

City Council Work Session Transcript – 10/17/2017

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 10/17/2017 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 10/17/2017

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[9:19:27 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: All right. I think we have a quorum here. We'll go ahead and start. Today is October 17th, Tuesday, 2017. It is 9:20. We're in the boards and commissions room at city hall. We have our work session today. We have three items that have been pulled and we also have a briefing on the mobility initiatives. We have presentation on two codenext items which we indicate will probably happen after lunch. I think that's when staff's ready to do those. I think we'll do the pulled items and then do the mobility initiatives and then we'll go back into executive session to handle the executive session items and then come back after lunch to do the codenext items. So we'll begin with the pulled items. Item number 18, councilmember pool, you pulled that. >> Pool: Thanks, mayor. So as we had directed staff the anti-lobbying ordinance portion of the waste management task force working group went to the ethics review commission and I made a presentation about it and some of the stakeholders were there representing two kind of different interpretations or preferences or desires for the anti-lobbying ordinance that were still in flux. As anticipated, the ethics review commission asked some really good questions and then assigned it to their working group. So they will be working on their assessment of it and taking input from the

[9:21:27 AM]

stakeholders who were there and I think we will have a good outcome, we just need to give them a little bit of time to do their work. I think that we should have this back on our agenda probably November 9. The working group is having a special called meeting to deal with this officially on November 1st. So I'll be -- >> Mayor Adler: You're going to be moving to postpone this to the 9th. >> Pool: To November 9th. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thanks. Next pulled item, Mr. Flannigan, you pulled item number 23. >> Flannigan: Yes. I wanted to ask the sponsor and the co-sponsors how this is -- what the substantive

outcome of this is. I'm in support of fixing the across I-35 thing. Like I'm on board with all that, that's not the question, but I want to make sure if there's a problem with cure zoning that we're actually solving it and that it's my understanding that we're not removing sites that already had cure zoning, we're just preventing new cure zoning -- this is my -- I want to make sure I understood the resolution because the be it resolved was one sentence and I hadn't seen that before. I have to know more about that. >> Houston: We're going to remove the last be it resolved because councilmember Renteria wants to keep the 5, 6 and 7, is that correct, to do the cure zoning. >> Renteria: I really wanted some staff, more info on what's going to happen and that's why I signed up also. I just wanted to know how it's going to affect what we already had seen. Like we already have done to saltillo and sixth street. >> Houston: And that's why we'll be amending it, but it

[9:23:29 AM]

will be for the cure zoning on east 11th, that strip. Because since 1996, I think, times have really changed. >> Flannigan: I'm with you, but I'm confused because I'm hearing conflicting because it will change sites that already have this right or that we're just preventing new sites from getting this. >> Houston: And I think I will have to ask staff to answer that. >> Greg Guernsey, planning and zoning will probably treat it like others [lapse in audio], under cure and certainly downtown so those buildings would be grandfathered under the previous regulations. I understood the resolution was removing some of the fingers from east Austin. Back in the '90s there wasn't a whole lot happening on the east side and he was trying to incent development to occur in east Austin and that's certainly happening now. So if council passes a resolution we can move forward in codenext to remove those fingers that are part of this resolution and leave the remainder in play. >> Flannigan: So this is about codenext? >> We could do that through codenext. >> So we should also do that through codenext, but I guess my concern was are we passing a resolution that is directing staff to do something in codenext when we have decided not to do that on anything else? And that being one question and the second question is if we're just removing cure and the point at which we adopt codenext is that substantively doing anything? >> The way the resolution reads right now it says council amend the following code amendments and I think that's the fingers that go into east Austin. We could do that as a

[9:25:29 AM]

separate amendment now or fold it into codenext. >> Houston: So what I've heard from the codenext consultant when we've talked about that, they said you need to go ahead and do it as a part of codenext while we're in the process. So instead of waiting until codenext gets adopted so that's why we brought this forward. There are parts of lower east Austin in Pio's district, councilmember Renteria's district,

where he wants to keep these options open. For the people on 11th and 12th street, and they're saying no. >> Flannigan: And I'm completely on board. I'm not trying undo incident tent. I'm trying to better understand it because if we're hearing from staff consultants that in order to get something in codenext I should pass a resolution now, I could go home and start writing a bunch of resolutions. And I don't think that's what we're trying to do either. >> Houston: No, but how is this different from having it go through the codenext process? >> With this direction we would just move forward and those 11th, 12th and I think mlk too, those would be the three fingers that would be removed from the code. As it comes forward and still have fifth, sixth and seventh would remain as they exist currently. >> Flannigan: Yes, I understand that part. >> Garza: Can I speak to maybe -- >> Flannigan: Please, please. >> Garza: You're right, this is part of the concern with codenext and partially what I spoke to last week was that we have all these districts and overlays that we have been told codenext is not -- told codenext is not touching, so that's part of the problem. If cure was something implemented that we need to take another look at, we need to take a look at all of T we're not just supposed to be looking at -- there are serious concerns about how it has affected east Austin, but it hasn't been used a lot near Lamar so

[9:27:30 AM]

maybe it needs to be taken away near Lamar or maybe needs to be taken away in certain areas, so now we're going to just pick little areas instead of looking at the whole thing in the codenext process and determining is this appropriate, period. And that's my biggest concern with this codenext process is if we're looking at parking regulations, we're going to look at all parking regulations, not where they're not allowed. We can't look at it in this neighborhood and not over there and this neighborhood is excluded. It just defeats the whole purpose of what codenext was supposed to be about I think is the point here. That's what I've been discussing about ads and there were concerns rightfully so, we'll have to agree to disagree, saying no, we're not changing Adu regulations at all, but I do plan to bring an Adu resolution before this codenext process is done hoping that we take another look at those and how they're implemented. That being said, I don't disagree with what you're trying to do here, councilmember Houston, I just -- maybe it needs to be meant to say let's look at all of cure and if it's right. It seems like a compatibility issue is the problem. >> Houston: It's not out cure. The cure from downtown was eliminated in 2013. So they've taken care of the downtown. Was it 2013 or not. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, it was in 2013. >> Houston: So now the only cures that are still in place are in those areas that we just outlined. >> Garza: So does your resolution mean that there's no more cure except for where councilmember Renteria wants to keep it? >> Houston: Correct. >> Mayor Adler: I have a similar concern and I need to think this through more because it does feel like something that should be part of the codenext at some level and I certainly don't want us to be bringing in a series of resolutions

[9:29:30 AM]

between now and March to create a parallel process. From a substantive process I know that cure allows for greater density and height without an exchange for affordability or anything else. So in that regard it seems to me that we're trying to move forward to in codenext if we can, I think, is to try to say in areas where we're going to lose any measure of affordable housing like I think immediately on the other side, east of I-35, because the market is going to push the value of those single-family homes to a place where only the richest in our community could afford them. If we're going to actually preserve some opportunities for mixed income opportunities in that area, it's going to be because we create tools that operate outside the market or use market incentives to get people to build those units. The saltillo tod is an opportunity to create affordability where the market is not going to create it by itself. So I think that it's -- one, I also agree that letting the density or height with cure without that corresponding benefit to the community is not good. And when the resolution was passed in 2013 with respect to downtown that moved cure out of downtown it did two things. It said we're not going to just give extra height or density or intensity or rejuvenation, but that resolution in 2013 said that

[9:31:30 AM]

instead of cure the manager was asked to -- the council initiated and brought into the downtown density bonus program. So I'm looking at the resolution and thinking the thing to do if we were going to do this would be to say we don't want to do cure because that gives density and height without the benefit, but let's take a look at how we can actually use the market to actually drive what may be our only and last opportunity to really provide affordability in these areas. >> Houston: So mayor, what I heard the consultants say is that everything was going to go in to the new code. They were not going to look at anything else. So on top of the cure designation for this area, there is also the neighborhood conservation combining districts. So we have two districts on top of a district, and that's where the confusion comes from is that none of them have community benefits and none of them are operating in the way they're supposed to be operating. So if in fact we're going to wait and go through the codenext process to take two combining districts off of 12th street, then by that time the developer that has 70 pieces of property will have a site plan built and we'll be too late. We always talk about how do we do this, how do we get ahead of the curve, this is how we do it. There are 70 properties at risk here because they can come and file a site plan without the benefits. >> Mayor Adler: That makes sense. >> So it's critical about getting this because he has 70 pieces of property already waiting to go. >> Mayor Adler: That makes sense. What I do want to then take a look at the third and fifth whereas clauses because I want to make sure those third and fifth clauses are consistent with us being able to consider adding additional entitlements in these areas in exchanged for mixed income opportunities with what we're going to do in

[9:33:31 AM]

codenext. And the third and fifth one don't seem to allow for that so I want to take a look at the language on those. But I understand what you're saying. That's helpful. Thank you. Mr. Renteria? I'm sorry, what? Third and fifth whereas classes. Mr. Renteria P. >> Renteria: Mayor, I really respect that because, you know, it seems to me that there was a move to redevelop 11th and 12th street and we don't know what's coming in. I was able to use the tod district. I am a little concerned about, you know, the cure that was overlaid on top of that because we hadn't gotten that much benefit if any, outside that tod district. So I just didn't understand how the cure by taking it off would affect the transit district too. So that's why I cosigned on and told them -- told my colleague, councilmember Houston, to hold back on my area until I got some more information. And if I wanted to amend her resolution, I would come in with an amendment. But I'm still trying to figure out how to get my staff to do that without affecting anything in the tod district. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar and then the mayor pro tem. >> Casar: I haven't had lots of time to look into this, but as far as I can tell, not having cure in east Austin you U just like we got rid of it in downtown, makes sense to me. And I appreciate y'all bringing it forward and I think getting it done before codenext seems fine to me because then in codenext we can actually

[9:35:33 AM]

calibrate the affordable housing bounces across the -- housing bonuses across the city. I appreciate the sponsors bringing it up and I think it can help us have consistency like the lead sponsor said that we don't currently have. I think it's a clear relic of, as director Guernsey said, cure zoning in those parts of east Austin seems to be a relic of a different time where the city seems to intentionally want to push some gentrification east of 35, and taking too long to address that I think has caused real problems that we're now dealing with. So I look forward to in the codenext process figuring out how we make sure that entitlements are fairly distributed and that we're extra sensitive to entitlements without community benefits and gentrifying areas and vulnerable areas and think more about how we can have - manage our growth in a way that's less threatening to some of our low income residents that are struggling to hang on. So I think that this -- stips like this make sense. We shouldn't have downtown levels of zoning without community benefits east of I-35 and we can nip that in the bud now and figure out in the codenext process how do it better. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem? >> Tovo: I'm a co-sponsor of this and strongly supportive on it. I think cure it an idea that had a place and time and that's past. I don't think we should have a zoning category like that as some of my colleagues have said, without community benefits. I think, councilmember Renteria, I would like to see it apply throughout areas where it currently is so I hope that I'd be happy to have my staff work with yours to think through with our planning staff how it impacts, if at all, the tod. I wouldn't think it does,

[9:37:33 AM]

but I would think that it has the down side that it always has had of letting developers come and exercise those entitlements. And I think it's very important and way overdue to eliminate it downtown. I think it's important to do it wherever else it exists. >> Renteria: Thank you. I'll have my staff work with you. >> Tovo: That would be great. It sounds like there's a lot of support in doing that. I think we should probably have a discussion outside of this one about other kind of code amendments that make sense to do. At some point whether we make a decision now or in codenext, we just need to continue to do our jobs and get things done and that's always been my attitude here. We all have a relative short time compared to other kinds of careers and we need to get the work done that needs to be done. I'm very supportive of moving forward on this. >> Pool: I am very supportive of eliminating cure wherever it may still occur. As mayor pro tem pointed out, it's a relic of a time and a place that has passed and it was more than 20 years ago when this was imposed and I think that it brought some negative consequences throughout the near eastside of Austin and this is our opportunity to remove it. And so that's why I have also co-sponsored this. >> >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember alter? >> Alter: I just wanted to let councilmember Houston know that I support the resolution. >> Mayor Adler: Anybody else want to talk. Yes, Mr. Flannigan? >> Flannigan: I will also be supporting this, but incident to reiterate councilmember Garza's point

