can keep the rainwater on people's yards because it's healthier for the landscape, it's healthier for the trees and you actually get a lot more bang for your buck from your landscaping if the water comes out of the sky rather than out of the faucet because of all the chemicals added to the faucet. And we have had some conversations over the last couple of years about how to go

about doing Swales and berms and rain gardens and dry creeks and that sort of thing. I wanted to ask specifically on the subsurface detention that you were showing. Was that bright orange-y yellow pipe that's underneath the parking lot. >> Right. >> Pool: So I'm going to use my yard as an example because that's what I know best. We've done a lot of rainwater harvesting on our site. We a massive rain barrel so we harvest off the roof and then we did a series of French drains and other things in the backyard because I have a flooding problem from the home behind me. It never has gone into my house, always going goes around, but one of these days you never know. We used on the subsurface detention, the porous kind or the

[2:38:46 PM]

penetrated pipe, the pvc pipe with the holes so the water would flow through and below. Is that what the pipes are going to do? Are they trying to get it off site? Because if they were away to keep that water on site because it's subsurface, it would help the health of that whole area. >> In that particular case what we're showing the Orange pipe, that was a flood solution and that water actually was not perforated, it wouldn't be infiltrating in, it would be slowed down and slowly moving through that and not contributing to peak flows downstream and therefore helping with flood waters. There are similar systems that actually are perforated that are exactly what you were talking about, councilmember, and we think that people will be using these with the green infrastructure/beneficia L use proposal that we've got. How do we take our water and slowly infiltrate it into the soil for later use. All of those things are what we're looking for, terracing, berms, infiltration, disconnection of roofs to get to vegetated areas so water can soak in. Use the water Barrett beneficially instead of having it exit stage left quickly. So we really think that's going to be -- there's a whole other side discussion take being our -- talking about our drainage utility fee. We have incentives for people to do that on a residential level. Right now the proposal is for new residential subdivisions, but not for individual building permits. It wouldn't affect individual people putting one house on a lot, an existing lot. All the site plans, the commercial and office and schools and everything else would be putting this stuff in. >> Pool: And that also helps us in those areas where they have undersized drainage currently because it reduces the volume that's flowing into the drainage. >> So on the smaller storms like the two and five-year level that's a pretty big deal. We've shown that with studies that can actually be pretty effective. You need a lot of people participating to make a dent in flooding, but it

[2:40:47 PM]

helps environmentally and it could help at low level flooding that plagues other areas in town. >> Pool: And just one request because I know we're running out of time. A couple of years ago you gave to each of the offices a map with the flood reports, the red dots that looked like the map had measles. And I got one for district 7 and it was really helpful for especially when we had FEMA with the updated FEMA maps and I had a significant issue with folks on the Hancock branch of shoal creek were worried about the flooding that they were newly experiencing. The localized flooding. Could you get updates of those maps to all the different council offices? >> We certainly could. We actually have a website now that -- I'm surprised I didn't plug. >> Atx floods? >> That's another one. If you just Google watershed master

plan Austin, our page will come up and you can click on this box that says master plan problem score viewer and it's just a little picture of it. It brings up a deal and you can zoom in by council district, you can zoom in by local flood versus erosion versus water quality and really see all those dots would show up on the local flood map and you could see where those are, zoom in and out. But we would be happy to make you an updated version of the map. >> Pool: That helps that we can take them to community meetings. >> Sure. But any individuals can do that from their homes and see what's going on in their lot. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mr. Flannigan. >> Flannigan: This is really interesting and really interesting opportunities here. First some more specific questions. When you talked about your analysis as it relates to properties zoned Irr, there's a lot of that in my district all annexed in the last 30 years.

[2:42:47 PM]

As we move forward through codenext and we -- we almost certainly will be asking for more analysis as the map changes, will areas that even in draft 2 in my district currently mapped Irr, but already have suburban style apartment complexes, a lot of impervious cover. Will we expect that to go up because the map is evolving or is any of that being considered now? I want to avoid in two months we get an analysis that says impervious cover went up in draft three, but really we've just been fixing more map errors? >> Greg Guernsey, planning and zoning. I think those areas where we see existing apartment complex may be brought into compliance with codenext, the draft 2 map. So if it was an interim situation we're taking a look at those sites and trying to make sure they're more in alignment. Most likely that is a single-family subdivision that may have started out as one large lot that came in that was old farm and it was platted after we got back in the city, that would be more appropriate. It might be sf-2 or it might be an R 2 designation or R 1 designation under the new code. >> Flannigan: I want to make sure as it relates to watershed that we don't see this analysis later that draft three all a all this new impervious cover but even in the draft two map I have suburban apartment complexes still not Irr. So I just want to make sure that even if it's a footnote for future analysis, know that even the map today is still not accurate for some existing on the ground impervious cover. On another site you talked about missing middle. How is watershed defining missing middle as far as this analysis is concerned? >> I think across all three departments or across all the departments, somewhere between three and nine units. >> Flannigan: Okay. I'm really interested in

[2:44:49 PM]

this opportunity that redevelopment can address some flood mitigation issues. In the analysis you did on the amount of impervious cover, is that just properties zoned? Asked another way, how much are the impervious cover for the roads and the public infrastructure? >> We actually just used what we call planometrics. We've drawn in -- someone has gone in and figured out what is the road impervious cover today. So that would be the concrete portion of it. I'm just looking over here. Do we use any more broad assumptions for -- so we're actually using actual impervious cover for the road. So I suppose if the road added a lane or did something like that, made a change, those are more and more rare these days, but that -- >> So when we talk about those public storm water infrastructure being undersized or having problems, I have a problem with asking a private landowner to fix flooding that is being caused by a

public road. How are we making sure that the public infrastructure is accounting for the public -- the parts that it would cost. We build roads and do our own public infrastructure. >> Yeah. That's a great question. So when you saw all those blue polygons all across town and they're unfortunately in every district. Equal opportunity deal. Those are areas we're looking to hopefully repair using capital projects. So those are public roadways, those are private lands, all draining to a spot. So we definitely -- we see that as a big part of our job is to help fix those across town over time. >> Flannigan: And I want us to find a way to get here, but I also kind of -- it also makes me upset that if you've lot of impervious cover now and a new property owner comes in and they want to do the right thing and they're reducing the impervious cover,

[2:46:49 PM]

they're actually going to have to pay the price for people in the past making bad decisions, be it past bad zoning decisions or past bad development decisions or in the case of my district bad decisions preannexation. And I've got a lot of development that happened with very few rules in place to address these matters. Has there been -- Mr. Guernsey, this may be a question for you too. Has there been any consideration if we're going to get public benefit from private development, meaning that they're going to fix a drainage problem being caused by property that maybe their parking requirements should be lessened. Maybe we shouldn't be on top of that requiring impervious cover for parking, which is much more difficult to mitigate the flood impacts of as you've noted. Has that conversation been happening with the consultant? >> I don't believe we've had a -- like an impervious cover offset bonus. That hasn't really been part of the discussion. We have reduced parking so there is-- probably if there's a redevelopment they will be redeveloping less impervious cover under a new redevelopment scheme because there's not as much parking required. There is incentive to go up or if you're doing affordable housing or to allow more units within an existing building envelope, but no, we have not done an offset for bonus if you're reducing your impervious cover. >> My concern is part of kind of previous analysis that we've gotten about we can set all the rules, but ultimately what will the market deliver? And if we just require a bunch of on site detention and we haven't considered -- actually it makes projects unfeasible because the zoning will have a certain limit here and the land use will have a certain parking requirement here and we'll limit impervious cover on this side. Now they have to do on-site detention, you actually end up not being able to do anything either because the height limitation makes the project financially unfeasible so they don't build the

[2:48:51 PM]

project, or there's one or two heritage trees on the site and as they try to move their project around to accommodate the heritage trees there's no room for the detention pond. But we want the redevelopment because it's helping to solve these flooding problems. So it's become somewhat of a focus for me on this because I want to solve the flooding issues. I want to do it without spending a billion dollars of public money, but if I make the rules such that the market won't deliver a product, I won't get any of that flood mitigation and I'm back to spending a billion dollars of public money. So that's the trade-off thing I think might be a valuable conversation because just to take an existing land

use code, which many people acknowledge doesn't give the flexibility required, adding a new requirement for on-site detention in a way that will increase the cost of a project, that means that the developer needs to fund another way to get the bank loan to justify the bank loan. And if I'm limited to one story or one and a half stories. And it also flows into if the code is incentivizing keeping an existing structure, does it -- does this new rule also prohibit building the Adu because it adds more impervious cover? These are the impacts that I'm bothered about because if we set up a bunch of rules that sound good, but we don't know if the market will deliver them, we'll actually get nothing. And in this case because the flood mitigation it puts us in a worst position. We need to get to a better position. We're fixing a broken land use code. The fix needs to be fixing things. It's not just about building things, it's also about fixing things. And the flood mitigation I think is a huge activity. My district has I think some of the least amount of flooding. I basically have just one little spot, one little neighborhood, shout out to my friends in Angus valley, but they're concerned about redevelopment happening upstream in their own neighborhood. They're worried about subdivision, worried about new impervious

[2:50:51 PM]

cover. But they're flooding today. So if the market -- if we set a bunch of new rules and the market won't deliver upstream because the rules make it financially impossible, they're still going to flood. Now, they don't want new development, people get nervous about new development. If that can solve a flooding problem, I want to make sure that it does and that both of those happen. That was a soliloquy and not a question, but -- [laughter]. But that's what I'm anying about. >> Getting right at the heart of the policy question. >> Flannigan: That's what I try to do. >> It's a razor's edge. >> Flannigan: That's all I have. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter. >> Alter: Thank you. I really appreciate this direction and like what I'm seeing with respect to the redevelopment and the green infrastructure. One of the things that I'm hearing a lot about I think does tell slightly with what councilmember Flannigan is talking about is a concern about how what's happening upstream is flooding downstream. And with either of these or with other elements can you explain your analysis when you're trying to figure out what they're required to do is taking into consideration the impacts elsewhere in the watershed? Because, you know, just as councilmember pool talked about the house next door flooding her house, I mean, people have that at various -- to varying degrees depending on the kinds of developments near them. And they're very curious to understand how the code in codenext or whether it's other analysis that you do as part of watershed, how that's being factored. And I think after Harvey there's even more concern about, you know, are we just going to build and create a similar thing here in Austin? And it sounds from what you're pointing that you're -- that you're presenting that you're taking all that into consideration and I want to give you an opportunity to explain how that's happening.

[2:52:52 PM]

Whether it's in codenext or in your analysis elsewhere, I'm not exactly sure where the appropriate fix is for that. >> I think part of it on a basic plan if you come in and you have a project that you want to build you can just look at your own site and kind of go through and do -- and comply with the current code. And then usually that's going to result in building an on-site detention pond or so forth. There are cases

where like we mentioned earlier that's not necessarily the best idea. So what you were talking about is exactly right. There are different complex things going on within a given watershed and we think that is the benefit of being able to use something like the regional storm water management program where you can look at the big picture and trying to figure out is this fix on this site the right one or can we better use resources in another spot? So we've actually had some developers build a downstream conveyance system to upgrade it. Literally they go in and build it. As soon as they give us money and we would do something similar. Depending on the case, this is not the usual outcome, but in certain cases that's what we deal with. We're trying to do what you just mentioned and we're trying to figure out what would be the best -- what would be the best approach for this particular watershed. >> Alter: But what I think people are trying to understand is in a given case how would those factors be considered? Where do they enter into the analysis? >> I think it's the point at which the applicant says I'm not sure current code is going to work well enough for me on my site. Am I eligible to do some of these other options. And we would have to get into an evaluation of is something else superior or not? And again, they have to prove up, they're not harming people downstream before they can even go to that next step, but that would be the point in the process. >> Alter: But you could still have current code that's harming people downstream? I'm trying to follow what you just said. >> I guess it would not be highest and best use.

[2:54:53 PM]

There's some kind of peak flow timing issue. >> I mean, I think it basically comes down to we look at the site and is that site creating more water? Is there development going to create more water? If it is, they have to do something about it. If they have to show that that increased water is not going to cause more problems downstream or they show that there's a detention pond on-site that's going to handle that increase in water? >> Alter: I will follow-up if I have more questions on that. I don't want to take more time on that. You mentioned during your presentation that there were nine properties that were contributing a lot to something, and I didn't fully catch either what was the feature of those nine properties and what they were impacting. I was wondering if you could clarify that. >> I have a slide of that at the end, a just in case slide. Yeah. So it just shows -- I was forgetting how many there were. Seven. There are seven properties. Five of them were public parks and then a couple were like a wastewater treatment plant and then the race track, the formula one site. So in a second when we get a map and it will show you where these were, but again this is -- here we go. So it just shows onion creek, metro park, Jimmy clay, circuit of the Americas, south Austin regional wastewater treatment plant, John Trevino park. In ever single case these are interim rural residential zoning cases being taken to something that's more permanent and more logical as opposed to this kind of holding category. Is that a good way of putting it, Mr. Guernsey? >> Alter: So that's where the increases -- that's where the increases of impervious cover are coming from, but are there corresponding properties where you're losing impervious cover because you're getting basically the average out to even,

[2:56:54 PM]

but now you're telling me we have these big properties that are increasing a lot. So where are we taking on it away? >> I mean, it's a little bit of a -- of a mathematical strangeness thing going on there. They look like there's this big delta and -- these aren't even particularly impervious sites. In a percentage basis it looks like they're going wild, whereas on an absolute basis it's not as big a change. You're right, to the extent that it's not zooming up even further there are commensurate areas in area places. There are some areas in town where the properties go from 95 down to 90 or what have you. And that offsets those ones that were going up to create that balance. >> Alter: So the parks are going -- they're going -- >> The parks are actually -- these particular parks are going from -- what are our -- is it 20%? >> Just speaking off the top of my head, I think it's 25% if I remember right. >> And what's our assumption on the park? >> [Inaudible]. >> Okay. So we're assuming 50% impervious on those sites. That's not going to a that's going to be -- thank you. Wow. Plethora of information. Okay. So these are areas that are in floodplains that have parks that don't go to 50%, but since it's P zoning we're just making these kind of broad assumptions about where this stuff is headed. So it's a very conservative assumption to say those are going to go up and look that red on that map, but we're just kind of running out the numbers using our methodology. >> Alter: So is it actually inflating the numbers of impervious cover? >> That's correct. It should be lower. And so anyway, we're going to have a -- >> Alter: I was trying to understand what the impact was that you were citing. So this is making it look like we have more

[2:58:56 PM]

impervious cover maybe than we do. >> Alter: Under the new code because we're matching it to a different zone, but the use is not actually changing. >> That's right. And those are already parks and they're already -- they just don't have happen too have their final sewed sowing yet. We'll try to make this a little clearer. This is distracting. You look at the map and it looks like things are on fire. But it's actually a little lower -- it's a lot lower kethan that with what's going on and the impervious cover is actually lower. >> Alter: And if we wanted to be able >> Alter: If we wanted to look more carefully at some of these maps and what's in here, where do we access that to zoom in to our district, for instance? >> [Inaudible]. >> Yeah, we could make a resolution map so you could look at it. >> Alter: I think where you had the changes in impervious cover were and it's hard to read it on this small -- I think that would be really helpful. >> We could do that. >> We'll work to get those on the code the next website. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar. >> Casar: I want to ditto Mr. Flannigan's soliloquy and councilmember alter's questions and two questions that spin off. The first is do you have slide 7 or I guess we could flip to it. Under public zoning is that what also includes city streets and roadways and the like? >> That's exactly right, yes, yes, and it's a pretty big percentage of the land. >> Casar: Is there -- is there any analysis around whether on our current land development code trajectory versus the proposed one, if

[3:00:56 PM]

our proposed land development code would reduce the amounts of new streets and subdivisions and amount of public paving going out to the evenlies or -- edges or not? >> Councilmember, right now the transportation department and public works and also [inaudible] Are looking at roadway crossings -- Kimberly horn is our consultant and we would be bringing back basically -- probably not as large. In the

future as they would exist now. That information will probably be coming out in 2018, I think. We can follow up with atd staff, but the sizes of future streets would probably actually be less than you would see today and that you might find in a residential subdivision. >> Casar: So I think what's just important there for public to note is that not only -- we really appreciate the hard work and modeling done here, that it's not just those parks in public zoning would have a reduction in impervious cover, but if we had a more compact growth pattern wouldn't -- wouldn't need as wide of streets for as many people coming from the edges into town. So that would be helpful in the future, but we understood can't take every factor into account but I think that's an important factor because that's just -- that's public impervious cover being laid down. And while I also really appreciate the localized flooding mapping that you all did, was there any analysis on sort of a regional level? If we are capturing more housing inside the city that otherwise might be sprawl

[3:02:56 PM]

housing being built in the region, do we have any sense of what the impact is on regional flooding because we are reducing that regional -- regional levels of impervious cover? I just know that imagine Austin kind of hit on that about us recognizing that less compact city results in more regional levels of flooding. Did we take a look at any of that during this analysis? >> I don't think we looked at it specifically. I mean we're hopeful and pretty confident actually the regulations we have in place were somebody to do that sort of sprawl development, they would have to do -- follow flood mitigation, they would be coming in as a greens field project. There's other environmental -- so I think from a flooding perspective I don't think we're creating a lot of new problems with that. I think there's environmental problems. >> Casar: What about regional growth outside of our area where we can regulate? >> So maybe spurring other development outside jurisdiction? >> Casar: Since under codenext my understanding from the consultants we're increasing capacity to have housing inside the city as opposed to sending market demand outside of it. If it's inside the city, obviously the regulations you've talked about regarding flooding apply. >> Right. >> Casar: And if it's where councilmember Flannigan's was obviously it doesn't. So I just don't -- it seems like that's one of the major [inaudible] For us to have housing inside the city is because we have it within our zoning authority. >> I think that's kind of drawing in that -- that development and that density within the city and maybe not having that regional sprawl, but that's certainly something we did not model. But theoretically I would agree with you. >> Casar: So this is

[3:04:58 PM]

ultimately helpful for us to see how much impervious cover capacity we have within the city, but it doesn't measure some of the most key benefits on the impervious cover side which is how much are we protecting the whole regional watershed which is, you know, a pretty significant factor in our flooding. That's also -- that's also helpful to know. I appreciate y'all's work on this and look forward to on the city side, you know, impervious cover, which is where people live, is a hard thing to wrestle with and appreciate working on the missing middle, but impervious cover where nobody lives because it's just a widened roadway or a larger than necessary parking lot I think is really where we'll have hopefully some

consensus and real opportunity to keep on working on the impervious cover issue because if it just means there is -- you know, cars have to park a little more tightly or there's the shoulders are a little less wide, I think those are places where we could have some easy ones so I appreciate it. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem and then councilmember kitchen. >> Tovo: I have -- thanks. I have a couple questions that I'll try to ask quickly. Let's see. So I think just to get back to the question the mayor raised, I think why a lot of that concern and questioning is coming up is that you do have areas that have pretty high impervious cover rates already and they are not fully built out to their allowable and impervious cover limits and they are proposed in codenext for increases in entitlements. I think you see that certainly in the central city where under the current maps that would be one of the few areas in the city that can go from

[3:06:59 PM]

two units to three units and they already have, you know, with the exception of councilmember Casar's district some of the highest -- well beyond most of the other districts in impervious cover. And so I wanted to ask you, one I wanted to just suggest to my colleagues, the watershed department has put together a really interesting set of maps. The impervious cover amounts by district are available on the city website. I think they may be a little outdated given the new maps, but they also have gone through and done it neighborhood by neighborhood planning area, district by district and I've got those and I'm happy to share them or show them up on the deal that I'm sure our watershed folks so for example in my area I can go through and see what different neighborhoods have in terms of impervious cover there on the ground. So, you know, just for example, Hyde park is at 55%, north university 59%, west university is 72%. Anyway, it's a useful snapshot of your district areas. >> Mayor pro tem, we can make sure that those mapping products that are provided by watershed are linked back to codenext as well. >> Tovo: That would be great. I think they are very useful for this process. But I wanted to ask you, as you were reflecting on this and the way in which -- to the extent that having the ability to suddenly do three units where once you could have two could spur on redevelopment. The consultants suggest -- they've matched the percent of redevelopment in terms of different zoning categories. I wondered if you had done any kind of more granular looking at neighborhood by neighborhood or looking at the actual impervious cover limits and matching that with the -- with high probability of