[9:39:35 AM]

that if we have problematic overlays and complicated combining districts and we shouldn't be told that we have to undo them now in order to undo them under codenext. I think this is really problematic. It's important that we not think doing something now is the same thing about doing something under codenext. The power of rewrite line use code is that we're able to reconsider all the line issues at once and all the trade-offs. This is about cure zoning, but at a higher level. I don't think it's appropriate to make the changes to the code so close to changing all the code because we miss the opportunity on where all the trade-offs lie. And as far as the fingers on the cure, I'm with you. I think we'll be fine on Thursday, but I'm kind of really nervous that you were told, councilmember Houston, that you needed to do this in order for it to be used under codenext. That's very problematic for me. Mr. Guernsey, can you help clarify what we're being told about the necessity of resolutions now to fix things in codenext? >> No. What I understood is that there was a desire to do it now because of the urgency that councilmember Houston just expressed. It could be done now or it could be done during codenext. But there's an urgency I understood on the councilmember's part that she wanted the action to take sooner -- take affect sooner than later. >> Houston: This is almost like an emergency action. >> Flannigan: I understand. That's why I'm with you. >> And it was not Mr. Guernsey, it was one of the consultants as we were driving around and we were talking about how that would impact the neighborhood, the further destabilization of the neighborhood. >> Flannigan: I understand that, and believe me, I went

back and looked at old news stories. I understand the problem we're trying to fix here and I'm with you and we'll likely pass this and we'll light up the board green as

[9:41:36 AM]

they say in the Lege, on Thursday. But I just wanted to be expressed that clear not as a council going to have to remove things from the current code in order for them to be fixed in the new code. I think there's been some implication that that's what was being said today. >> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry? >> [Inaudible - no mic]. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, I'll work with you. >> Garza: I just wanted to say I support this. I think it's a compatibility issue and there are no community benefits, I just wanted to make the broader point that I have big concerns of doing this piece by piece when we should have been looking at the entire code and we're not doing that. And it's just been a very complicated process for everyone. And we're not doing what we said we would be doing if we're making these exceptions for different areas and different things. But I fully support the intent of this resolution. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Then we'll move on to the next item. The next item we have is item number 62. Councilmember alter. >> Alter: Before I talk about 62, I just wanted to go back to item 18 for a second. I want to draw to the attention of our colleagues that without the Alo in effect the biosolids contract will need to move forward, so by doing nothing here the Alo will be waived for biosolids. I don't see anyone from water here or Scarborough still here. I will try to get some clarity on that, but I just want people to know that you will be lobbied about the biosolids contract. This is the key contract that was the reason we went through this whole process, so I just want you to be aware of that. I'm going to talk with Austin water to make sure

[9:43:38 AM]

that they are comfortable with proceeding under this particular set of rules, unless Mr. Good wants to speak to that, but I do think it's important and we're all aware that that is likely to be what happens and that may or may not be a good thing since this is the contract that has been at the center and the heart of why we've had to move forward in the way that we have. So Mr. Good, if you had some thoughts on that. >> Sure of. Robert good, assistant city manager. Sorry, staff was here and then water utility is fine with that. Their whole concern is we've got to get that contract in place so that they're fine with it. If you decide to continue, right now it is exempt for previous council action if you choose to continue that process, then we would continue that rfp as it is on the street, which is waived now. >> Alter: And this is something that we flagged the last time when we proposed it that this was one of the pieces that was impacted by what we were doing with the Alo in postponing it. I just want to make sure that people are aware of it and what it means is that the various players will be coming and trying to talk to all of us and

we can all agree that we're not going to meet with any of them. Or that may be a decent solution, but we just need to be aware that that's coming. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar. >> Casar: So is one -- are we posted to actually be able to take any action to give direction around whether or not we want the Alo in place on this thing or not, or are our options essentially to postpone it, deal with the entirety of the ordinance or do something informal? >> The rfp on the street now does not have the Alo in place. It's already waived.

[9:45:39 AM]

>> Alter: So there's still the possibility that it comes back, so the draft Alo doesn't have the Alo applying until the solicitations come back, so at this stage in the process if we were to adopt the new Alo it would be no different. I don't know when that -- >> November 7th. >> Alter: So it would be coming back on the 7th. So if we pass it on the 7th there would be a short window at the very least when they would potentially be able to do that. This was just brought to my attention right before we walked in so I don't have a full download of the implications. And it may be that we all wanted to say, okay, we're not going to talk to any of them and then it's resolved. But I about want to make sure that people were aware of that consequence of postponing the aol. -- The Alo. And I will try to get more information and if I get something beyond this to report, I will, but I believe the only option we have is to go back to the old Alo in this case under the posting language. >> Casar: It would be helpful -- I would love to hear what our options are. In the end it is a month, so I know that it's not of monumental response and many of us might be out for a few days around Thanksgiving -- I guess it's next month. I'm already getting ready for Thanksgiving. [Laughter]. So -- >> Mayor Adler: Good try, though. [Laughter]. >> Casar: So it may not be such a big deal, but I was generally operating under the assumption that while the Alo was -- while we were in this Alo consideration period that we would do our best not to change too many things up by default. So if the council comes up being creative. >> Alter: I want to say that the Alo waiver only applies to the waste management category of contracts. It's a very small subset.

[9:47:40 AM]

The contract that we know that's at issue is the biosolids. So it's just one contract. And I don't know if it's possible, if there's more information, since we'll be here all day anyway, if someone can come back, and I apologize for having not flagged that sooner. It was two minutes before and then she started talking and I didn't have a chance to sort of fully absorb it. But I do think it's important to daylight it. I don't know if it's possible for -- to come back later. >> If I understood what your questions are I could possibly answer most of them. The solicitations are due November 7th. The original idea was perhaps you wanted to take an Alo that would take effect from that November 7 bid solicitations due period until the

contract is awarded. But in the rfp that we put on the street we envision that we might put an Alo in place, but there's no Alo in place for the rfp. So if you left it alone there would be no Alo in place and we could proceed forward with the solicitation. >> Alter: But under the posting we have for Thursday my understanding is we have to go back to the old Alo on -- >> We don't need any direction for biosolids. >> Alter: But if we wanted to apply an Alo to biosolids, wouldn't we have to take an action since we waived it? >> I think the previous action gave staff an ability to put in an Alo. If you are nodding your head that said just leave it alone, then we would leave it alone. >> Alter: So without direction from us, staff will put in an Alo. >> No, we would leave it alone. >> Alter: Okay. But we could -- would we have to take a vote on that? So how would you know if we wanted you to -- >> No direction from you, you would leave the Alo out and proceed as the rfp is in place with no Alo in place. >> Mayor Adler: I think what they're saying is from from the dais they would want to have a majority of the council indicate a desire. >> If you wanted an Alo in

[9:49:41 AM]

place that is what we would need on Thursday. >> Alter: But under the posting language we can put that forward. >> Mayor Adler: We can't take action, but they could certainly walk away -- >> With direction. >> Mayor Adler: With direction. >> Alter: So then -- >> Mayor Adler: Actually, it wouldn't be really direction. They could walk away with a sense of where a majority of the council was. >> Alter: Okay. Then probably it would be best offline for us and maybe councilmember pool and anyone else in the working group or anyone else who wants to have a conversation about whether we do want to put any sort of Alo in place for biosolids to have that conversation. And if we conclude that we want to, then we'll bring that forward on Thursday for discussion under this item. Is that the appropriate way going forward? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. Councilmember Houston? >> Houston: I don't have a problem saying I don't have any time to meet. Rather than going through all of those things rather than going through the anti-lobbying provision, just say I'm not going to meet. >> Renteria: I have that same sense. I'm always looking out to get the best deal for the city anyway. So they can come and honor by all they want to, but -- and lobby all they want to but I'll look at the bottom line and get us the best deal. So I don't care either way. Doesn't matter to me. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan. >> Flannigan: I agree councilmember alter on this point. I don't know that we have to wait until Thursday for direction or for measuring a sense, whatever the language is we're talking about. I'm with councilmember alter on that. I think it makes sense to maintain some level of consistency with how vendors are operating even if it's just one contract. And I can also say that I don't have time to meet, but

[9:51:42 AM]

it doesn't stop them from filling up my inbox. I would rather not have that happen too. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar? >> Casar: I will say this at risk of being the guy who just thought Thanksgiving was in October. [Laughter]. So I just have a sense of deja Vu when we had this discussion about the Alo and this contract. The last time we postponed this, didn't we already have a conversation about this about protecting ourselves from having too much lobbying happening? Maybe somebody could check the tape there and remind me, but I have a sense that we have been through this already on this contract. >> Pool: We do. There was another on this contract and it was the organics by gosh and that proceeded without any anti-lobbying in place. I think that was two months ago. >> And I think the timing of this was remember you have on Thursday an Alo. So if you would have adopted that on Thursday we could have put that, although there's some debate about the rules, we could have put that in effect by November 7, by the time the solicitations were due. So that was the timing. And now that you're delaying Alo to a future date, the revision -- and this kind of complicates the biosolids rfp. >> Casar: We've already postponed the Alo once when we sent it to ethics review commission and I think when we postponed it to sent to erc we had this conversation about this contract and -- >> You did. But it's going to come back to you on Thursday. Now we're postponing it again so that complicates the biosolids. >> Casar: That's fine. Okay, thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Anything else on this 18? All right, councilmember alter, 62. >> Alter: So 62 is the audit plan. I really appreciate us postponing this last week so

[9:53:42 AM]

that we could create the space to have a conversation with Ms. Stokes our auditor. As you may recall, the audit plan normally comes up in audit and finance for discussion and one month and then is voted on the next month. There was not -- I believe there was not a quorum or something in August and that meeting was canceled. So that opportunity to have that discussion didn't happen in audit and finance. In the interim from last week I was able to spend some time with Ms. Stokes and also to speak with councilmember Casar, who expressed some interest last week also in the plan. We were able to meet and id a list of products that could be swapped in if we choose over the next couple of days or be replacement projects if we kept the plan as it is. I'd like to invite Ms. Stokes to speak to where we are at with the plan and some options that we may have at this point in time. >> Corrie stokes, city auditor. Good morning. So you have a few documents in front of you or perhaps that were included as part of the backup. But the main thing I wanted to point you to is on the proposed audit plan there's a new version that has a third page that has Orange bar across the top and is called replacement projects. The concept here, this is something that we've done in the past, is to have a replacement list in case anything on the plan goes off the plan for whatever reason, either there's initiatives under way that make it not a great time to do an audit, or we're covering the risk in other work that we're doing. So the replacement list has seven projects on it currently, although I did flag two of those as possible special request projects. This list can grow or shrink, but the idea was to look at any of these projects that might be good candidates for either

[9:55:44 AM]

replacing something on the plan, which would be page 1 of the plan, all of the new projects, or basically moving up to the front page of the plan to replace something that's currently on there. I think one of the things for me is that this is an iterative process. I try to meet with you in the summer and get together with some of the initiatives in the city, but there may be some things that we're already auditing a lot in that area or the timing was right when we put it on the plan, but it's not as right now. So really wanted to get a sense from y'all of the projects that should be on this front page, the top 10. There were a couple of projects and discussions that I think just based on my analysis of what's going on in the city could be moved off. One of the projects is actually -- it's a little confusing because it's a carryover project, but we've barely started it. It's looking at down payment assistance, which is a fairly small program within nhcd and we are already looking at several other things in nhcd with our homelessness assistance series as well as we're looking at the match savings program, which is an availability program in hcd. So that's one that I would flag as a possibility to move off. We have initiated that work, but only internally. So we haven't gotten far enough for that one really to have to stay on the plan. I would say the rest of the carryover does -- we're within a month or two of finishing all the rest of the nine projects on carryover. And then on the front page another project, affordable housing tenant selection is one that came up. And certainly a lot of people expressed interest in it at the time, but I also had just like happens, kind of with any topic, there was an interest in this topic and council took some action related to this topic and management has taken some action related to this