[3:09:07 PM]

redevelopment. [Lapse in audio] And most -- most of what we see -- they are building to the maximum impervious cover and will will more impervious cover on the ground if the site are redeveloped. >> We just received that information from the group that shows next year's development and so we really want to start understanding what that looks like -- those are great questions. I'm not an economist. I don't -- there's really good stuff to do with the data we've got. >> Tovo: That's great. And again, the extent you do more granular analyses, that would be really helpful. And also I notice some of the percentages went down. I was curious, like on the website when I pulled it, [inaudible] Was at 20%, it's now at 18%. I assume that may be because of annexations. The other one that went down is from 23% to 22%. >> And some of that may be the result of just updated impervious cover information. >> Tovo: I

see. >> It's more resize. >> Tovo: Thank you. But I think that is instructive to really look across. Quite a few are in the 20% range. Councilmember Casar's is at 57%, you really get a snapshot of where -- you know, how the districts differ. Let's see. When you talk about redevelopment and that they would be required part of the new code to bring the standard up and mitigate flooding around, are you talking

[3:11:08 PM]

primarily about -- or are you also talking about single-family residents? >> I missed the first part. >> Tovo: You talked about the change in this code where you -- it's not just about badly impact, the standard is no longer whether or not you are going to badly impact your neighbors, but it is improving the situation on the ground. Will that extend to single-family residential, individual property owners? >> We have not proposed that at this time. This is -- you are exactly right. We're talking about site plans and new subdivisions, not individual building permits, which would be a single-family residence. >> Tovo: Thank you. And then I think my question is for Mr. Guernsey. You talked about the provisions in this draft that weren't in draft 1 with regard to encouraging the preservation of existing structures. And I'd be real interested in knowing kind of where those are in the code so that I can review them. I remember something along one of the -- but not in r3. Though I had proposed it in my formal comments I had proposed about there -- >> We can get that information. I think that was in regard -- John Mickey pointed that a little out when he made his presentation recently about giving an opportunity to add a two-story on the back of a one-story house. You may not normally be able to do that if you are constructing all new to try to encourage additions as opposed to doing a tear-down and starting all over again. >> Tovo: Yeah, if you could point us to where those options are in the code. I think I saw one, but as I recall they weren't available in all categories and there weren't provisions for that in the areas that currently have allowance to do two structures and are going up to three. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Kitchen and councilmember Houston.

[3:13:08 PM]

It's 3:13 and we have another presentation. >> Kitchen: I'll be real quick and in fact you can provide information afterwards. I just wanted some more information on the scope of the modeling that you all are proceeding with for the flood impacts. My questions would come in if it doesn't, you can let me know, but basically I know in the past there's been some -- at least I've seen for one of my neighborhoods there's been some mapping in the past of the drainage infrastructure. As we talked about before, you know, I think you mentioned some of the oldest and under sized drainage structure is in our central area. I'm wondering if our analysis includes mapping that infrastructure and the cost of updating it. So in other words, when you are looking at the flood impacts, I guess would be looking at where adding -- adding additional density could impact the existing size of the pipes, so to speak. >> Uh-huh. >> Kitchen: And what the cost might be for improving those. So I'm asking actually if that's part of your analysis and if it does is there mapping involved, and then could we understand the cost of any impact. >> We'll get some answers for you on that. >> Kitchen: Okay. Great. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston. >> Houston: Thank you. I thought it was going to be boring, but this is really fascinating. Thank you. [Laughter] >> We're honored. >> Houston: I'm sitting on the edge of my seat going what's

next. A couple of things, and Mr. Guernsey while you are up there, on slide 8, how are projects approved for -- approved that exceed the impervious cover that -- cover that we already have on the books? That's happening in my

[3:15:08 PM]

district and I want to know what the process is because it's becoming a practice. >> A property owner who already has a site that exceeds impervious cover is entitled to maintain that, and if they are in a situation where they are actually just remodeling the structure, they are not necessarily expanding that use on level grade. There is not a limitation for them to do that. They can utilize existing parking lots, even if a use changes, and if a use changes, the parking at the time that the original building was constructed, if it was grandfathered from number of parking spaces, they could actually change to use that might require more spaces and they would still be able to comply with the minimum parking requirements. >> Houston: Mr. Guernsey, I don't think I'm talking about those situations. Where the entitlements are already there. I'm talking about new buildings on green field. >> So if they are new buildings on green field, they should be complying with our code. The only way you might have a situation where they would exceed the impervious cover limits if they have some vesting right, they have grandfathered by state law to build more because they maybe were annexed in. They were under other watershed regulations under -- regulations that might allow them more impervious cover. But the vast majority of property that's probably built in your district and other districts, if it's a new building in a green field, they have to comply with our impervious cover regulations. They may amass more land, they may buy more land so it has the appearance of having more impervious cover because it's maybe built on a portion of a property and the area behind it might be green, but if you build on green field, you would have to comply with impervious cover regulations

[3:17:09 PM]

and whatever the restrictions might be. >> Houston: Thank you. On the slide we talk about maintaining existing watershed protections, I've got quick three questions. I don't know whose question this is. What are the cutting field limits in the urban watershed versus the suburban watershed? >> I do not believe there are any cut and fill in the watersheds. That applies to nonurban watersheds. So suburban and out in the west only, not in urban. >> Houston: So -- so is there consistency across the city on how we look at the various watersheds regarding relating to cut in fill? >> There is an exception in the urban watershed so they are not consistent with the other watersheds. Back in the '90s there were discussions about what to put in, urban watersheds versus not, and cut and fill and steep slope were included in the urban areas. >> Houston: So those of us that are not in the protected area that also have slopes and hills and there is no protection for us, did you all consider that, that, you know, west Austin is not the only part of town that has slopes and hills, and I'm just concerned that people are still building on those sides of hill tops and flooding the people down below them. So there is no consideration of having some consistency throughout the city on cut and fills on slopes? >> That is certainly something the council could bring up. It's not in the ordinance past it was, you know, there were I think the city was trying to figure out how do we incentivize folks and that was one of the things left out in the central city. It is important to note

there are steep slopes and cut and fill are not as prevalent in these flatter, central areas, but there are big exceptions and there are some areas that actually have quite high

[3:19:10 PM]

topography. >> Houston: And they are close to the central city whether it is fairly flat, I understand that, but there are areas very close that are being impacted because we don't look for the unintended consequences and we don't protect those sites. And some of the folks that live there have been living there for generations and all of a sudden we approve a site plan and there's comes four new huge duplexes and the water runs downstream. And so the person at the end of the property is now required to do something to mitigate the problem that was not caused by them, but by the ability to -- to -- we don't have any protections for steep slopes or cut in fill. There's another one -- do neighborhood -- can neighborhood plans put anything in their area plans or neighborhood plans about how that neighborhood would cut and fill the in fill? >> Perhaps not about cut and fill, but we have neighborhood plans that might speak to capital improvement projects that might assist with flooding problems or drainage problems in the neighborhood. [Lapse in audio] Capital funds that are available -- to go spend that money --

[3:21:12 PM]

>> Houston: And I guess my question is about the small infrastructure in some parts of Austin. Dramatically increasing that live in those areas, so what are we with doing to ensure that the infrastructure is enlarged to keep up with the density that we're projecting? >> That's a big part of our capital program is to look at those areas, see what we think is under sized and those according to how many residences and folks are affected by those. So we're definitely trying to stay ahead of that. It's a very expensive proposition, but we're trying to keep up with those issues. It's worth noting that residents can call 311 and get their issues on the radar and that actually helps us map out our projects more accurately. >> Houston: So do you have a current mapping of where the under sized pipes are currently so that we know where your next [inaudible] May be or -- because if you've been watching this process, district 1 is supposed to get 20% of all the new density in the town and I know that our infrastructure is severely under sized. So I need to know are we adding insult to injury when we start adding the density. >> Those are great questions. We do so first time sensitivity indicated flood modeling of all of our -- we've been systematically monitoring and so we actually have -- we haven't completing mapped all of the city. It's well over half, but we haven't mapped the entire city. We were starting with the older areas because your area may pretty well be covered by our modeling but it shows which ones are under sized. We have an asset management program that we're ramping up to really try to understand where the areas in most need, have the most sort of

[3:23:13 PM]

antiquated and under sized drainage infrastructure. That's something we do look at. >> Houston: Thank you, I appreciate it. >> Mayor Adler: Next briefing. I would say that I'm real pleased to have a

conversation about codenext that's not just about mapping uses. [Laughter] And my sense is this is a really good conversation for us and the whole community to see what else is happening in codenext. So I'd like us to think about bringing in a presentation on transportation and subdivision so that we can also see those other kinds of elements that are in the code as well so we can see what it is that a new code would provide for us. >> And mayor and council, Greg Guernsey. And the topics of transportation of subdivision are ones -- a lot of those sections are prepared by staff so we could actually have those on the off weeks when the consultants are not here. We do have the consultants next week so -- >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> If you decide to have another special meeting which I talked about last week for next Wednesday, we could have the consultants talk about certain topics. I think I heard wanted to talk more about housing and a little more about some of the work John Frigenese's staff was doing. >> Mayor Adler: Even if everyone can't make the meetings, have the consultants talk in front of the TV. Let's go to the next one.

[3:25:19 PM]

>> We have about 25 slides. I could bring this back in two weeks. >> Mayor Adler: We can't do that because we have a resolution tomorrow. Work quickly and see if you can get done in 15 minutes. >> Greg Guernsey, I'm joined by Matt Duggan, division lead on long-range planning. We'll go quickly through this. Just give you a little bit outline we're going to cover the new directions, what we've learned and where we're going. First we're talking about selecting areas for platting services and what types of platting services that we would deliver. Part of this came about because of the audit that was done in November of 2016 regarding neighborhood planning. And one of the things we talked about back then was a new planning process and because of codenext we also talked about that. Our current process that we have today is basically the neighborhood plans that we've been working on for probably the last 20-plus years. They only cover about 26% of the city, about 38% of the population. We've got about 30 different plans over 53 different districts and we're still working on two of them, one for north shoal creek that we would look at finishing possibly this year and then moving on to the last neighborhood plan that is on a map that you might see up there and that's rosdale. The findings of the neighborhood platting process by the auditor said they were equitable -- don't necessarily reflect back on imagine Austin since there was only one in process at the time that we were doing imagine Austin. And the older neighborhood plans, they really lack time lines to complete the recommendations. The auditor pointed out in order to do all the recommendations that were in the neighborhood plan it would take about \$3.7 billion, and if we tried to do neighborhood

[3:27:20 PM]

plans in the current process, it might take 81 years because of the length of time. So it really is not an option for us to probably keep pursuing so we are looking at new neighborhood plans. The Zucker report echoed this that we should be looking at corridors and centers. So moving forward the codenext looks at and maintains neighborhood plans. They are not going away. They still provide direction on how we might develop in parts of the city, but we're looking far a new small area plan. Neighborhood plans are a type of small area plan just like a corridor plan or one that we might find along transit orient

development area. So I think I'm going to turn this over to Matt. >> In looking at redesigning our planning process, it's important to start with the end goal in mind. For small area plans what we're trying to do is complete communities throughout Austin. These are people can meet daily needs with a short trip. A mix of uses, variety of housing courses, connected street grid, places for people to have recreational opportunities -- [lapse in audio] Get them all to the table. Predictability. Everybody wants to know what's going to happen next to me on my street, in my block, in my neighborhood. We took a look around to see what other cities were doing. Portland, Oregon has a similar concept. They did an analysis of

[3:29:22 PM]

proximity to those five categories, parks, grocery stores, community centers, elementary schools and frequent transit stops. It's a little hard to read, if you look at the map, the areas that are yellow and Orange have high level access and the dark areas, purple and blue, have limited access. So we prototyped a couple mapping concepts to help choose future planning areas. The first one is an access map, which areas lacked access to daily needs. We took our city and E.T.J., planning jurisdiction, the demographer took that and created reporting areas. Basically just areas we can run reports on and come up with data and tables to figure out what's there. What he was trying to do, what Ryan Robinson was trying to do is really make these reporting areas about the same size. Some that worked out, some it didn't. Areas 1 through 17 are within city limits and areas 18 through 24 are outside in the E.T.J. So we had four criteria, elementary schools, parks, frequent transit stops and grocery stores. Just a simple analysis of how far our people to those four categories. So we had -- this is the elementary school map. After that data table, it's hard to read, but on the left it's the 24 reporting areas. As you come across the table it shows population numbers and then it gets to those four criteria. The percentage of population within a half mile of a grocery store and then on the right percentage of population within half mile of a park and it's ranked percentage of population within a half mile of an elementary school and that ranking and the fourth one, percentage of population within a quarter mile of a frequent transit stop. Taking those four we can average those and figure which have better access than others. So for this for example

[3:31:23 PM]

looking at the final rankings, report area number 3, 6 and 4 have the highest ranking, and reporting area 8, Bergstrom, has the lowest level of access. So on the map it shows it here. The dark areas in the middle, 3, 6 and 4 have the highest access, and then the ones in green have the lower access. So around the eastern crescent. And the ones that are tan have medium level of access to those four criteria. The second prototype, opportunities map, how might we leverage planning investments with city investments. We put on there areas that already have a plan and then we overlaid the imagine Austin centers and corridors. And so the centers are the colorful circles, the corridors are the yellow lines. And then on top of that we put on the 2016 mobility bond areas. So now we're starting to see some things. The areas that -- that don't have a plan, that do have a imagine Austin center or corridor and do have bond investment as well. We learned a lot just from putting these prototypes. The data on this maps

provide a good analysis of lack of equitable access to basic needs. Realize our complete community is different for everybody. While a coffee shop me me, it's a park with -- just that definition of a complete community is different for everybody. We took the two maps and put those together and this is a bit busy, but again the access map showing the areas that have low access which are in green around the eastern crescent, and then on top of that the imagine Austin centers and corridors, and on

[3:33:23 PM]

top of that areas that have a bond investment for the 2016 mobility bond. So now we're starting to see some areas that have both a need and an opportunity. So based on that, we came up with some potential future planning areas. This needs additional work and analysis. These first areas on the left, those are areas that had a low rank in accessibility, they had a imagine Austin center or corridor and investment from 2016 mobility bond. The second areas, Parmer, Braker lane, low rank and accessibility and also imagine Austin center and corridor. A potential selection would be this micro level assessment, come up with a handful of sites to look at and then drill down site specific list. This would be some ground truthing, a field trip to see if the data on the map is what shows on the ground to check the results of the data analysis. That will let us know where the services are needed and what services are needed in those areas. And then we go out for those planning services. So potential work plan for us, do the assessment, the first year do a couple areas and reassess. Do the assessment again, figure out what it shows us, which areas are coming up that need help and that have an opportunity and then go out and delivery planning services for them. So we're talking about two changes. First the way we're going to select future planning areas, and then two the types of planning services we're going to deliver. It could range anywhere from demonstration-type project to a corridor plan to a full-blown center plan. But realizing not every area needs the same type of planning service. So one of the things we're trying to do is come up with a

[3:35:25 PM]

more [inaudible] Approach for an ever changing city. Don't want to get stuck doing the same thing that are producing the same results not getting us results. City planning can help residents experience a more complete community where they can meet daily needs without traveling too far. >> Mayor Adler: You'll be back before council tomorrow and we can talk at greater length. Ms. Kitchen. >> Kitchen: I would like to distinguish what was present to us from my resolution. It's not the same thing. So although I really, really appreciate the work that you all have done so far and so the purpose behind the resolution that I'm bringing forward is actually to provide some additional ideas or direction from the council to help you with your work. I think there's some overlap in what I've said. In other words, you've already done a lot of thinking [lapse in audio] The resolution I proposed is not a a replacement for planning. You all may want to make -- you may want to make recommendations around neighborhood planning, that's fine. I'm just saying this resolution is silent as to neighborhood planning. There's that. Then with regard to the small area planning, the focus of the resolution adds -- inherit in y'all's thinking so far but may be things to add. Because I was coming at this from perspective of the market forces. And

so the resolution that I'm proposing includes a number of criteria to look at in terms of coming up with potential areas. And although the complete

[3:37:25 PM]

communities is inherent in that, I'm also adding the market forces indicators that express an opportunity to leverage an area's potential. So in other words, to get ahead of the curve in terms of growth so that we are looking at the growth in the entire city. So -- so it's forward looking as well as looking at what's on the ground right now. So I won't read you all that right now, but it's looking at our public investment, which I'm seeing that's part of what you guys have talked about. Our affordable housing investments, but also to look where there's private development, where there's potential market for that sort of thing. So -- so it sound to me like I really appreciate the work you all have done and I'm thinking that with the direction from this resolution that can refine some of y'all's work, at least with regard to small area plans. And it sounds like you are already well on the way to thinking about what you might bring back to the council. And so what this resolution asks is that you bring back the identified geographic areas, something you all have started to think about, the proposed criteria, sounds like you all have started thinking about that, proposed changes to the land development code, so we'll want to see that back to us also, a plan for implementation, a specific plan for implementation and sound like we're starting to think about that, and letting us know what resources would be needed to implement a small area planning -- at least from my perspective, I would not expect you all to be able to move forward in any kind of aggressive way because you need more resources. So we would want to understand what those are. Why I think that it's important to move forward with this resolution because it does provide some more focus and specific

[3:39:27 PM]

requests and I'm glad to hear in audio]. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston. >> Houston: And you went through that quickly. If you've answered this, just tell me and I'll talk to you after it's over. Corridors, help me define corridors. >> In the imagine Austin -- so the [lapse in audio] On then 16 mobility bonds as well. >> Houston: The concern is that 12th street is considered a corridor, a two-lane street. About width, something other than a street would help understand I think what the impact may be when we use the word "Corridors." >> Imagine Austin doesn't particularly say what is the exact boundary of a corridor or the exact boundary of a center so it may be those lots that front on that street would be part of that corridor, be part of that discussion. Or maybe going back a little further. But it's not just the street itself, it's the area that abuts that corridor. So if there is not a good

[3:41:28 PM]

transportation system along there, there's not enough room for bus, bike, pedestrians. >> Houston: None of that. >> That might be looking at some of the things. If there are not enough services that people can get to easily to shop or go to work, those are things that I think that Matt was talking about. So those areas where you want those completely communities and talking about the context which

could be on a corridor or could be at a center are things that we would try to build on so people have things that are close by. >> Houston: Sometimes I think I'm speaking Greek and you are hearing me in Spanish. [Laughter] I'm not talking about that. I'm talking about how we call anything that vehicles travel on a corridor when in fact it's a very small collector street and should not be -- I'm hoping that you will come up with a definition of a corridor that matches these are the -- what they look like in imagine Austin, this is what they look like in the mobility bond and not a small residential street that happens to be the only east-west connectivity and we call that a corridor because that implies other kind of density and growth. They are single families on the sides of these corridors that are being impacted because we use that term so loosely. >> All right. I understand what you are talking about. South Lamar and east 12th street are very different. They carry much more traffic on one than the other and the characteristics along those roadways. We can provide that information that we have in the imagine Austin and the bond program and get that to you. >> Great question because I think when we look at these they change from one area to another area. So it's really a tough thing for us. For example, you know, burnet road has that local purpose, but it also serves a regional function. You can get from Austin to

[3:43:28 PM]