[9:57:44 AM]

topic, so that's another one I would say in terms of economic opportunity and affordability, while that's really kind of the front page project on that topic, we are in that area because of the interest in the city and because of the -- really the impact of affordability efforts. We have a lot of affordability projects going on right now. So just in looking collectively, I think that's one. Again, depending on the interest of the council it can move off. I would say really anything on the front page is -- could be moved off just based on the interest of this group. >> Mayor Adler: I'd be a little bit hesitant to take the first one off. Without understanding better what the management action was or where we were only because I think it big part of what we need to do is to really do the density bonus programs or otherwise figure out how we're incenting, creating real mixed income opportunities. And to the degree that there's doubt in the community generally or in fact as to whether or not we're actually achieving that, then we undercut the belief in the process. Which would make it difficult for us to be able to do something. So I think the integrity of that process is -- for me as I look at the first page is perhaps one of the most important things on that entire first page. But I do look at the lobbyist registration compliance. That's only been in

effect for two months. I know that our ordinance said we wanted to do that annually and I think we do. What and first one of those will be after it's been in place for a year so I'm not sure if we need that one right away. I just don't know. >> Pool: Mayor, I'm really -- I really want to see with -- even though it has only been in effect for less than a year, I want to

[9:59:45 AM]

see -- we need to benchmark how well our city clerk office and -- and other folks in community understood our changes and how well they were implemented. Because if there are any corrections that we need to make, I don't want to wait for another full year for bad habits to form, which is why I specifically will advocate for us leaving that piece alone. It may not take as much time as some of these others, but I think that its priority is very high. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mr. Renteria >> Renteria: You know, I really wanted to see the neighborhood centers as the city has gentrified and the lower-income people are moving further out in the suburb areas out, we really need to look at these locations that we have and are they really, you know, meeting the needs of the low-income. I know that my colleague, Greg Casar, district 5, you know, they have a huge population of low-income people because they have a lot of affordable apartments in that area, and I know in my district now that -- that Austin -- east Austin neighborhood center has gotten to the point where it can't be consolidated with the rosewood neighborhood centers so we really need to look at some of these, how we're spending our money there and are we really meeting the needs of our people that are most needing. >> Mayor Adler: Any other comments? Yes, councilmember alter -- okay, councilmember Casar >> Casar: I had mentioned when we postponed this item on Thursday that I'm really interested in having the auditor look at the citizen review panel recommendations and how -- how faithfully

[10:01:46 AM]

those are implemented, how often they are versus aren't implemented, and then when they aren't, how the communication comes back to that panel and to other interested parties about why they weren't. There's been recent report from the Texas criminal justice coalition that listed a pretty long significant list of recent citizen review panel recommendations that they said haven't been implemented. And we just got an email, I think, from the chair of the public safety commission and the chair of the crp, citizen review panel, asking for this to be audited, I think between now and Thursday we should -- can figure out whether it needs to be on the full audit plan list or if it can fit into a special report. But I think that in many ways it warrants a significant amount of work, and having it all in one place I think would be really helpful for the community. So between here and Thursday, we'd work on that. I of course -- that means something else would have to be lowered in priority, and I would see some of these things on the new

audit's list as potentially auditing smaller programs, like the home repair program that have a smaller level of scope and potentially those would be more of a special project deal because it's a smaller program rather than some of the really -- the issues dealing with very large amounts of personnel and large departments. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter -- I'm sorry, go ahead >> I will say on that, I did have a chance, I think we spoke about this last week and I hadn't had a chance to see the report but I have had a chance to look through there. I do think that many of the recommendations that have been flagged as outstanding would come in. We can include those within the scope of our audit number 3 here, the police

[10:03:46 AM]

response to people with special needs. I think that that -- some of those recommendations would really fit right in the scope of that audit. I think, you know, we could as special request or as an audit itself. >> Casar: I think the challenge is given so many of the recommendations don't have to do with mental health or special needs, if those were handled separately then would these things then be stored in separate documents and would there -- would we potentially miss -- one, have the sort of separate reports, which idea would be less accessible to community members trying to handle this issue, and then a second question I might have and this is why it might be best off-line is if we separate this out as a mental health and special needs and then other crp audit, that are we missing out on the opportunity of looking at why some of these recommendations aren't being put into effect and how well it's being communicated back to the panel and to the community when they aren't being looked at when we -- when it's really not an audit on citizen review panel registrations. Now it's a audit on some citizen review panel recommendations and -- so I think that's my concern. But if there's capacity to do it in two separate places I wonder if there's a creative way we could redirect that capacity to have one audit. >> Right. We certainly don't -- I also think we have ongoing follow-up which will follow up I think some of the work we did related to the complaint process would fall into this next cycle of follow-up, so there's a few different places to do it. I guess the thing we would need to discuss is the reporting aspect. It sounds like reporting in one place -- even if we touched on this topic and three separate projects, sounds like the desire would be to have one report out. >> Casar: I mean, I could see some significant benefit to not having to go find this in three different places and to have the same

[10:05:47 AM]

staff working on it so if they start noticing a trend across three different places that it could be reported on in one report, if that makes sense. >> Mm-hmm. >> Casar: But that may just be a construct of arbitrary like what's a special project and what goes on this list? So maybe between here and Thursday

we can think of some smart way of getting through the arbitrary constructs and just getting to, if you have the staff who are interested in doing this and you're thinking about doing it three different places, maybe there's some way the council can just give you the direction to go do that all at once. >> Yes. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter. >> Alter: I was wondering if Ms. Stokes could speak to the affordable housing tenant selections. It's my understanding that we've passed some resolutions addressing that and we pretty much know that we're not doing it in an equitable manner which is why we have passed those resolutions. >> I believe there has been effort over the last six months or so to try to come up with an inventory of all the units and I believe even all of the population of people who might need those units, but that's something I would have to look to management to -- to city manager probably to talk more about. >> Alter: And I just want to point out that a comment that Ms. Stokes made earlier is that on the list of carryover audits there's a large number of them that are in -- focused on nhcd. It's a lot of audits to be done in one department that has a new director, that has the housing blueprint, and the office of the auditor does have a role for the entire city and functioning of the entire city. And so I would be proposing that we would maybe look at some of the audit topics that are on the replacement list, assuming we're also

[10:07:48 AM]

able to address councilmember Casar's concerns through the other ways that we've talked about. So the first one on that list is city staffing, and this is managing vacancies to minimize overtime costs and assure meets with net. This is something that came up over and over again with respect to talks. I know I talked about it with respect to fire. But it's something that came up pretty much in every department. There were a lot of departments that had that. It's not something we've looked at, which leads to number 4, human resource governance, which you've been hearing from different staff members they're concerned about capacity there, we also have issues with retirement and retention we need to be able to be moving towards. So it's a step along the way towards the human resource governance. Number 3 is also that way. That's looking at police and fire use of civilian staff. I also want to call attention to item 2 okay, with traffic safety. And what I'm particularly interested in here are the interrelationship between our enforcement efforts or a lack of enforcement efforts and its impact on several other departments, and I will highlight two for owe. One is atd has to do -- their local area traffic management, put speed bumps all over the city because there's no traffic enforcement. We are looking for a behavioral change in those issues which normally comes from police enforcement of the traffic laws, which is not happening. So then we end up having to put these speed bumps and make people's lives unhappy as they're driving through their communities. We also have a situation where if you look at the municipal court, which I know many people on this dais are concerned about and we just created the judicial committee, they have a drop in revenue of something on the order of \$2 million because these traffic enforcement is not taking place arbitration which we are now taking care of out of general fund money. So those are just two of the examples of where not having

[10:09:51 AM]

this process work effectively or equitably is really impacting several other departments in way that they're able to function and people's quality of life. And so I am particularly interested in one and two, and it seems like we could move the down payment assistance or we could move the affordable housing tenant selection or the home repairs and be able to focus on a better balance of topics across this two-year period since last year we did so much that was nhcd and we have a new director. When you have an audit it does impact your ability to get your work done, and we should be thinking about how that's distributed. We also need to be thinking about how much of our resources are affected by the choices that are made in any particular area. Calibrate the down payment assistance Ms. -- I think the down payment assistance Ms. Stokes mentioned is a small amount of money not affecting a huge number of people. I'm not saying it's not important but it may be something that could be done with a special request. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston, and then the mayor pro tem. >> Houston: Yes. And I appreciate these additional options because the budget process is one that is important to me. There's got to be a better way to do budget and make it more equitable and not as contentious as this last one turned out to be. So I would support the budget process. >> Alter: Mayor, if I could speak to that one. Ms. Houston, I share your concern with the budget process. The reason that that was put later down it's my understanding through the is strategic planning process the consultant has been engaged to help us to improve the budget process, and then there's also a piece of that that we could do through a special request in comparing with other cities. We haven't yet had a chance

[10:11:51 AM]

to talk with the consultant about whether that's already under their purview and scope of work that they may already have that information so we didn't want to reinvent the wheel. But in my conversations with Mr. Struthers over the strategic planning process he made it very clear he was doing a deep dive into the process, so that's why we kind of put it lower down but I completely agree with you that we have to improve that process. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: I just want to get kind of clear on what the different amendments will be. It sounds as if, councilmember alter, you're suggesting the traffic -- the traffic one and a potential elimination of one of the three that you mentioned. I would argue -- I would advocate for keeping the home repairs. As I said in the audit and finance meeting, there's been kind of a long ongoing discussion about home repair programs here at the city of Austin and whether we would get more leverage from our dollars if Austin energy's weatherization program were combined with some of the work that some of the programs that exist in nhcd so that's -- I really look forward to that work to help us sort out what the different programs are and whether they could be done more cost effectively and in a more user friendly way for our Austin

residents, if we made some changes to that. And I think I shared with the audit committee that at various points in my time on council stakeholders have asked us to make changes to those programs and in fact I think I probably have a resolution that my office drafted about making some combinations or making some changes floating around. So I just think that that is one we would really benefit from keeping. And so I'm going to ask that we try to find another one to move if there's an addition. And talking about the budget reminds me that we had talked in passing -- and I brought this up at our audit

[10:13:52 AM]

and finance meeting as well -- about having a conversation as a council about before it gets too far in the background about our budget process this year. I think we certainly can maybe learn from some other cities, but I think that while I think there's some global issues that we can address through our strategic planning process, I think some San Francisco what I would like to talking about -- some of what I would like to talking about is how it unfolded this year and why it purchased to be more challenging in some respects than others and how we can think towards next year and some of the things that we might want to do differently. So we had talked, mayor, about maybe having a 20 minute discussion, I don't think it should be a long one, maybe a 15 minute, 20 minute debrief while it's fresh in our mind so I suggest that would be a good step to addressing some of -- some changes. >> Mayor Adler: We'll set that for a work session. You know, as we hear the conversation, corrie, with respect to everybody wants potential different things on the audit plan, I don't know if there's a way to add some metrics to the process associated with at least being able to compare different things. In the pages that you gave us in terms of what was -- what you looked at, you looked at audit coverage and your resources and timing. I think those are all things to look at. The first two things you listed were risk or impact level. I'm not exactly sure what that means or the things that you look at. Maybe when people are suggesting things you could take a look at and indicate with choices how much of our budget does that impact so we can see which items are impacting large portions of our budget. Maybe it's the number of people that are impacted so that we have that metric. And not to say that we

[10:15:53 AM]

decide it just based on those two things but at least there would be some basis to be able to look at to be able to compare. The second one you had was stakeholder interest and community impact. I would think that would be something you could just get directly from the council, that since the council sets those priorities, that -- I mean, to the degree that you're getting community input requests, that's something you could share with the council but then the council could be the arbiter of community interest or impact or stakeholder impact. But just something so that there's some standard or evaluative

measure or metrics to be looking at in terms of what makes the list or doesn't or recognizing that the council can do whatever it wants to on any given issue, but just some metrics. >> Mm-hmm. That's something we can certainly work on. I think one of the things that maybe we don't see as clearly in this process is that at some point during -- usually in July I sit down with all of you with a list and this year's list had -- I think it had the ten that are on here plus another 70 plus projects, and those came from a variety of sources. But the ten that end up on the plan either had very -- I guess the filter there had very high council interest or relatively high council interest in order to make the cut. So one of the documents that you have actually has the sources of input, and you can see that for all of the projects on here, with the exception, actually, of the coordination of the right-of-way, the council interest was really the driver that made it to the front page. Because of the strategic priorities -- and I think I said during our performance appraisal and development -- kind of looking to the future, plan for the next

[10:17:53 AM]

year, I said I wanted to try to hit all of those strategic priority areas with audit, and so that's where that mobility project actually came in. That was identified through the voice of the customer. I can't remember the name of the survey arbitration but basically the citywide citizen survey as a topic, as well as an audit that we did last year. So I would say that we can certainly get clear on the metrics and on how we do that evaluation of kind of the laundry list of potential projects to get down to just ten. I think you can see that the filter, council interest is one of I guess the most impactful filters. >> Mayor Adler: Maybe in the audit and finance committee we can do greater depth, you can say who on the council indicated interest for that and if management had interest we could better understand what it was that management had indicated, why it was an interest. I'm just trying to come up with -- because as we go around, there are a lot of people that want to do lots of different things, there's a limited amount of time and I'm just trying to figure out how to navigate that. Mr. Casar. >> Casar: And I think the high level of council interest on all these issues is probably why this is hard, but I want to speak to two points, the tenant selection item and then the traffic enforcement, to some extent. On tenant selection, mayor, I had a high -- I have a high level of interest in the topic. I think the housing and neighborhoods planning and housing committee has lots of interest in it, so I think this is an item that's really important. That's why we have two different committee recently had the housing department come and speak to it. While I have a high level of interest in it, I'm not sure whether in the -- our priority of audits it should

[10:19:53 AM]

make the top of the list because the housing department has made it really clear what some of the major gaps are already. They have a strong monitoring contract, and if we dedicated more resources to

it, they could monitor even more thoroughly, but it's not just about the monitoring. The challenge we face is even if people income qualify, whether or not we're getting people of lower economic power even if they are of lower economic income. Because we can measure people's economic -- people's income but not necessarily their power in the marketplace, and to address that power issue I think we need to do affirmative marketing and affirmative tenant selection, and that is also just a resourcessing programming -- resource and programming issue. I think the housing department has been so up front and clear and repetitive on those points we may just turn up an audit that tells us what it is we've already been told. In this budget cycle we dedicated some level of resources to -- not nearly to address the need, so I just wonder whether or not we need an audit to produce for us what I think is widely known, which is these programs are producing some level of units. If we recalibrate we can increase by four or five or six fold the number of units produced. We're doing some level of monitoring but the technology is weak and through investment in resources we can make the technology stronger and we should and our biggest gap is affirmatively marketing not just to low-income people but to low economic power folks which I think is part of that Austin up work. It's not just that this is changing, but the fact of the matter is it just seems like we have very clear to-dos on this front and our team of auditors could potentially produce other lists of to. Dos which would be helpful but the fact we know we have some very clear tasks and now the ball is our court, I just

[10:21:55 AM]

wonder whether or not we should spend our energy driving toward those. That's the reason I would be okay with removing that. Not because of lack of interest but because we have expressed so much interest now we're at a beyond auditing stage. Then as far as the traffic enforcement, if we can find a place in the plan for traffic enforcement to fit, I'm fine with that. I wouldn't oppose that. It's a lower priority for me than some of the other things on the list. But I would just say for -- as food for thought, I believe that our municipal court likely should run a deficit and likely should be subsidized by the general fund. I don't think this is at all what you were implying at all, councilmember, but I just think it's important to restate over and over that I think that the incentive for any municipality is oftentimes to try to generate revenue through enforcement and through the courts, and to think it's part of our job as councilmembers to continuously hold that back to make sure the administration of justice is never tied to revenue generation. Again, I don't think that that's at all what was implied by the councilmember because I think your point is adequate enforcement of traffic could lower that gap without creating an incentive there, but I just -- that's just such a dangerous thing that all cities confront that I think it just sort of bears saying and repeating. And so -- but at the same time I wouldn't oppose if we had space for it to fit traffic enforcement into, into the audit plan. And what it might turn out saying is unfortunately that we may have -- so much of this may be design and infrastructure work that we have to do if we ever want to change people's behaviors that we may not be able to change through mere enforcement and ticketing so that would be something I'd be interested in the auditor looking at if we do indeed do traffic

enforcement. I would love for the answer to be through some tickets people will slow down but if the answer indeed is we actually have to spend twice

[10:23:56 AM]

as much money in speed bumps and infrastructure changes because that's really what's driving speeding then I would want that answer to potentially be something we learn about, too, which would be unfortunate because it's really expensive but that may very well just be the situation that we're in. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember alter. >> Alter: Thank you. I want to -- there's a bunch of stuff here I want to speak to. I want to echo councilmember Casar's comments on the tenant selection. We did fund, in addition to Amanda and the city-up money, councilmember is part of the reason we're not doing that well, we don't have the ability to connect people up to the apartments since we don't know when they're available, and that's a key step in that. With respect to mayor pro tem's comment, what I was hoping today -- I don't know that I know exactly what I'm going to propose. I was trying to get a sense from my colleagues since we haven't had this conversation about where their priorities lay and, you know, I'm hearing that between city staffing and traffic safety that people might be more interested in traffic safety which item comfortable with. I was hoping to be able to use this conversation to get a sense of where other people's priorities are since part of the thing that doesn't happen with this process is us having a conversation about our priorities specific to the audit as opposed to specific -- to particular issues throughout the year. I also wanted to speak to the mayor's point about perhaps this going back to audit and finance, not this particular plan, but the process sort of moving forward. It seems to me we probably want to make a decision on this plan before we could think about whether in the future we want more of that data and other stuff and audit and finance would be an appropriate place. I want to throw out there there's another appropriate place we should be thinking about. It's a little tricky because of an auditor's role, is what is auditor's role in the strategic planning process or whatever we come up with at the other end of

[10:25:58 AM]

the strategic planning process. And there are some limits that Ms. Stokes discussed with me on that, but I think that, you know, if our end product of the strategic plan doesn't incorporate how we want to use the resources we have in the auditor, we will have missed an opportunity to be advancing our goals in the strategic plan. So I hope to the extent she feels comfortable and as appropriate that Ms. Stokes can participate and that the city manager will facilitate that. Again, within the professional guidelines that the auditor is comfortable with. I will, you know, be thinking about how I take in this information, if other people have other thoughts on one's -- I mean, it seems like the affordable housing tenant

selection or the down payment assistance might be the best options and maybe councilmember Casar and I can coordinate to figure out the best approach for the citizen review board and maybe come up with a joint approach for Thursday. I look forward, you know, to continuing this conversation and I wanted to have this conversation, I think it's important today, because the auditor's office is very important in my mind to the well functioning of the city, and this discussion was meant to highlight the fact that auditors are useful and important to our work. So I appreciate Ms. Stokes' willingness to have the conversation and look at the process and allow us this opportunity. But if anyone has any additional thoughts on that I still have room in my quorum on it and I would be happy to talk with those. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else? Great. Then we'll move on. Thank you. Those are all the pulled items we had. We have the executive

[10:28:00 AM]

session that's going to be a lengthy one today on the -- some of the items that are there. But we also have set the mobility discussion. Do we want to pick that up right after lunch and go in executive session or do we want to have the mobility discussion first? After. All right. Do we want to go into executive session now? >> Houston: I saw one of the consults here. Is that for something on the agenda? There he is right there. For the city manager? Is that for the executive session? Rather than -- >> Mayor Adler: Yes, yeah, yeah. >> Houston: You did mention that, so -- >> Mayor Adler: That's what I think may take up most of the time in executive session. Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: Mayor, I know we have our planning and -- our planning staff and codenext staff. We're going to take that up again after -- we're going to take up our codenext piece of today after lunch at that point in time. Is that correct. >> Mayor Adler: My guess is probably about 1:00. >> Tovo: Okay, great. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember troxclair. >> Troxclair: I know we've had the transportation staff here. Is there a reason that we're not hearing that briefing now? >> Mayor Adler: Well, they're also going to be here for the codenext deal at 1:00. >> Troxclair: Just makes sense for them to come back then. >> Mayor Adler: It is 10:30. We're going to go into executive session to take up seven items pursuant to 551.074 of the government code, personnel matters related to e2, e3, e4, e5, e6, which is the search for new city manager, and then compensation and benefits for the city manager, city clerk, city auditor, municipal court clerk, pursuant to 551.071 we're going to take up legal matters related to city of Austin labor negotiations concerning ems and police, e8, which is the Reagan national advertising versus

[10:30:00 AM]

Austin lawsuit, and the 200 for judicial district Travis county. E1 has been withdrawn without objection. Here at 10:31 we will now go into executive session. [Executive session]

[1:21:37 PM]

' I you he

[2:12:14 PM]

[executive session]

[2:27:47 PM]

Session]] Executive session] [Executive session] >> [Executive session session]. >>> >> [Executive session]

[2:57:30 PM]

>> I'm going to call us back. We are out of executive session, and what time is it? I don't have any glasses on. Does anybody know? There we go. 2:57, we're out of closed session, in closed session we discussed personnel matters related to e2, e3, e4, e5, and e6. So we'll resume our council meeting. Councilmember, was there something that you wanted to bring up? >> Sure, but I think we may actually need -- I think it would be interesting to everybody but having councilmember Garza and councilmember Renteria here is important. We have the mobility bond corridor prioritization item, and three of us were gone last week, so it was brought back now, and I wanted to get a sense of whether we want -- from those three, but also from y'all, whether we still want to do that today with our limited time, but I think it would be hard to test that without both of them in the room. >> Does that sound good to everybody? And we can wait until councilmember Renteria and councilmember Garza come back in and come back to that. Would that work? Okay. So let's see, what do we have next, on this briefing is our subdivision chapter, and should we take up subdivisions first? All right. >> Good afternoon. Assistant city manager. Item d1 is a discussion related to the adoption and implementation of code next proposed regulations. If we have time, transportation as well, and to do go over the

[2:59:30 PM]

subdivision portion, I'll introduce Steve Hopkins from the >> Good afternoon, Steve Hopkins, with the development services department. My presentation today is about the subdivision chapter in codenext, specifically what we'll do is identify the changes from the existing code to what is proposed in codenext. So a quick summary is there's really just few changes. The intent was to simplify and clarify the process. And codify existing policies. One of the -- it's not really a change but it comprises most of the new material in the subdivision code, is that it provides a legal basis and policy context that is missing in the current code. That was strongly recommended by the legal department, and it has been included. Second was to clarify the existing procedures. Next we wanted to remove impediments to affordability and missing middle housing, and, finally, street layouts will be context sensitive. That is a topic that will segue into the transportation presentation. What I want to make sure that everyone understands is when I say street layout will be context sensitive, that is not related to how the street will be improved. It's not related to street widths, street trees, anything like that. It's talking about block lanes. And I will give you some more explanation with that towards the end of the presentation. So the legal basis and policy context that's the

[3:01:32 PM]

new portion of the code, it really just explains the purpose of the subdivision regulations and how those regulations are intended to implement the policies contained in the imagine our current code so this is not just a process for process sake. It is intended to create -- help create the vision that is in codenext -- or, excuse me, in imagine Austin second, it will clarify what can and cannot be done on land that has not been properly subdivided. Right now it's a little bit fuzzy that has resulted in some needless confusion. Next the changes provide details on what the land use commission may consider in reviewing applications. That is not a change to their authority. It does not reduce their authority in any way, it just provides a clearer path so they can make a clear decision. One of the overall goals was to clarify existing procedures. There's a lot of things we do that are -- we've done over the years, but they're more interception interceptions of code. What we've done is clarify and codify those for amending plats, plat vacations, simple adopting state law. We also better described the expiration requirements and the consequences of what happens if you -- if your project dies. And we clearly identify the allowed exceptions to the subdivision process. That's nothing new. That's just clarifying what is current process or current policy.

[3:03:38 PM]

Also in clarifying procedures we want to describe the process for recording plats, consistent with state law, and also consistent with current practice. The final one here, revise the original tract process, the approval requirements for the original tract process will remain the same, but we will streamline that review process. So it will not be a separate review process. Currently, I can go into what an original tract is if had to send a letter to certain landowners, and then the city had to send a certified letter to those landowners ten days later. That was a needless process. So that is the only thing we will eliminate, but all the other standards for that process remain the same. >> Alter: May I just clarify if it was a needless process to send two letters to the landowners or that it was a needless process to send a letter to a landowner? >> It was a duplication of effort. >> Alter: Okay. So there will still be a letter sent -- >> There will not be a letter, but the neighbors will be informed. Through the notification process. >> Alter: So if you're not going to do it by letter, is there -- I mean, do we call the notification something other than a letter? >> There's a notification required for the plat, and the -- that notification will include this balance -- or, excuse me, the original tract language in it. So the neighbors are informed. >> Alter: So it's not that you're eliminating the duplication across notification for original tract. You're eliminating that notification altogether because you think it should be collapsed into a prior notification that's already happening? >> Correct.