Round Rock on that. 969 is the same thing. It serves a local purpose but also serves a regional function, gets you from Austin to bastrop. That's a good one to figure out. >> Houston: But I think it's important that we figure it out and we don't treat all corridors like burnet road, north Lamar like we do east 12th street. >> Kitchen: I would just add that I think that -- I would agree with what councilmember Houston is bringing up and I would just say while I appreciate the kind of inventory you have done so far, I wouldn't want this to be considered proposed small area planning areas because -- >> No, they are not. They are just reporting areas. It will take a micro assessment to see what's going on and we would have to drill down and determine what's the boundary, what's this area and what is the actual service needed. >> Kitchen: Right. And the other thing is the additional criteria, because we're proposing some additional criteria, as you said earlier, that could change what this picture looks like. >> Oh, yeah. >> Kitchen: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Let's go on -- >> Tovo: Mayor pro tem, I have one quick thing I want to say and I have other questions but I'm going to leave it at this because I'm eager to go on to the next discussion. Our city committed probably 30 years ago or so to community-led neighborhood plans as a good planning strategy. It's a principle other cities use as well. I have said several times if we're going to continue citing the neighborhood audit I want a full discussion at council and evaluate it together because in my opinion very significant flaws. But after 30 years, tens of thousands of staff hours, tens of thousands of community the other

[3:45:28 PM]

information, I just have to call out that it is extremely disappointing to see from our planning staff and planning director the comment pulled out not equitable, feasible or representative that our neighborhood plans fall into that category. And I just want to also say, you know, the -- to the extent that we need to broaden those who were in the room participating in the neighborhood plans, the staff

has to work with the community on that. We have a good example of the north burnet plan where the neighbors themselves took on a lot, I'm told, I haven't verified this, took on a lot of outreach, but typically that falls to the staff. To the extent the neighborhood plans have not always had a representative group in there, it is all of us that bear that responsibility. But I don't think if you are going to say three things about neighborhood plans that not equitable, feasible or representative does justice to the staff work, the community work and again the countless taxpayer resources that have gone into creating our neighborhood plans. >> Mayor pro tem, that was actually from the city auditor so we're pointing that out that was pointed out to us. And my point that it was only 26% on the city, that still leaves 74% of the city that does not have a neighborhood plan and I think that's what the auditor was pointing out and staff has a concern because I don't have the staff and resources to plan the entire city on a neighborhood plan basis as we have done so in the past. >> Tovo: I know who said it. Again, I think that that's -- I think if we're going to continue citing that audit we should have a full discussion about it. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you very much for your time. Thank you for the presentation. Yes, Mr. Flannigan. >> Flannigan: I want to add to that. I would be willing to have that conversation about the audit. Obviously there are no neighborhood plans in my district, there are no neighborhood plans planned for my district, there are no small area plans in reality planned for my district.

[3:47:28 PM]

And I think it's important that we not assume that work done 30 years ago is still relevant today. There are a lot of things the city was doing 30 years ago that we would never do again. And I just want staff to know that not every time you do analysis, it doesn't necessarily reflect poorly on staff. Sometimes they have been given a mandate that's difficult to implement or impossible to implement or challenging to do it fairly or equitably. Where struggling with those issues every day in this building as we created an equity office to try to address these issues. I have concerns about the neighborhood planning process. I've mentioned it in part before and I would love an opportunity to dig into that audit because the neighborhood planning process is something that my part of town doesn't participate in, has not been offered and in fact was created before my part of town even existed. And I think part of our 10-1 experience is understanding that decisions made when significant portions of the city didn't exist don't automatically then become good decisions for the future. >> Mayor Adler: I think it would be a good thing to talk about as council. We'll take a look at getting that opportunity. Let's go ahead and move to the second item that's on the agenda, talking about the downtown issues. Mayor pro tem handed out -- [lapse in audio] >> Tovo: In collaboration with councilmember Garza -- they though may have some different ideas -- and take more time with the areas I believe just based on yesterday's conversation and

[3:49:29 PM]

our previous need more discussion. Attached to this -- so I attached three pages of amendments, but I also added in my questions just to show that, you know, there are questions we have to answer about, for example, whether a geographic extension of the tif is the best way to fund -- the best way to fund issues related to homelessness. I have thought I was 100% behind that and I learned it couldn't actually fund housing potentially so that to me doesn't sound like the best option. I passed out the question so

you could see some of the things I think need to be resolved in these areas. What I've tried to do is very similar to what councilmember kitchen did in a few different directions. I would suggest that we really try to resolve what we have agreement around and then again hold back on the issues where we don't. So number 1 is the suggestion that we -- that we allow staff to do what they have been doing a year ago which was to work on the waller creek tax increment finance zone and really just revert back to staff process. They were working with the waller creek conservancy, they were analyzing the work, met with most of our offices in the spring the decision was I think to merge it into the resolution passed last spring to let that process evolve. I think at this point as you all discussed yesterday it sounds like if it's going to get down this year, it would need to move more quickly. And so again there may not be agreement around that ultimately, but I would suggest we take that piece out because if we want to do it -- if we want to do it this year rather than wait a whole other year, we should make a decision. Number 2, amendment 2, I've

[3:51:29 PM]

added on this separate page after about the -- I think we had like a 14-hour day of programs so I was trying to draft them on the plane last night but here's amendment 2. Really these are all very drafty. These are not probably final language. Amendment 3 is the line edits that I handed out on here. They are very small ones, but the one thing I was really hoping to have an opportunity to talk about, mayor, I have a question about this last whereas that I hope we have an opportunity to talk about because I wasn't completely clear on that one. And then what I've done with the rest -- what we've done with the rest of the amendments is to really take the different issues that, again, I believe we may have consensus around and move them forward. So the first one talks about the mac, and affirms our commitment. Many community members have asked to approve item 52 because they are interested and concerned about the mac expansion. I'm certainly ready to make that commitment and sounds like it has a lot of support to commit that we will do the expansion when the master plan is done and we want our staff to look at different official options. I believe at this point that certificates of obligation or general obligation bonds as has been done in the past may be our best option so we're not restricting future programming and the kinds of activities that can happen at the mac which could come from the convention center if it was -- if hotel-motel tax was used. I've had questions into our staff through the Q and a just to I will -- I the next one we did on the same day that we considered -- we passed a resolution asking staff to

[3:53:29 PM]

look at alternative funding streams for addressing homelessness and housing issues. This just affirms our interest in getting that information back. We had asked for it to be back by today so we could have it as alternatives to what is before us in 52. We've been so busy with budget it was an unrealistic time line. I'm not sure what a realistic time line that's why I have it highlighted. There have been in several of the conversations we've had people have asked to be informed about the action plan. What is the comprehensive plan that the housing providers have done for the city of Austin, and I think it would be well worth our time to have a briefing, if the ending community homelessness organization and other

providers are able and willing to provide us with that really comprehensive plan to end homelessness in Austin, I think it would be great for us to all have that presentation. And then again I believe there are legal questions and other questions that need analysis with regard to an additional tif downtown, and so I've organized that where it seems to belong with regard to the housing -- housing stream. The next deals with the tpid. It's quite similar to what was in the original resolution. I understand that this -- convention center expansion so depending how we want to consider that, I think this section stays or doesn't, but seems to me the terms -- [lapse in audio] The next one this is a plan to know range of options could be from certificate obligations -- occupancy tax which would be restrictive in terms of what could happen. But we -- it's possible.

[3:55:31 PM]

Then the next one I did what councilmember kitchen did was to eliminate all the -- suggested in exhibit a. Important historic sites but not all of them. Some churches but not all of our churches. I think it's best handled either not in the resolution or in exhibit a situation where our -- later were included but we didn't have funding. Also it drew my attention -- I wanted to understand better what the steps are. I did go through and do a comparison, councilmember kitchen, with yours. Eliminate the dollars for historic preservation, had a council resolution set higher standards so I'm not ready to -- I don't want to move forward with says \$3.2 million when we've indicated to people we want that number as soon as to believe to be 15%. -- As soon as possible. I think this is quite -- number 3 is repetitive with our first one but I thought it was important to mention again. And so I hope -- you know, our intent was really to figure in how can -- this has been challenging public conversation, a challenging community conversation and I believe some of it can -- there's a lot about which I think we agree. If we can focus on what we agree on, I'm concerned like the waller creek tif where we may have agreement, may not now move forward in a fashion because of lost time. I don't want to lose any more time and we can focus attention on the conversation about the convention center.

[3:57:31 PM]

One understand presented to me by wattly and I have permission to credit her is to engage u.t.'s center for sustainable development. I think she may have talked to members. And I'm not going to just really -- to work like this, something they did analyzing, it's called planning modern psychiatric facilities and analysis of the state hospital and it looked up programming and design elements and as I understand is to provide kind of independent review that presents the information and lays out the question so that decision makers have that at -- have that to make good decision. If it makes sense to move in sure we're even ready to talk about our process. There is a way forward and come up with some kind of answer this may be a good option. I think, councilmember kitchen, you've suggested a work group. I think some of the questions that we'll be bringing are we just need staff help. Consider the focus, the convention center, this is again another option and the language here is intended to suggest that they would -- [lapse in audio] An expansion to a renovation. I understand from previous discussions and I've confirmed this with staff on Q and a that -- also generates ability for us to increase hotel-motel tax. Cultural arts, historic preservation, that all can happen as well.