[3:05:39 PM]

>> Alter: Okay. >> All right. Now, the affordability and missing middle housing, what we want to do is incorporate the best practices for subdivision review. We want to remove impediments to creating affordability and missing middle housing, and those are also supported by the neighborhood housing and community development department. And I will go into those specific requirements in just a moment. Two of those items are flag lots and single family attached dwellings. What we want to do is flag lots right now, if you are dividing an existing lot and it contains a -- if you were -- excuse me. I'll back up. If you are dividing unplatted land and it includes a flag lot, you do not need a variance for that flag lot. However, if you are subdividing an existing platted all right into a flagged lot you do need a variance. The only difference between those two situations is you're starting with unplatted land versus starting with a platted lot. If you're starting with a platted lot, you need a variance to create a flag lot. That is not a best practice, and staff is recommending getting rid of the flag lot variance but requiring all the other standards for a flag lot, specifically there's a requirement for a driveway and utility plan, and the flag lot needs to meet the minimum lot size requirements, but the requirements for a variance we're recommending against. Secondly, single family attached dwellings, we're recommending that those go -- be allowed in any zone

[3:07:39 PM]

that allows duplexes. And I can show you the difference between -- we'll start with a flag lot first. You can see what the flag lot is. It's a regular-sized lot, but it's attached to the street, with just a strip of land. It still meets the requirements of the zone that the flag portion of that lot needs to meet the minimum lot size requirements. And this here is showing single family attached. It looks like a duplex, but it's one structure that contains two dealings, and each of those dwellings is on a separate lot. And this is an important tool for affordability. This just further shows the difference between a duplex and single family attached. And, finally, street layouts, street layouts will be context sensitive, and that means they will vary by the zoning district. That's different than in current code, where it's more of a one size fits all. The minimum lots are -- excuse me, the minimum block length in the current code is 1200 feet that applies everywhere, to all residential Zones, and that is not a best practice. It should vary. It should vary by zone. Now, again, these are not standards for street width or street trees or street type. It's just block length. Now, the importance of that, of varying the block

[3:09:41 PM]

length -- get to the next one here. The difference between these two scenarios is block length. You can have a very suburb type of development, which will have some geographic constraints, most likely. Versus a very urban development, and the only difference is that the block lengths are shorter on the right and longer on the left. So that is intended to implement the purpose of each of the zoning districts. A more urban zone, more dense zone, would have a shorter block length. And a suburban zone or a much less intense zone would have a longer block length. And that is -- I can go back and discuss how each neighborhood will be served by an appropriate street network. Some of those -- some of these standards like dead end streets, access roads and street alignment are currently in the subdivision chapter. We thought it would be better to move that to transportation. As well as the block length standards are also in the transportation code. And that is all my presentation, and I can just stand for any questions >> Mayor Adler: Any questions? Yes, Ms. Garza. >> Garza: The flag lots, I'm still trying to understand what is changed. So now it requires -- if you can put on slide 8. Now it requires the variance if you want to do this? Draft it will no longer require a variance as long as they meet all the necessary

[3:11:42 PM]

setbacks? They can just -- is that right? >> Yeah, that's generally right. What the current code says is if you have unplatted land, you can go ahead and create flag lots. All you have to do is meet the minimum standard, just like any other lot. But if you have a platted lot, let's say it's 5 acres -- it could be any size. Let's just say it's 5 acres and you want to further divide that lot and some of those lots will be flag lots, then each of those flag lots needs a variance. And that is -- that has an impact because most of these

flag lots that are being created are not by big developers. It's by just the mom and pop who have a single lot, it's a large lot, and they want to divide it. And a variance is very expensive, and the worst part is that you can go through the process, you've spent tens of thousands of dollars and you get -- >> Garza: I totally understand that part. I'm right there with you. I want to make sure I understand that is no longer required, owner process is no longer required in the current draft? >> That is the only change to the flag lots. All the other requirements for the flag lots stay the same. >> Garza: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember alter, then councilmember pool. >> Alter: Thank you. I was wondering if you could provide an example for -- on page 3 of a situation where you need to clarify what can and cannot be done on land that hasn't been properly subdivided? I understand that was part of the basis but I'd like just a little more context. >> Yeah. >> Alter: Like what are we guarding against or clarifying here? >> Well, the -- right now, the code requires if you're going to get utility service

[3:13:43 PM]

or any permits from the city, that you will have a platted lot. If you do not have a platted lot, you are very limited on what you can do. And we have spelled out exactly what those situations are where you can receive service or what you are allowed to do if you do not have a properly platted lot. Now, there's -- one of the exceptions is that you've had this piece of ground in its current configuration since before you were subject to the city's jurisdiction. Now, if it's -- if you've -- let's say you -- if that lot has changed configurations since that date, then that would be considered not a properly divided piece of land. Is that answer -- >> Alter: I guess I'm trying to understand if we're codifying what's there, if there are new things added? >> Nothing new has been added to that. We're just making clear and taking away any ambiguity. >> Alter: Okay. So it's just -- it's simply clarifying if you had -- >> Current standard practice. >> Alter: Current standard practice if it hasn't been properly subdivided, okay. Another question. On the slide 9 for the other case beside the flag lots, so I understand that the two units are connected. I understand why you'd want to do that. I was wondering what are the requirements for the lots? And does that change under this scenario, or is it just that you can have the Normal sized lots and they can be together? >> That's right. A -- the -- every lot needs to meet the minimum dimensional standard of the zone, and the zone will say whether or not you can have single family attached homes or not.

[3:15:47 PM]

>> Alter: So if you can have single family attached homes in that zone, then you'd be able to do this configuration without a variance? >> Correct. >> Alter: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, Ms. Pool. >> Pool: So I was curious on the flag lots about access for our public safety vehicles, if they need to get into the back of the property. So I think the fire code speaks to the width of the drive or the street, and have

you all talked with our staff and the fire department to make sure that the newer vehicles which tend to be larger would be able to get into the back of the lots in a flag lot configuration? >> Yes, I have discussed this with the fire department, and there are no conflicts. >> Pool: So would the width -- what would the standard width then be of the drive going to the back of the flag lot? >> Well, there's two things to look at here. There is the width of that pole, that skinny portion. >> Pool: Mm-hmm. >> And then the width of the improved surface or the width of the actual driveway. And what we've done is make sure that the width of that pole is more than adequate for any driveway that would be required by the fire department. >> Pool: And so what's the width of more than adequate? >> If you -- for one flag lot, it's 20 feet wide, is the minimum. If you have two flays -- flag lots and they have a common access, then each of those lots, the minimum width would be 15 feet, so the effective area would be 30 feet wide. >> Pool: Is 25 feet the standard width that the vehicles -- the engines require? How would they -- do we worry about them being able to get into the back of the lot with a 20-foot wide

[3:17:51 PM]

drive? >> The 20-foot wide is typically required in the second scenario, where you have two flag lots sharing an access. If you have just one flag lot, typically 25 feet would not be required. >> Pool: Okay. I don't understand that. So first we were talking about a single drive into a flag lot was 20 feet wide is what you were saying. And if you have two of them positioned adjacent that would be 15 and 15, so that would be 30 feet. And 25 feet I think is the standard width requirement for the fire trucks to be able to pass without bumping into anything. So my question goes more to the 20-foot wide, also with the 30-foot wide you want to make sure that there isn't a barrier in the middle that would also impede progress going back. And so I would like at some point, mayor, I think it would be helpful for us to have our staff from fire department come and talk you can to us a little bit make sure we're not inadvertently making it difficult for our public safety vehicles to get access to a property while we're making these determinations about how wide the access -- the driveway is supposed to be. >> Mayor Adler: I understand the question. >> Pool: Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Manager can check on that. >> I'll have the fire department provide some additional information on that. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, Ms. Garza. >> Garza: It sounds like the question is could a fire truck fit in a 20-foot driveway. What's the answer to that? >> I'm not going to say a fire truck will fit there. That's not my expertise. I will say that I've worked with fire department to find out what is the minimum lot -- what should be the minimum lot width, and they said 20 is adequate for a single lot. >> Garza: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Pool: So

[3:19:51 PM]

to that point, I definitely want to have that conversation with them, and if 20 feet is wide enough for them to be able to open the doors and to do all the activities that they need to, with hoses laid out in the driveway and so forth, then that information might inform some of our other decisions as well -- as how wide fire lanes need to be elsewhere. >> I need to ask for clarification. Do you want them to come speak to you or in writing? >> Pool: I think a memo would be great to everybody to give us that input. >> We'll get that done. >> Pool: Unless somebody else would like to talk with them directly. >> Mayor Adler: It would be great if you start with a memo. We have so many of these stacking up with each other and then after if people have questions. >> Pool: That would be great. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Renteria. >> Renteria: Yes, thank you, mayor. My question is, you know, presently a homeowner can -- if it's wide enough could condo out their backyard or sell the front and build another unit in the back, in my district I know they can do that. And how do y'all regulate the -- that little small strip? >> Are we talking about the flag lot? >> Renteria: Yes, mm-hmm. Yeah because what's happening right now is that there are people that are selling their backyard or they're selling their front house and building another unit in the back. And it's their -- they call it condoing out their property and building another unit in the back. But the house is already situated in the sense that they're just using their driveway to extend both -- to give back to the back unit. Would that be affected by this new rule here or. . . >> The condo laws are state laws, and we have no authority over that as a city. We cannot regulate the condo regimes. >> Renteria: Okay, thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Kitchen.

[3:21:51 PM]

>> Kitchen: I wanted to understand -- and I apologize if you mentioned this while I was out, but what are we doing -- Greg, it's been a while since we talked about this, or Mr. Guernsey, I'm sorry. Is it chapter 41? Is this the subdivision requirements that we have in place with Travis county? So -- and I think that's chapter 41, if I'm remembering correctly. It's something that I had wanted us to address, and I just wanted to know the current status of that. I'm not remembering what we said about that, so -- >> Greg Guernsey, planning and zoning. So I think we call it title 30 -- >> Kitchen: Title 30, I'm sorry, got the completely wrong chapter, sorry. >> There's a unique relationship between Travis county and city of Austin. It's provided for by state law, so we have basically a one office shop for subdivision, and we pretty much have to complete codenext before we can actually work with the county through a negotiation to bring in the etj, extra territory jurisdiction in Travis county to be-similar regulations. We have to formally contact them and we actually -- I've had discussions with an assistant city attorney -- or assistant county attorney at Travis county regarding this matter, and they understand that we pretty much have to finish our code before we can approach them with something to talk about. >> Kitchen: I would just suggest, again, it could be done as an iterative process but I know you have a lot on your plate so I'm not suggesting you need to do that now. I just think -- and the reason it's of importance to me is that -- there's development happening in the etj, and our current title 30 doesn't include all the controls that it could, assuming the county agrees

[3:23:52 PM]

with them so it's like everything else, yesterday would have been good to have it but obviously we have to get through this process. So I would just ask as we get through this process we not wait until this council finally adopts a code next before we start to talk to the county. Maybe we wait until after we have recommendations from the pci. I don't know. But at some point along the process because it's just -- the back and forth with county will take some conversation, but if we at least let them know where we're at and what we're talking about and in particular some of the differences between what we have right now in our code and what's in title 30 has to do with protection of trees, for example. So those are the kinds of things that aren't going to change completely radically and I just think it's important that we at least start to have that conversation with -- >> We can certainly contact the county. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> I think they've been kind of monitoring what we've been doing. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> We haven't really engaged them in one to one discussions I think on most of it, so -- but we can do that. >> Kitchen: Okay. And then I had one more question. Okay. That last question has to do with street layouts, and so I think what I'm seeing here is that that's all been moved over to the transportation chapter. >> Correct. >> Kitchen: And that includes the sections about connectivity, so we'll be talking about that next then, I guess. Okay. I just noticed you had this. So there's nothing in the subdivision code that speaks to this situation, right? >> That -- well, yeah, that's correct. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> I work closely with atd and public works and the favorite to come up with those standards that are

[3:25:53 PM]

reflected, the block length standards and the other -- I just put connectivity standards that are in transportation. >> Kitchen: They're in transportation. I want to talk about those because I have some concerns about them, but we can talk about it as part of transportation. Really my question we talk about is part of transportation, right? Is that what you're saying? >> That would probably be appropriate, yes. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan. >> Flannigan: Councilmember kitchen, were you talking about the nature and connectivity on one verse the other? >> Kitchen: I guess I should be more specific. What I mean is, to be more specific, our current code has certain requirements about streets and when they need to connect. Our current code only talks about connecting streets with regard to automobile traffic. It doesn't account for pedestrian or bicycle traffic. In other words, if -- we have a standard that relates to connecting people's ability to get around, but we don't -- we don't -- bicycle and ped doesn't count, in other words. So that has arrangement understand the past in some -- resulted in the past in some circumstances from my perspective I think we've insisted on punching through existing cul-de-sacs in the name of connectivity to the detriment of the neighborhood when we could have significant the pedestrian and bicycle. It's a big -- you know, it's a policy question the council

will have to talk about. I just want to know where in the code it was so I was trying to figure out when to have that conversation. But it sounds like that provision is in the transportation code. So. . . Does that answer your question? >> Flannigan: I think we're kind inform similar spots and I'll save it for transportation but it does seem like even the current code wouldn't allow for one of your -- some of your

[3:27:59 PM]

example on the left. >> Kitchen: Yeah. It's just that -- >> Flannigan: Poor connectivity, a poor example. The block size alone isn't going to turn the thing on the right to the left and the thing on the left doesn't get built anymore anyway. >> Kitchen: Right. >> Mayor Adler: Anything else on this presentation? That's it then for subdivision. We going to go to the mobility conversation or to the other presentation? >> We still have one outstanding presentation on codenext for transportation? Do you want to do that? >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Casar: I think the conversation was going to -- we just wanted to see whether or not we would punt the mobility bond prioritization conversation from today or not, at least three of us were gone last Tuesday. Watching the tape the mayor mentioned there didn't need to be too much discussion because we were going to repost this. I have a good handful of questions that at least I could ask off-line but what I'd be concerned about if I asked those questions off-line then y'all don't hear them and if that sparks some level of interest from the group, you know, that we would miss that opportunity by punting today at the same time I was scheduled through 3:00 P.M. For today and can stay through 4:00 so I just wanted to get a sense from other councilmembers. >> Mayor Adler: I would be in preference of staying and touch base on both those conversations if we can. >> Kitchen: Let me just make a point, just an informational item for everyone, not instead of whatever you want to do right now. The next mobility committee meeting we have scheduled a work session with our mobility team to go over the criteria in depth. That's just an FYI. Everybody is invited. I'm not suggesting instead this but I did want to let people know that was happening. >> Casar: That may serve as the replacement spot. What I want to best understand is since we're not taking a vote on this process but the staff is

[3:29:59 PM]

listening carefully to where the majority of us are at, I just want to make sure we set up a process where everybody is heard on what is, you know, several hundred million dollars worth of investment, you know, I want to -- us to set aside enough time to -- >> Mayor Adler: We're going to elevate that to a conversation with the council. We'll either do it today orb at some other point so we can get that information back to staff. To me the only question is how much time do we have today and how long will this presentation make and how long will that other thing happen. >> Kitchen: My point is for

people that want to really dig into the details. Not instead of it being in front of the full council but just as another opportunity. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. That's good. Councilmember Garza and then councilmember pool. >> Garza: I'm sorry to go back to the other one, but just real quick because was it Mr. Hopkins, you mentioned that with flag lots, the requirement for variance was something that was most difficult for homeowners, and I'm -- I'm really trying to find out more time, like other instances where that's the case? Because I'm hoping through this process to eliminate barriers and regulation that really affect the mom and pops trying to just do something with their piece of property we had -- we had a zoning case last week where a guy was trying to build two houses for his sons. I don't know if that's another codenext special presentation very specific to where our staffs are the best people to know what kinds of things do you see that affect the small homeowner just trying to change things? Because we hear time and time again how the permitting process hurts people because, you know, more regulations and fees don't help developer -- don't hurt developers. They hurt the small people. So is that a presentation you think you could make? Or we could have at some point? >> Certainly. >> Garza: All the different kinds of, you know, flag lots, whatever, ads,

[3:32:01 PM]

other things we see on a common basis or on a -- I think you understand my question. Is that something that we can maybe have a presentation about? >> Mayor Adler: We could. I'm trying to figure out -- and I need to work with you how best to tee that up because that's a question we could ask pretty much of everybody in all the presentations. I mean, that could be a filter we ask staff when they come to talk to us about ads, affordability, or transportation or subdivision, talk to us about how this relates to more frequent kind of mom and pop scenarios that impact that. I think that's a really good question to ask. It almost seems like it could apply to almost every presentation we're hearing. So I think it's a really good question to filter. >> Garza: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: So let's think about how you tee that up. We'd almost have to have everybody come in in their areas to say how that addresses the area. >> Garza: Yeah. >> Mayor Adler: So let me think through that with you. Councilmember pool. >> Pool: I just wanted -- I was thinking we had told Greg we could hear his questions, but then it sounds like maybe we're going to delay? I don't know if he should just ask his questions and then we can know what they are and get responses -- >> Mayor Adler: My hope was to actually do both if we could. Is that okay? >> Casar: Yeah. I think -- I'm going to leave here at 4:00, I think, 4:15. >> Mayor Adler: Let's see how far we can get. Let's see if we can daylight that. Let's get the presentation and then you bring the questions and then we can talk about them both. >> Pool: Good, thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Go ahead. >> Mayor, council, our next presentation is on chapter 23-9, transportation. We have Nick day, assistant director and Daniel Moran as well from Austin transportation. >> Thank you. Good afternoon. I'm going to walk through the transportation chapter that has been led by the

[3:34:04 PM]

Austin transportation department. It's not scoped by opticos so we've been working hard on interdepartmental, interagency coordination in looking at what needs to be changed in the transportation chapter. Of the code. So I'll be giving you an overview of the six most significant changes to the transportation code, the new codenext is 23-9 in this current draft of codenext. And while parking and of course land use densities are important to transportation, we're not leading on those sections. Those are in the zoning chapter. But I'm going to, when I get to slide 10, talking about the -- talk about the coordination there's been a lot of discussion and lot of information we've provided to planning and the opticos team on both those areas with regard to -- through that transportation lens. So with that, the top six transportation improvements that are changing from current code to codenext are in the areas of how we do transportation impact analysis, driveways, connections for urban trails and sidewalks, requirements for street trees, block lanes, which you just heard a bit about on the street layout section. That's now in transportation. And a new section requiring transportation demand management plans for commercial development. So first area on transportation impact analysis, the first -- the first change may seem simple but it's far reaching, which is to change the name to instead of traffic impact analysis we're changing it to transportation impact analysis to reflect our current best practice of reviewing for all modes of transportation when we look at the impact of development. On our street network -- on our transportation north America. We'll be -- right now the draft lowers the trigger for transportation impact analysis to be done from 2,000 trips to 1,000 trips and requires, as I said

[3:36:04 PM]

before, an active mode analysis. So we're codifying the requirement to look at all mode of transportation with a transportation impact analysis. And this is really important. We now have an expiration date of five years on our transportation impact analysis, whereas current code had no expiration. So we've had a lot of zoning cases that had impact analysis that was done in the '80s or in the '90s with not a real mechanism to require an update to those analysis. Next is our driveway guidelines. This is really important in that we now have a mechanism for our engineering staff at atd to review driveway locations based on safety considerations. This differs from current code in that we've explicitly called out in the code safety as a different factor in the different factors that will be reviewed by transportation staff are on the screen, ranging from looking at entrance and exit ramps, site distance, all different kinds of things that we should be looking at with regards to safety. So we've enabled staff to acquire -- to be able to require driveways to be closed. So that's significant. We don't have that ability right now. So that's a significant change. With sidewalks and urban trails, the important part of this slide is that with this version of codenext, we are actually implementing policy recommendations that were adopted in 2016 with the sidewalk master plan. So one of the major changes is we're requiring

consistency with the urban trail master plan at platting, at subdivision. We're establishing controls to ensure new sidewalk installation and sidewalk rehabilitation of noncompliance sidewalks with

[3:38:06 PM]

subdivision site plans and building block or relocation permits. So this is really important as we think about our current sidewalk network and the need for rehabilitation, not just new sidewalk needs, so the needs to keep our current infrastructure in good working condition. And lastly, we've added language that requires property owners to keep their driveways in good working condition, and the idea there is that if the requirement is on, for example, commercial industrial property owners to maintain their driveway, they're more likely to limit the width of those driveways, which makes for safer conditions for mobility. So those are three major changes when it comes to sidewalks. And then we have a requirement for street trees. So this was -- this came out of a pretty long meeting, lots of interdepartmental coordination, including city arborists to ensure that Austin remains sustainable and pedestrian friendly. Right now in current code we were only requiring space for street trees on certain major thoroughfares or corridors, which we call core transit corridors, and with version two of codenext, we're requiring street trees on all streets and space requirements have been worked out to make that possible, and actual requirements for spacing and other technical elements are being worked through the technical manual update that are going to be underway shortly, namely the environmental criteria manual. So you just heard the street layout section described major changes by Mr. Hopkins, so, again, as it relates to, you know, that street layout section is in the transportation -- excuse me, in the transportation chapter and, most importantly, as it

[3:40:08 PM]

relates to transportation, we are having context sensitive block lanes, which is really important with regards to spreading traffic across the grid system, as well as incentivizing trips by active modes. We're adding a new section requiring transportation demand management plans for commercial development that generate 300 trips or more. The actual toolbox for what would be in those plans for demand management will reside in -- currently it's being proposed to reside in the transportation criteria manual so that staff can, you know, periodically update that administratively based on best practice, but what is included in code are these last four items, which that compliance be included as a condition of approval before a building permit is issued. There's reporting requirements, an on-site tdm coordinator will be required and staff will be able to periodically review sites or inspect sites for compliance and issue a fine if there's noncompliance. Again, the tdm standards are being developed as we speak with the TCM, and is kicking off our amendments to the transportation criteria manual actually this month and we're

looking across best practice across cities on how other cities are doing management plans and we'll craft ours accordingly with what we believe works for Austin. So this is a slide I was talking about. We have been coordinating very closely with planning and with optics. Really through two mechanisms. Our mobility prescription paper talked a lot about parking, and its effect on demand management. So we gave recommendations in our transportation mobility prescription paper ideas such as parking maximums, et cetera, right

[3:42:10 PM]

sizing parking. We also gave information to optics that was developed through -- we have a housing transit jobs working group that's an interdepartmental and interagency, including capital metro staff, and we looked at developing transit-oriented development areas that capital metro was planning for and looked at the existing zoning and gave some strong recommendations that were consistent with capital metro's planning. So through those mechanisms, you know, version two should include -- or should have considered those two inputs. But generally, you know, the reductions, what we wanted to note for parking spaces per housing unit going from two to one is consistent with our recommendations in the mobility prescription paper. The 40% cap remains the same, but what's important to note is that with the -- with the inclusion of the demand management tool in the code, we believe that there will be more of an incentive to push towards that more -- that 40% cap. I don't believe it's used that much. It's used sometimes to -- you know, developers will provide close to that 40 percent, but with this demand management requirement, we believe that the tools such as reducing parking by providing shower or changing facilities or providing car share parking spaces, the tools that are in there if they're required to be part of a demand management plan we might get closer -- >> Mayor Adler: What's the 40% cap? >> So no parking right now, no matter what combination of reductions in parking that's allowed in the current code, you can't go below 40% of what would be required before you took any reductions. So we have, for example, a 20% reduction if you're in the urban core. You can have a further reduction, 10%, I believe, if you provide a certain

[3:44:10 PM]

number of caring to spaces or car share spaces, for example. So no matter what combinations you pick from the current code for reducing parking, you can't go below 40% and that's being carried forward in version two. But we believe there will be more developments that take advantage of getting closer to that 40% with the tdm requirement. And then as far as zoning, as I said, we have matched up the tools with what would be consistent with transit supportive densities in transit oriented areas as >> Mayor Adler: Continue to make comments after that point, just how they get gathered. Would you talk about

would you talk about safety and parking? Some of the neighborhoods I go to they're concerned that by reducing the parking on-site and putting more cars on the street that we would be creating additional safety concerns. >> Sure. I mean, onstreet parking is considered a tool for creating friction on the street and lowering speeds. And what we do know is that through vision zero is that speeding is one of the top factors in safety of our roadways. So we definitely look at onstreet parking as a tool, as a design tool that also helps with safety. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Garza. >> Garza: On slide 6 it talks about some of the changes and it says, controls to ensure new sidewalk installations,