[3:59:32 PM]

So I think -- I think we owe it to explore that. So that's why the language talks about renovation, expansion, so takes into account the exposition center. But I do know that there is -- if we expand we -- if we are -- if we do move forward with something like that that we have that conversation I think there are some really great ideas. I think I should hit on the main intent is is there are ways -- if there's a will to expand the convention center that we can expand it in with a that it is not a one-purpose facility, that it is a multipurpose facility, unlike any other convention center in the country. That it's not one big building, but maybe a series of smaller, more flexibly located rooms that could be of interest to our innovation center and some of the other businesses downtown that would use that space. So that it would be more of a 24/7 again multi-use facility versus just strictly for use as a convention center. That idea was appealing to me not just esthetically and from a design perspective, but also that may address some of the financial concerns that I had that maybe it's not the most financially viable option to expand the convention center. I think it would be great if it turned a profit and this study may -- this kind of study may help us get to the point where we can be more discerning in our choices about moving forward. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen? >> Kitchen: Okay. So the question that I have, the proposal I've put forward was simply just an attempt to think about how we might have the conversation as a council. So really my question for you, mayor pro tem, is do you think a work

[4:01:33 PM]

group would be useful in -- not instead of what you've done, but a work group to focus on whatever remaining questions there are. I don't have an objection to moving forward with pieces that people are ready to move forward with. And I don't know if a work group is useful or not. I was just bringing it forward because it seemed to me that there was a lot of complexity and that perhaps having the focused on digging into the flexibility would be useful. But that's really a question of whether we want to dig into the details of a convention center renovation or expansion as a whole body or whether we through there's some useful in a smaller group of doing vetting and bringing it back. I was curious about what you think about that. >> Tovo: I appreciate the question. I think it's a very good suggestion. I'm trying to figure on you how it would work. Number one, I would say if there's a work group I would suggest it really be limited to the convention center expansion piece because I believe that the amendments that I've distributed move forward all of the other pieces. I realize I've missed one and that is the pid for waller creek which I need to understand better. But otherwise I believe all of the other pieces are handled in the amendments. And as I look at them, most of them are moving forward in one way or the other, we have a macc plan -- master plan underway, getting started on the financing piece I think makes good sense. So I would say it would seem to me that the work group -- what would fall to the work group or the convention center. Not to say that there are not questions. There are certainly questions and I think the questions I've distributed show that. There are questions about all these other issues, but at this point I feel pretty comfortable that I've raised questions, you all have raised questions. I think councilmember Garza, you added another one that I hope goes into the Q and a about the bond funds and the

[4:03:34 PM]

mac. And I think at this point we need to ask our staff to do the work, provide answers to the questions and legal restrictions on those funds. I'm not sure that beyond that that there's much more to resolve with those until we have the information we need and can say, yeah, we would rather use this funding or that funding. Or the community really wants to see the facility move in this direction so this funding seems appropriate. In terms of the convention, I don't know. You know, it's an issue that I think is of broad interest in the council. And it's not clear to me whether a group with four of us -- I'm happy to over on it, but I don't know whether a work group with just four of us will get us to where we need to go or if having some work like this done that helps us understand the options out there and the questions would be another place or whether we can -- whether we should arrive at a decision about either of those options this week. I mean, I'm sort of -- I believe we may need more time to really hash out how do we want to make that decision about the convention center and the exposition center and their interrelationship and not try to resolve it tomorrow. >> Kitchen: Okay. From my perspective I would be happy to have a work group and I'm not -- I'm happy to not even participate in the work group and have people go over and vet and come back. I would be okay with that. That's just me. It depends on -- I think the question really depends on how many of the -- how many of us as a council would like to have those kind of -- I think they're deep dives. I think that they are conversations that we'll have to have in-depth, but it may be that the whole council wants to do that so that's really a question. >> Renteria: Mayor. The way I see the amendment the mayor put forward, my co-sponsor, it's asking for those kind of questions to come back and give us. I don't understand why

[4:05:34 PM]

we're going out there going to create a task force. It's just going to take more resources and time and delay the whole thing. Unless you want to delay the whole expansion process and study again for another year, that's fine with me, but I think that what the mayor is presenting is actually doing the same thing that you're saying is we're going to get feedback on how much and what. We're just instructing the manager to come back and give us the information that we're going to need and how to get this process done. >> Tovo: Councilmember, if I may. The mayor's resolution. >> Actually tells -- we already have a master plan. I think maybe we're ready to vote it up or down at this point. The mayor's resolution has some pretty specific language about coming back to us with whatever is required, something like this, whatever is required to any other tools necessary to do so. To me that means you put the master plan on our council agenda and we vote on it. I agree with you, doing this would certainly delay decision about the convention center and we may not want to do that. We may just want to have the vote. Yeah. So. >> Mayor Adler: If I could have a quick turn. Mayor pro tem, I think you raised some very good questions and a lot of those are questions I have as well and questions that I need answers to before I can know what I want to have happen and what I want -- what I want to vote on. Some of the questions I think you raised, like the tif, for example, we know the tif funding can't be used for economic development. Economic development is -- affordable housing has been determined to be economic development, but my understanding is

[4:07:35 PM]

that the legal question that hasn't been asked is what about the permanent supportive housing for people who are homeless that are driven by public safety issues and jails or folks in emergency rooms. If that's not housing that's associated with economic development, but more safety and -- it might be something. Then I think that's one of the open questions that's important for me to have answered. I like the conversation we had yesterday about things being able to move forward like waller creek, which I support, and I would like that to be able to move forward. I want to make sure as we're moving that forward and we look at the waller creek tif that we take a look at as we're setting up that tif whether it should be extended down to Rainey as to become another possible funding source for the mac as we're setting up that tif. I don't want to do anything to hold up waller creek and I don't know that it necessarily has to happen that way, but to have somebody, our staff take a look at it to see whether or not that gives us another funding source that we could cobble together with multiple funding sources in order to make that work. The language on the preferred option that you noticed on the resolution was just because that's how staff presented it that way, but as I discussed yesterday in answer to a question from councilmember pool and from councilmember Garza, I'm not intending to presuppose any answer to the question. And we can take a look at them all, but it was asking the staff to get to a level of detail sufficient for us to be able to consider these so that we could -- so that we could answer those kinds of questions. It's hard for me to -- I want the mac -- if there's support on the mac I would love for us to have us do that and ce's is certainly an opportunity for that. That of course calls into question property tax funding, but that

[4:09:35 PM]

might be an option. The bond that we're doing in November might be an option. I think it's important for us to look at and study whether or not the hotel tax that could be generated with an expansion or renovation could be used for the mac in a way that doesn't interfere with the mission of the mac, nor is the conversations that I've had with the macc board and the mac board has had because there are scenarios that are being discussed where perhaps the theater that they want to have, so it could be funding that comes from the convention center from the mac to be able to do that in a way that sets up rules so that it doesn't interfere with the mission, recognizing that the mission of the mac comes first. But just as -- for me the decision that I would ultimately make on the convention center in part, I want to know whether doing either an expansion or a renovation turns up additional money that could be part of what's getting cobbled together to be able to do the -- to do the mac, the homeless issue I think is real important. We're trying to cobble together money, and goodness knows we're going to have to find as much money as we can as many different places as we can. And the tpid is part of that conversation. And the fid conversation also ties into the convention center center issue. I'm not sure I'm ready to decide those questions without the other. These are questions I have too. I see some of these things as being perhaps a -- interrelated. I'd like to see the mexicarte museum be able to be completed. And I think the museum is one of the allowed purposes for hot tax funding. And I know that the

[4:11:37 PM]

mexicarte museum had a bond election that involved five million dollars associated with that project. That in conversations with the macc board there might be an opportunity for a second kind of auxiliary for mexicarte that would be down from the five million as part of what's spent on the mac. If we could generate enough money from the hot tax to replace that money and to add to that money so that the mexicarte could be done. A lot of these elements don't necessarily have to go with each other, but they could go with each other. And the intent of the resolution was to just ask for the opportunity for our staff to be hold go away and study these things to the detail necessary to be able to answer a lot of these questions that may be interrelated, may not be interrelated, but we should ask that question now in case they're interrelated in a way that they want to do something with. And had originally said let staff go away and come back with detailed enough information for us to be able to assess those. The amendment that came from councilmember kitchen with the overview of some of the councilmembers on that, I could support. The same way that there was kind of an oversight committee on the resource recovery issue that councilmember pool did. I think that might be an opportunity for some people to dive into it a little bit more in-depth for everybody involved. I'll take a look at these things tonight. I think you raised some really good points and I think they need to be included in what we do tomorrow. Ms. Houston? >> Houston: Thank you,

[4:13:39 PM]

mayor. And I'm not sure that we're all on the same page about the waller creek tax increment financing zone. I understand about the amount of time, but the last time you presented that to us you gave us some expanded boundaries and I have asked that to the east I believe and I've asked staff where do those boundaries go because we've expanded it and I need to be able to see where that expansion stops because it may have some unintended consequences each of I-35 and I've not gotten that. I'm not sure where the expanded boundaries are. Until I'm able to see that and understand that and say to the constituents who are concerned and that are sending me emails today about where do those boundaries stop, I'm not going to be able to vote. >> Mayor Adler: And I agree, I have the same question you have. When I asked the question I was just told it was a line that was drawn. My hope is that as part of this we are asking staff to go away and actually take a look at that is. Where would that line be? And what does it mean if it's a block further to the west, two blocks further to the west. What does that mean? We don't have answers to that. And the resolution is not to decide any boundaries. It's to ask staff to go away to develop exactly that level of detailed information so that we can have that conversation. In part that might indicate whether or not that's an idea that should be weighing into the rest of the decision. And if it shouldn't let's learn that and put that aside and say that's not going to be part of this. But until we have that information, not only -- we can't vote for it, but we can't vote against it either. I just want to have the questions answered. >> Houston: So help me understand what is in your mind the reason we have to vote on this Thursday? >> Mayor Adler: So

[4:15:39 PM]

that the staff will go away and answer these questions at a time when all these issues are in front of us so that if they prove to be interrelated or there are opportunities for us to do things together, we can see that. And if there are or there are better ways we can do that and go in the opposite direction. >> Houston: To give us time because we've gotten a lot of new resolutions and amendments to resolutions and stuff to read tonight, October the third, would that be too late to take a vote and say -- October the third is that the next council third to meeting -- the fifth, thank you. We've settled in, we've reviewed it. We've come to a place where we are just as comfortable about what the ask is that you are. We don't have time to do that? Because tonight I'm going to be reading about the downtown puzzle instead of some other things that I need to be reading. >> Mayor Adler: I'm confused, but Ms. Houston, all that I'm asking for is an opportunity to have all these issues examined by staff and have them come back in the future and give us information on them. That is the full extent of what is being requested. And to the degree that there are words in this that suggest anything else, I'm fine changing those words. And if we want to have some staff over and say I'm fine with that, but that's it. But somehow or another it seems to be turning into something that is suggested we're taking litmus tests or votes on action, and I don't want to get lost in that. So I don't understand if all I'm asking for is can we have staff go away and develop information for us, why that question needs to be delayed? >> Houston: And I'm sorry, I think it was the way it has been word sheriff's department that you asked for staff