[3:46:11 PM]

sidewalk rehabilitation. It says building permits are one of those. And again my biggest hope is really trying to help families who are trying to change something. And right now it's my understanding that the code, if you were adding an addition more than 50% of the current square footage you're required to add a sidewalk or if you are adding an Adu you're required to add a sidewalk. Is this part of that? And where -- if we choose to not have that requirement, where would we change that? Is this referring to that? >> Yes, you're correct that 50% is the trigger for redevelopment permits to require sidewalks. For a suspect it would be resident to construct the sidewalk or on pay a fee-in-lieu if that's considered. >> Garza: And if you have a 1,000 square foot home and you're choosing to go buy -- you have a limited budget and you can go buy a 2,000 square foot home further away or in Kyle or in Buda or you can remodel your home to 1500 square foot and you're keeping the same number of people in your family there, just making your house bigger, you have to pay to either construct a sidewalk or pay a fee-in-lieu. And I don't think that that's -- I don't think we should be requiring our families to do that when they're simply trying to stay in place especially on what could be a very limited budget to begin with. So if we want to eliminate that requirement, why -- it is in this part of the code that you're referring to? >> Yep, it's in the sidewalk section. And that's definitely something we can discuss more with our sidewalk folks at etd to discuss maybe more

[3:48:11 PM]

[indiscernible], different percentage triggers. >> Garza: It's also a limiting factor if you were trying to build an Adu, you would also have to build a sidewalk or pay the fee-in-lieu. >> Correct. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston and then Ms. Pool and then Mr. Flannigan. >> Houston: I wanted to circle back to something that was said about safety or the parking requirements or lack thereof. Yes, it does slow traffic down, but where we have young children who used to be able to learn to ride their bicycles on the street they're no longer able to do that because of their -- there's parking on both sides of a very narrow neighborhood street. So I would be -- I would be hopeful if instead of making a blanket kind of

decision for all of Austin that you have to at it community by community and that's something that transportation has never seemed to be able to do. Each neighborhood is very different from all of Austin. So I live on 22nd street and we have parking from haymakers, from MI madres, from Hoover's, from salty sow, so our streets are literally packed. Yet when manor road is congested down to Dean Keeton going east they use 22nd as a cut through and they're angry because there's congestion on manor road and they come rushing through and they sometimes go straight through the stop signs that are there. So you cannot just make a blanket statement about how this is helping to control traffic because it's not. It's making it even more dangerous for people who are trying to live on those streets. And I know this is not your concern, but on Thursdays when I know we're going to be late, I have to put my trash out on Wednesday morning because did I wait

[3:50:12 PM]

until Thursday for pickup on Friday there's no place to put it because the street is literally blocked from chestnut all the way to poquito. So you've got to think about it in terms of the congestion that it causes, not the safety that it may cause, because it's congestion on the streets and it's very difficult for people trying to live there. You can't walk, you can't do a whole lot of things because there's so much parking because there's not parking other places like at haymakers or some of the other businesses on a very busy thoroughfare. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool? >> Pool: So a real quick follow-up to councilmember Houston's statement. If we do have parking on the street, everybody knows it's legal, what do we do with the trash pickup? How do you -- how do they even get those -- the pickup mechanism over to pick up the trash cans? I think this is a really -- I hadn't thought about it much, but I have the same situation as you do. I need to get my bins out early enough in the day or the evening if someone is going to park, there's enough room for those arms to come around and pick up the bins. And you have to put your trash cans a certain distance apart so the mechanism can get in there and grab them. I'm just curious, I hadn't thought about it before, but I think it's a very real world issue so I would like to know what conversations maybe you all are having with Austin resource recovery to see -- >> We have been coordinating with Austin resource recovery on the Austin street design guide with with regards to street widths and their ability to sweep the

[3:52:12 PM]

street, clean the street, operability with regards to pickup. And we haven't heard that they're having an issue with parking, but we'll continue to talk with them. >> Houston: They're probably not having an issue with parking. They just drive by because they can't sweep the streets and it's twice a year and they just drive by and go on to another street. >> With the street sweeping we have been talking about

concerns and -- >> Pool: If they can't reach the trash cans they go FBI and leaf them there and they don't pick up the trash and that becomes an issue over time, especially in the summertime. So that would be a real good piece of information for us to dig into. Thanks for bringing that up, community. And then I have a question. Ms. Bodet, you were talking about the general reduction ons remain the -- general productions remains the same at 40%. Are you saying the reduction is 40% or that the parking itself does not go below 40%? >> The parking itself currently cannot go below what is out right required by code. You can't utilize any reduction incentives that are in the code. You can't reduce below 40% of what would be required, and that is remaining the same in version 2 of codenext. >> Mayor Adler: Doesn't change. >> Doesn't change. It's not proposed to change by opticos. >> Pool: And it's 40 percent of what? >> Of the code requirements for parking before utilizing any incentives that might be in the code to reduce parking. So right now the current code I believe it's 26478 has reductions for -- allows for reductions in parking if you do certain things such as requiring car share providing showers, doing some other things. You could reduce what would otherwise be required out right. But you can never go below

[3:54:13 PM]

40% of what would be required out right. >> Pool: Okay. And are we holding back on those reductions so we can have them in our incentives toolkit? Or are we automatically giving that piece away where we might be able to use it as a bonus item? >> Repeat the question? >> You know how we talk about density bonuses and the type of development that we would like to see. Are we using parking in this way or are we automatically saying that you have to go down to one space per housing unit and then the 40% general parking reductions, or are we holding on to that as an incentive to the developer to shift the development from having two spots per unit and instead making a larger apartment complex, for example. >> Councilmember, Greg gun six again, planning and -- Greg Guernsey, planning and zoning. I think our development team is looking at that. I think the incentives that Ms. Bodet was talking about about the showers and car sharing, those are currently in our code today and those would be carried away. But I think what you're talking about if there was some additional bonus, reducing parking in exchange for affordable housing. I think -- I don't know if they've been distilled yet and they're being discussed. >> Pool: Okay. I just don't want to lose that concept along the way. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mr. Flannigan. Mr. Flannigan,. >> Alter:, councilmember troxclair and then -- no, I'm sorry. Renteria was first after Mr. Flannigan. Then we're going to do latter, troxclair and then we'll go to transportation, mobility. >> Flannigan: Wow, okay. Do you know when we'll see tdm defined for the city? It says you're going to come back to us. Does anybody know when those will come back? >> The actual regulations that we're developing for

[3:56:14 PM]

the transportation criteria manual with regards to how those plans are what the menu of options are for those plans? >> Flannigan: I'm just trying to get a sense of if we're going to in codenext require participation in a program, I'd really like to know what they're going to be expected to provide. >> Most likely within the next four to six months we will have those developed and ready for review. >> Flannigan: I'm sure you can appreciate four months is very different than six months given what we're all trying to accomplish here. >> Yeah. >> Flannigan: I don't want to see any gaps by the time I'm ready to vote on something. And the timing is interesting because campo is also having a parallel conversation about tdm programs and how it applies to regional projects, so there might be some opportunity to collaborate. I hope you guys are already doing that. I urge you, please, to do that quicker than four to six months. I also want to support councilmember Garza's point about what families are trying to accomplish on their existing lots. It's very easy sometimes to talk about what a developer will benefit from, but we're also talking about people that are trying to stay in their families. I wouldn't call a family that -- maybe they are having a kid and they need that third bedroom. I don't count them as a developer. And if I'm trying to build an Adu, the parking requirements about one per unit or two per unit can dramatically shift how much impervious cover to build. So I think it's important not to just boil everything down to what developers are doing because more often than not I find that what I'm trying to accomplish through this process is really going to happen when families decide they want to do something different with their own properties. So to the extent that we can support that, councilmember Garza, I think your point was well taken. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Renteria. >> Renteria: Thank you, mayor. My question is we're asking

[3:58:24 PM]

our citizens to have alternative transportation modes. I use my bike and I'm not very comfortable out on a street, but I do enjoy riding it on a trail. But at night it's so dark you cannot see and there's a lot of these bike trails even on public streets that it's so dark that you're very uncomfortable because you can't see what is in front of you. And I've wondered do y'all have any plans to start putting lighting out there on those trails? I mean, we have this beautiful trail here on town lake and people don't use it at night because they can't get around, it's too dark. >> We don't have current plans and that has been an item that's been discussed over the years with regards to promoting more active transportation. And I will commit that the conversation is alive again as we develop the strategic mobility plan, and looking at the strategies that will come out of that and how lighting might be part of that strategy. So that conversation will be had with the strategic mobility plan. >> Renteria: Because I know there are other cities out there that are developing their trails to connect to different parts of the city. And providing their citizens an alternative and safe way to travel. And I'm very -- I'm comfortable if I leave here at 10 or 11:00, and he cannot use the trail. It's too dark. I would have to drive down third or fourth street to east Austin and then cross that dangerous intersection there called 35. So I'm more comfortable using our public trails, which is a lot safer. You don't have to interact with the automobile. So I would really like to

see, you know, that discussion pushed along. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember alter. >> Alter: Thank you. I'll have an opportunity in mobility committee to dive in deeper. I just want to ask about how

[4:00:28 PM]

we would make the parking a little more context dependent. Because I understand the desire to move it down in terms of the requirement, but what I'm hearing is not so much the concern only about the parking on both sides, but it's sort of a wicked combination of having parking on both sides so that you can't actually get two cars going down in either direction at the same time, so that's bad from that standpoint, but there's no Seahawks so the -- sidewalks, so the only place you can walk in the street and if you have one car or two cars, literally you're cutting mobility dramatically. And we've seen lots of examples of this in central Austin where you have the narrow streets, you don't have sidewalks and you have businesses that come in that have lower requirements and their staff are all parking in the streets and you literally cannot move. These are streets that are really central to kind of getting from one place to another if you're walking through the neighborhood. And they're just not wide enough and they don't have the sidewalks. It's a combination if we're not going to put sidewalks in, but have the double parking, we have to worry about the effects. And that's not mentioning the garbage. And let remember we're now going to have three cans, perhaps. And these streets are not going to magically -- they're already having the double parking and they're not going to magically get less cars in the near future. Maybe over time that's where you get, but how do we make this a context dependent choice? >> All good questions and we have our pp program that we utilize -- >> Mayor Adler: What program is that. >> Residential parking permit program, which is being discussed as we're having our staff conversations about parking and understanding what the demands on the residential

[4:02:28 PM]

parking permit program will be in response to the parking changes. So that is something that we're talking about. >> Alter: But I guess parking is done by atd so it will get done, but these are neighborhoods that we don't have any traffic enforcement. It just seems like it kind of compounds things instead of making it better. And I understand the first impetus to reduce it, but there are all of these unintended consequences that reduce mobility. And it doesn't happen everywhere. If you have a Y in the street and you have sidewalks that are connecting, you have alternatives and you can still to that and you still get the safety benefit, but when you don't have those factors -- the example I gave was when you had these businesses, but when you have this and you have these houses coming in and you have the reduced parking it will all be on that street and it will all be residents. So it's not going to be resolved by residential permits because how do we decide if they're all residents and they all live there,

how do you make that choice? It won't be resolved by the residential parking program. >> So what I hear you saying is to continue to work with opticos on a context sensitive approach. >> Alter: Yes. >> And that's definitely what we should be doing and we'll do that. >> Alter: And I think that would address a lot of fears that a lot of people have with respect to this because it's just different in different places. It looks like it's one thing over here and it's a totally other thing over there. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember troxclair. >> Troxclair: What's the approximate cost for a traffic study? >> A transportation impact analysis, a tia? They can vary from 20,000 up to 100,000 depending upon the size of the development is what my educated assessment is.