[4:17:40 PM]

to come back with resolutions and ordinances and tools which sounded like all these things had been decided on by everybody here, and everything has not been decided. >> Mayor Adler: And I noticed that as I read councilmember kitchen's deal she's changed that to reflect the conversation we had yesterday. What was intended by that was only get to a level of detail. Actually talk to the hotel people. Find out what would or wouldn't happen with the tpid. Negotiate on that and come back. That's all that was meant because we've been playing with it up here and every time we've had these conversations we get stopped because there are lots of questions that no one can answer. So if the wording that we used originally was wrong, that was not the intent. The intent was just get to a sufficient level of detail. Ms. Kitchen? >> Kitchen: I would just say ask people to think about this. I appreciate moving forward with pieces of it as the mayor pro tem has suggested. But I also appreciate what the mayor is suggesting that at least some of these, maybe not all of these, but at least some of them may have some interrelation to each other. So the language that I have here is that individual projects and -- so I am thinking that the creation of the work group may be a good route to go because it gives us a defined process and mechanism to actually dig into these and have those conversations. And then I did include language that says individual projects in the puzzle can be studied, evaluated and returned to council separately. So in other words, they could move forward in a different -- at different times and in a way that does not presuppose a decision regarding a convention center expansion. And I appreciate what mayor pro tem did in terms of suggesting looking at-- I forgot

[4:19:40 PM]

your words, but renovation or expansion of a convention center. So I think that range of possibilities should be part of the discussion. So that kind of language I would certainly want to change instead of proposed expansion of the convention center, proposed expansion or renovation of the -- but I guess I'm thinking that if there's a way to sort of meld the ideas that the mayor pro tem has brought forward in the resolution that I've brought forward that may be the way to go because as we have this conversation I'm convinced that a work group can be helpful because I think a conversation about the inner relationship of some of these kinds of initiatives is worth having. But then I do think it's important to make it clear that we want to talk about potentially renovation and expansions, not just expansion of the convention center. So that's what I would think, that's what I would suggest moving forward. >>

Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Garza? >> Garza: I'm appreciate the discussion on the intent -- it sounds like we're all very close on what we're trying to do here. I would just go back to it -- and you've already addressed it, mayor. The language is very strong and that's why I have concerns about it. It says put the city council in the position -- that's pretty strong. It says upon receipt of the petition requesting establishment of the tpid, expansion of the convention center. It's very strong language that all hinges on the question of the convention center. Again, I think that -- it's interesting what the mayor pro tem's brought up in terms of what can be done and how we can decide to move in a different direction because I think I don't know where -- there's been a lot of discussion

[4:21:40 PM]

on the convention center. It kind of went away for a little bit. But we never really had a real discussion about it and I think that there's a possibility -- I think what was thought was this council is against expanding the convention center. And I don't think that was a fair assumption. I think we were against parts of that, but I think if it's done in a way that ensures that the community is thought about and considered and how we help the community and how this is just not something that helps the tourism industry, I think the support would be will there. I can only speak for myself, but I think the support would be there. So now it feels like we're in this forced position to make this all depend on each other. And I don't think we need to be here. And it seems like there needs to be significant changes to the wording for us to be where councilmember Renteria thinks we are and where the mayor thinks we are and where we all really want to be. So my only concern about agreeing -- my support of agreeing with councilmember Houston would be I don't think we're there. I don't think -- we're voting on this tomorrow and there is significant concern about the language and I think if -- I think we could get there, but I don't know if we can get there tomorrow. So I would support a postponement to get to the language that we're all comfortable with. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter and then councilmember pool. >> Alter: I appreciate mayor pro tem and councilmember kitchen bringing this forward on ways to amend this so we can get to the common ground, but councilmember Garza suggested that we're actually not that far from. I am concerned about us voting tomorrow when we are missing one of our councilmembers. And this may be very close votes on multiple things. And we've already had to go back in one case and

[4:23:41 PM]

reopen a zoning case because we had people absent. And we have 100 plus other items on the agenda tomorrow. I don't know which of the other weeks in October has only 17 or 18 items. I think it might be the 12th. I'm not sure. I think we need some time to put these together and to think through them. And I know I would welcome that time so that we can make sure that we're doing our due diligence on everything else that's on our agenda tomorrow. For waller creek I just wanted to say I think there's two pieces of that. The piece that is needed to finish the park and then there's a question of whether this can be a funding source for solving the homeless issues that we're experiencing. And those do not have to be linked and there's nothing to stop us from just doing the temporal extension. That was always the process. And I think that's where mayor pro tem is going with hers. So I'm not saying that we shouldn't consider the geographic extension of that tif, but we have a lot of options for how we go about funding homeless. We could add a cent to our downtown pid. We could extend the geographic reach of the downtown pid. We could apply it to residences. I have no idea what any of that means, but there are options that we have for that that require lots and lots of study. There are however consequences of not moving forward with the waller creek temporal extension because we have momentum moving forward with the pard process. And while we have invested a lot of money into the tunneling, we have not invested into the park stuff. So I think that it's really important that we allow the process that was put on hold to move forward.

[4:25:43 PM]

I spoke with -- I happen to have my meeting with the city manager today and with Greg canally and they have a very clear path. All they need to do on wok waller creek is come back to us in three or four weeks with a briefing and tell us what they're going to do and then go do it. None of that requires council other than to do a briefing. They have to do a market study, they have to do the financing models. We can't help them with any of that, but they can't do that until they give us sort of the briefing, which has been I think on hold. So I would very much like to see that process move forward. We can still have a conversation about whether we want to extend the geography, but we shouldn't hold that temporal extension hostage to the other questions. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool. >> Pool: Thanks. I think that, mayor, you were saying you wanted this process to give direction to the staff to go and bring back information, but we have a couple of resolutions already. And one that we did on February 9th, item 33, it directed the city manager to assess a number of financial tools and possible funding options for projects and entities. And so forth. So they have had more than one resolution and we certainly have indicated our interest in them pursuing those conversations. I think the real issue is that the information that we're getting back brings additional questions which doesn't really surprise me because these are really complicated matters. So we have answers to two or three things already. The time extension that councilmember alter and the mayor pro tem have talked about with regard to waller creek, and I completely agree. In fact, I thought earlier this year back in January or February I thought that that was the course that we were on. So they're in the middle of fund-raising and the fact that we are extending the time, the temporal extension on

[4:27:43 PM]

their time is something they need to move forward on their fund-raising and I don't want us to inadvertently cause problems for the actual groundbreaking that just happened and the expansion -- the creation of the park. We also have a pretty straightforward path that has low risk and high certainty for funding for the Mexican-American Cultural Center, the implementation of the master plan. But the master plan, which is underway, has to go to conclusion. So the timing on that lines up really well too with the work that we're doing here. It looks like the mayor's having to leave. Okay. I'll just keep talking. [Laughter]. That's all right. I'm just making the case for moving forward on the pieces similar to what I talked about yesterday. I think that we have a clear path forward and we have funding mechanisms. That can be augmented by funding from the hotel occupancy tax if we are able to find a way, which right now I don't know what that is, but maybe there's a way, without making it an extension or a creation of the convention center to get some of the hotel occupancy tax funds. So I guess what I would say the essence of the question tomorrow is I don't think we have agreement -- we've never talked about whether the city of Austin should engage in expanding the convention center. So I want to separate all of the various programs and financing schemes from that question so that our answering that question doesn't unduly delay us being able to move forward on at least three things and the third one is a briefing and a presentation of the homelessness plan, which we haven't had. We need to move forward

[4:29:43 PM]

on the stuff we can move forward on and that will simplify the work that councilmember Kitchen is talking about. It will narrow it down to what is the elephant in the room, which is do we want to expand the convention center and if we do, what are the community benefits that would truly come to the community and what are -- what are the negotiating pieces that are on the table? That has to be a separate conversation. >> Tovo: I need to say that the mayor had to leave. He was scheduled to sign an MOU with the governor of Monterrey, so has left us for that purpose because he was 30 minutes late. >> Oops. >> Tovo: Councilmember Kitchen? >> Kitchen: I don't want to hold people up because I know we're past the time. Just quickly, we can have conversation about this. On councilmember Pool, if I'm hearing what people are saying, there seems to be some agreement to move forward definitely with the Waller Creek temporal extension. I'm kind of hearing that. And I'm also kind of hearing that maybe some of the other things we move forward with, and that maybe we focus -- to the extent that we do a work group that if we were to do that we would focus that on the convention center renovation. >> Pool: I think we have to do that. We have to narrow down the scope of it and the additional items that were hung on that like a Christmas tree. >> Kitchen: To my mind it also means that in the conversation about a renovation or an expansion of a convention center, if something else comes up that relates to it, it can certainly be discussed. But it's not dependent upon it if I'm hearing -- you're not holding up another action for this conversation if I'm hearing you correctly. >> Pool: No. In fact, the discussion about the convention center is holding up action on all these other things and that's the piece that is really clear to me and that's what we want to get it out of the way. And then when we have the conversation about an expansion or renovation at the

[4:31:43 PM]

convention center, I want to bring in the very real need for the expansion of the heritage center and what role Travis county plays in that with their request that they be considered as a partner with one of the two pennies that are available to us. So that's why that conversation needs to be severed from everything else. >> Kitchen: Okay. Then I will go back and -- we'll see what people are ready to do tomorrow, but I'll go back and make some changes with this in consideration of what mayor pro tem has done and perhaps she can do the same and we'll just see where we're at. And we may be close enough - I hear the concerns that people are raising about being ready, but we may be close enough with our language that we can do at least some things tomorrow. We'll just see. >> Tovo: Councilmember kitchen, I see councilmember Houston has her light on -- oh, she doesn't. I hope you can stay for just a minute because I know this is our only forum to talk and I have an idea. Councilmember Garza. >> Garza: I had a quick question for law. At what point -- is there a point where an -- a resolution that has been posted is amended so much that it's beyond the point of us having been able to publicly -- that doesn't -- I'm just curious if -- >> Kitchen: We can just substitute. >> You're talking about something -- as long as the resolution is within the posting language then you're okay if that's the question you're having to answer. >> Tovo: So I think there is significant support for a postponement as well. So I think that is also an alternative. And I'm almost at the point where though I was the one who suggested that we postpone and really allow for the discussion, I would also rather narrow that discussion down. And so if we can accomplish some of this tomorrow I think we should. But I do think that the approach you're -- if we're in agreement and it sounds like there may be a lot of agreement, that the conversation that we need to continue to have or really start to have is around the

[4:33:44 PM]

convention center and expo center and their interrelationship financially and whether or not to renovate or expand or do neither of those things. I think you and I have pretty different we should really have that conversation. Are we in a position now to send four people off to really hash that out? Or would it be useful to have a group like that come in, work with all of us, work with stakeholders, and really then present us with information from which we can provide -- make a better decision? One will certainly take longer than the other. So that's a factor too. But I don't know -- maybe we should allow ourselves a time to really explore both of those options in a different conversation other than tomorrow, and decide that part next week, how do we want to proceed, kind of getting back, address the council process for deliberating on that question and really talk about what makes better sense. >> Kitchen: Is that a study, is that what that is? >> Tovo: It is. And I think that we may have a representative here tomorrow who could talk about it. And I can also potentially post some more information on the message board if I'm able to share that there. And this is kind of the result of their work. >> Kitchen: You don't have an idea of how long that would take? >> Tovo: I do. They could not begin it likely until next spring and it would probably take one semester plus the summer and that would be a pretty abbreviated process. It would certainly extend a decision. My guess is a work group would as well. And so it just is -- it's just a different approach. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Tovo: And I'm open to either one. But again, I'm also open to not making the decision about which approach we want to take tomorrow. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Tovo: I'm open to not -- not deciding tomorrow which approach we want to take. Councilmember alter. >> Alter: I appreciate you raising this on [indiscernible]. UT architecture also had a

chance to speak with Mel bah and the professor over there who leads it. And I think part of the value and the ability for them to deliver will

[4:35:46 PM]

depend on us clarifying what it is that the question is that we want them to answer. And they can bring in not just architecture folks, but people from the school of business and real estate. And there are lots of complicated implications of expanding the convention center for economy and for our community and all of those need to be part of what we're asking for. And part of the value I see in this is even if we - I'm not sure whether there's a about will to expand or not or what that looks like, and that would be what we would want to be clarifying in part, but I think for people who in the community who are hesitant about expanding having a third-party group that is not the convention center providing the analysis to say whether or not there is this extra value could be very helpful, especially if we are going to take an approach that's not going to go back to the voters to say do you want this or not? So I see value in that I've not made up my mind at all on this. I would find that kind of analysis very useful both for myself and how I'm thinking about it, but I think also in terms of the community no matter where we end up, I think that could be potentially valuable. It would, however, take more time and that's something that we have to weigh. >> Tovo: And I should say there would be financial cost as well. Councilmember Casar. >> Casar: For my own decision making, tomorrow it would be helpful for me to really clearly understand what the differences are between councilmember kitchen's amendment and the mayor pro tem's apart from the work group versus other options. I understand that part that yours has a work group, Ms. Kitchen, and mayor pro tem's didn't have it, but but other than that what the real differences are. And maybe once I sit down and read them both I can more clearly understand it because reading councilmember

[4:37:46 PM]

kitchen's, one thing that could make it more helpful and build more consensus is that does pretty explicitly say this isn't predisposing that we're moving forward with anything, which is the gist of what I was getting from part of mayor pro tem's, except you were adding more options. Just as we decide whether to postpone this for tomorrow, I want to get some sense of how far apart we really are? Because maybe reading the pieces of paper it may be different and hearing y'all talk it doesn't sound that different. >> Kitchen: I think -- >> Tovo: I'm sorry, councilmember Casar, were you finished? >> Kitchen: Sorry. >> Casar: And the other thing I want to mention before it escapes me is on the waller creek point I've mentioned this to the waller creek folks and to lots of others, I really don't want to miss the opportunity to figure out how any tax revenue from east downtown goes to other critical community needs at the same time that we're making any potential parks investment. And so for me that is -- I I just want to note for me that is pretty important that if we're going to be dedicating property tax revenue streams that we -- that we do our best to have multiple investments if possible. So I just want to -- I'm not saying that's not important for anybody else, it just sounded like part of the conversation was maybe we just want to move forward with that. I just need more information, not just about the park investment, but about the potential for dedicating that revenue stream to multiple

needs. And I know there are some barriers as to what we can bond off of on tifs, but I think we can be thoughtful and creative about whether we can address multiple needs with what's a pretty significant chunk of our downtown tax base. >> Pool: Mayor pro tem, can I answer that? >> Tovo: Can I just clarify your question -- your point? Is it about the -- was your point about the temporal extension? >> Casar: Yes. >> Tovo: Councilmember Houston and then councilmember pool. >> Pool: I just wanted

[4:39:46 PM]

to say I have asked that question already of staff. Or maybe I didn't formally. But could the waller creek tif benefit the expansion at the mexican-american cultural center? And I don't yet have an answer back on that, but I'm interested in finding that out too. But again, if we have co's and bonds that are more certain and sooner, depending on when the master plan process is complete, we may go that route, while still having the benefit potentially of getting funds through the waller creek if that's possible and also the one or two pennies in the hotel occupancy tax. I'm with you on that. I don't want to close down any of those doors, but I also don't want to inadvertently delay some funding pathway. If that makes sense. >> Tovo: Ms. Houston? >> Houston: I have to go because I have somewhere I really have to be. It's really interesting that we're now calling it east downtown. Both councilmember -- mayor pro tem and I have that part of downtown and we just call it downtown. So I'm not sure where this east downtown came from, but I don't want us to start doing that because it's downtown, from 15th street down to the river, it's downtown. >> Tovo: It almost got rebranded, but I'm glad that you got us back on track. >> Houston: I could feel it would it was about to do that and we it is downtown and we need to treat it as downtown. >> Tovo: Good point. Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: We can all think about this more, but I think the difference might be besides the work group or not a work group, is that the mayor pro tem is proposing moving forward right now with some of these items and taking them out of the study of a work group. Which I'm not opposed to, it just wasn't part of my idea because I thought people weren't ready. So -- and the most notable of those being the waller creek. So there's that. And so the question that leaves on the table

[4:41:49 PM]

is -- so what that would do is that would leave on the table a focused conversation about the convention center. And so then -- so with mayor pro tem's approach it leaves the focus conversation just about the convention center, so then the question remains can we or should we do that with the work group process, which to me mind would still allow for considering any interrelations of funding? I don't think it matters whether we say go forward with something or not, whether or not what the conversation what the conversation can be in the work group. >> Tovo: And too -- I'm not sure that that's a meaningful difference. I would just say. >> Kitchen: You're right. >> Tovo: Really what we're doing here is the mayor's -- let me say what I think we're doing here is just to reaffirm we are committed to expanding the mac and we want this analysis of different funding sources. It's not about making a decision about which one is most appropriate, but in case it looks like we're delaying things I want to assure the community we're committed to this. And we are going to explore these kinds of -- and the same is true for homelessness. We've actually already initiated that work, but we're just again reaffirming it. The

tourism bid, I think there may be a good argument that we don't want to do anything with that because it's so related to the convention, palm school. You know, we might not have announced in a resolution that we were interested in purchasing it. That's not always the best strategy. We've already done it and have done it over the course of year. So I don't necessarily see any harm there either. So the things that we're moving ahead are really items that are frankly already in progress. So I'm not sure that -- I guess when I was looking through your resolution -- my amendments versus yours, I'm not sure that there's a big -- that there's much of a difference there except this really clearly states our intentions and I think that is important to the community. >> Kitchen: I would agree that is important. So then it really just

[4:43:50 PM]

comes down to is what we want to do go ahead and state our intentions, which makes sense to me. State our intentions in the way that you're talking about. And then I would suggest creating a working group to focus on the conversation about whether we expand or renovate the convention center. And that work group could still consider the kind of study that's being proposed. That's how I would put all this together. I will make an attempt to put that together and then people can just think about it and we can work together on that. >> Tovo: Councilmember alter? >> Kitchen: Via message board. >> Tovo: Councilmember alter, did you have your light on? No? Councilmember pool. >> Pool: One last thing. That leaves on the table the request of councilmember troxclair that we wait for her to come back to take the vote. It may be that when we put all of this up on the message board and she sees the direction we're moving in she may be able to read that and since it's not to move forward on the expansion of the convention center, but rather move forward on those separate pieces we've already talked about where we can and then to fall back and have a work group of some number that may look at doing a study, that might be all right by her, but we'll let her weigh in on the message board or her staff can tell us. >> Tovo: One last thing, and we're all really late. I believe we did have a request for a time certain. Does anybody have any more information about that? I think there was a request potentially for a time certain? >> [Inaudible]. >> Pool: You weren't here. It was Tuesday. >> Tovo: I was listening intently, but I missed it. 4:00. >> I think the mayor talked to the agenda office. I believe it's 4:00 is his request. >> Kitchen: Is it 4:00? >> Casar: I think if I recall work session right -- >> Tovo: I'm not going to recognize you if you're not in your seat. [Laughter]. >> Casar: I think if I recall the discussion he said if there seems to be some set of agreements about how to move forward that we might not have to do

[4:45:50 PM]

that. And it sounded like we all might have been wrapping that up just now depending on what happens with the message board. Wow, I'm on a different camera. That's fun. [Laughter]. >> Tovo: All right, thanks. Okay. We stand adjourned at 4:45 -- 4:47.