[4:04:30 PM]

>> Troxclair: And what is an example -- I don't know what a thousand trips a day looks like. >> We have that. We had a feeling that would be asked. A thousand trips a day is 70,000 square foot office space if you could imagine a 70,000 square foot office. I'll try to give you an example. >> Town lake center is 125,000. So it's one floor less than that. >> Thank you. >> Troxclair: What about for like a restaurant? I know the restaurants have higher -- >> Trip generation? >> Troxclair: Or like a retail store. >> So for a 6,000 square foot shopping center would generate about a thousand trips. That's pretty small. A 7-11 is about five to six thousand square feet if -- like we're talking a very small retail is a thousand trips. Smallish retail. Does that help? >> Troxclair: Yeah. I think I obviously -- it's important that we get a handle on -- to the extent that tias are usually in helping us -- are useful in helping us plan, that's good, but I guess I just have questions about reducing -- right now we don't require the tia below 2,000 trips and you're proposing to cut that in half to 1,000 trips. And that sounds -- yeah, that's -6z thousand square feet for a retail center, sounds pretty small. I'm just wondering -- I had no idea that they were so expensive, but if we're talking about 20 to \$100,000, I just -- I guess I wonder about the I am fact -- impact. Again, we tend to think of things as like impact on the big developers, but that's a small business. That's somebody trying to open, you know, a little

[4:06:32 PM]

clothing boutique or something like that. And that is a huge amount of money. So I guess what is the reason for that change? Is that kind of best practice? Do you feel -- >> Yes. >> Troxclair: Help me understand why we would make that change. >> Sure. So about a year ago we had a consultant do a best transportation impact analysis requirements throughout the country and it -- the consensus was a thousand was being used most of the time as the trigger. >> Troxclair: Does that mean that other cities are using a thousand trips or a thousand trips is really -- is the most effective -- >> I think both. Because it's most effective and then, you know, to talk about why is it allows the city to mitigate a larger portion

of the development in Austin. So we weren't mitigating transportation impacts except with an impact analysis that was triggered to add a 2,000 trip trigger, which is a larger development obviously. So this allows us to mitigate and talk about improvements relative to the development's impact. So the smaller the development, the mitigation will be obviously that much smaller as well. >> Troxclair: By mitigation you mean that they will have to pay some portion of money to the city for future transportation improvements. So it's actually not just the 20 no \$1,000 for traffic study, it will be more than that because then the city will ask them to chip in for something. >> Correct. >> Troxclair: What's the process -- I also support councilmember Garza's point about the sidewalks. What is the process for us to make changes at this point? I mean, I know I've heard

[4:08:32 PM]

from our conversation earlier that resolutions aren't the way to go. Are we just kind of continuing to talk about things in work sessions and see the feelings of the dais and then it's up to kind of the staff and consultants to take the -- >> Mayor Adler: The process that we set up was for the planning commission now and zap to be able to -- and for our council -- our staff to be making recommendations. And then it will be coming back. So our process didn't have us reaching down at this point and giving that kind of policy direction at this point in the process. We started doing these meetings so we could elevate these issues so the community could see these presentations and so that we could so that when it came to us we were as familiar with it with as many pieces as we could be. >> Troxclair: I guess I'm raising that as an issue right now. So the impact of lowering 2,000 to 1,000 trips the impact on small businesses. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Troxclair: One more question. Is there a requirement, the tdm that talked about in the presentation, is that -- is there going to be a cost for people to participate in that? Because it's going to be a new requirement, right? >> Correct. There would likely be a cost incurred with that. They could an applicant could likely put one together themselves or it could be that they hired a consultant to put it together. So a transportation impact analysis needs to be stamped by a registered engineer so that is usually hired out by a developer. But with the tdm plan that's not a requirement, so it's hard for me to say right now. I believe it will not be as expensive as a traffic

[4:10:33 PM]

impact analysis, but it could be something that the developer feels the need to hire out for. >> Troxclair: And everybody will be -- who is required to have a tdm plan? >> It's commercial only. Commercial, which -- commercial only and it's a 300 trip trigger at this point, which is still being discussed. Which is -- yeah. That's still being discussed. Whether that's too low, should it be a little higher. The best practice is saying that a thousand to match the transportation impact analysis trigger is probably too high. So we

went with 300 because it's the trigger for the neighborhood transportation analysis and we're trying to keep things simple because that's one of the tenets with codenext, but we're still discussing. Maybe 500 is the right trigger. >> Troxclair: Yeah. Three hundred sounds really low to me. I'm guessing that's even smaller square footage if I'm thinking about a 7-11 being a thousand trips a day, that kind of square footage, then we're -- pretty much anybody, pretty much any kind of small business will be able to do this. So I would be curious to know what the cost -- what kind of cost range or cost estimate -- >> For the tdm plans? >> Mayor Adler: I would at this point that Greg highlight some of the issues on mobility. Can we do that? We have Robert good here. >> Casar: Sure, that's fine if we want to go to mobility. >> Garza: A quick thing on my comments is I absolutely support building out our sidewalk network. I just think that there are things in the code right now that puts it on the backs of homeowners who live in older neighborhoods and are simply trying to improve and now they didn't have sidewalks and they're going to build a home right now and they have to pay for the sidewalk. So we need to have

[4:12:35 PM]

sidewalks. I have no problem with them trying to pay for it. My big concern is homeowners. >> Casar: And closing on this presentation for me as well. I know it's not a popular thing but I really appreciate our staff pushing us to reduce parking requirements. We're trying out how to fit people in this city and businesses in the facility and businesses and parks and green space in the facility. And it is really hard choices. You see us grappling with that all the time and ultimately requiring that people pave precious land for parking spaces that often times have nothing on them is -- might just be the thing that has to go first. And that will create some level of inconveniences, but other cities figured out how to get the trash picked up and I'm sure we will figure it out too. >> Mayor Adler: Do we want to daylight some of the mobility questions for the people who weren't here to be able to raise those? Do you want to go ahead and do that? >> Casar: Sure. My questions are tied to the presentation. Do we have the slide deck so that everybody -- I'm not making them -- asking questions either. >> Mayor Adler: Do we have the mobility presentation? Thank you, staff. >> Casar: So my first question relates to slide number 7. I saw that on our timeline we have already -- the staff has already worked to review the corridor plans, the existing corridor plans and make any updates since several of those were several years old. I wanted to know whether any changes to the existing corridor plans have been developed and if those could be shared with the council? Some of the things that stuck out to me is I know some of the corridor plans in and nearby by own district and there are things in there like bus pullouts that seem to me to contradict potentially with some of the other parts of the resolution, namely conforming with the latest map co-standards which say bus pullouts should only be

[4:14:36 PM]

used in extraordinary situations rather than regularly. So just an update on how the corridor updates process has gone and where we are at this point on that. >> Yeah, councilmember. Mike Trimble, head of the corridor program office. So the team in conjunction with our corridor consultant HDR, is wrapping up the technical review of the corridor plans. We didn't make any substantial changes to the recommendations, but we updated the data with currently what's on the ground now. So any changes to existing conditions, new projects that have come online, new development that's come online, there might be some places like some improvements that have been done. So we've updated that, we did look at some of the other -- the new policies and regulations that are in place. We did look at standards as well. We do work in conjunction with Austin transportation department who is our sponsor owner represent rep. And we do actually have a rep co-located with us, Austin transportation. We have confirmed that we have not made any substantial changes to the recommendations themselves, we've just been doing this technical review piece of it. >> Casar: Okay. I would be interested once that wraps up and I'm sure the council would be to any changes in the corridor plans, especially as it relates to public transportation because I think there's been things lightning bus pullouts or side running bus or pavement on the street as opposed to the bus, those things, I think. Some of that has come a long way since some of those corridor programs were first put together with community input. And some of those haven't been that long of a time, but I think there's been a decent amount of change. My second question had to do with page 14. So here you list out the priority, the mobility priorities and the community ones. It seems to track very closely to what is in the resolution, but missing from an exact wording in the

[4:16:37 PM]

resolution was reduction in vehicle miles traveled and increase in transit usage. Were explicitly laid out in the resolution, but aren't in this circle here. I wanted to see whether you think those are covered by something here or if there's a reason that they're missing. >> Yes. So they are covered. We did evaluate every piece of the contract with the voters. And so those particular pieces, we talked of those internally in-depth and we did feel like when we're looking at the level of service and some of the other metrics and indicators associated with some of the other components of mobility priorities that we did capture those aspects of it. So in other words, we felt like there was another overlap where we captured those metrics in the other pieces. >> Casar: So along with those metrics you have listed, which ones of them do you feel reflect reduction in vehicle miles traveled, for example? That seems to me to be a pretty straightforward metric. >> Yeah. So under mobility priorities, so we have improved level of service and reduced delay at intersections for all nodes of travel. Under there we have reduced length of delay. So we have delay time. We also have level of service for pedestrian, bike and transit as well. We have safety also wrapped into that. And then also under congestion reduction we have people through-put for all modes. And that is a percentage increase in people moved through the modes. And so with the vehicle miles traveled we felt like between a couple of these different mobility priorities and kit indicators that we were able to capture that. We did look at that in-depth and said we need to pull that

out separately, but felt we were capturing that in some of the other pieces. >> Casar: I guess I don't fully understand -- while I appreciate measuring people moved as opposed to cars moved, I think that's important, I don't see how moving more people through an intersection results -- covers our -- making sure that they're safe actually

[4:18:37 PM]

measures what's in the contract with the voters, which is trying to design our transportation infrastructure to make sure people take shorter trips because right now we're on a path even with the changes contemplated in codenext where we are going to continue to increase the amount of vehicle miles traveled in this community, which is probably one of the highest causes of our congestion it is that people are taking longer and longer trips rather than shorter trips in our community. >> So just one of the things I'll note to councilmember. I understand where you're coming from. One of the -- I guess the premises of the corridor plans is they're looking for a mode shift in the recommendations. So again, looking at improved level of service, but also looking to get some mode shift in improving the level of service for some of the other modes beyond vehicular. Obviously improving that little service is important, but also improving the other levels and the quality of that particular mode seeks to get some mode shift as well, which also hopefully reduces the vehicle miles traveled. So they kind of work in conjunction so there's an outcome component in conjunction with this comparative analysis. So right now we're looking on how to do the comparative analysis between the recommendations, but we will be looking at outcome metrics and we'll be bringing back the proposed outcome metrics to show what we've seen on the ground at the end of the day and how we performed. >> Casar: No more questions, but councilmember Houston wanted to ask something, so I'll let her. >> Houston: Thank you. I wanted to share some information about residential parking permits. I have that in half of the neighborhood I've lived in. I've been informed that they're not enforced. So you might have them and have to pay for them,, but they're not enforced. We don't have enough police to enforce them. To I want people to be aware. >> Casar: To wrap that point on, I can reflect on it and maybe you can too. I understand that likely when you're actually doing the construction you might want to figure out how to get to an outcome metric since it's explicitly listed in the resolution, but I'm also interested in as you're

[4:20:39 PM]

comparing corridors and choosing how to utilize limited funding, are there certain corridors or certain types of work that you could do that could reduce vehicle miles traveled more doing it one way or in one place more than another? And it just seems to me that since it's such an explicit goal of our comprehensive plan, such a key part of reduction of congestion and that it's let'sed in the resolution, it

just stuck out to me that that metric is missing. >> I think that Robert good, assistant city manager, I think the metric that we're going to measure, though, is what Mike said is connectivity, transit improvement, the other multimode share. That's going to show in reduction of vehicle miles traveled. So that's an outcome of the things they are measuring to compare project a to project B. So the next thing you could do, I suppose, is say we're comparing all those and it will result in less vehicle miles traveled in project a versus project B. So we really are getting there -- >> Casar: But I think the challenge in not measuring it directly is if you say by doing a, B and C, I will reduce vmt, but you're not trying to reduce it generally. You don't know if def and decreasing so much that you're not reducing a goal of vmt. >> We'll get back to that. We've got it, but I get your point. >> Casar: Like some of the things you do may help, but some may hurt. I don't want to monopolize the questions. I have a handful of others, but I've taken some time. >> Alter: This sort of relates to the question we were having last night at campo with active transportation and stuff. You were there. It's too complicated. >> Casar: I just don't want this to increase vmt is all I'm saying. So on page 15, so the next

[4:22:42 PM]

page, my next question is on people moving through all modes you have here a percentage increase in people moved. Help me understand how it is that you're going to use this to compare corridors because I guess one concern I might have is that since we have such a single occupant car transportation system right now that even a small percentage increase in people moved per hour in cars may actually be tons more cars moved compared to significant absolute increases or big percentage increases you could get in other immediates. So help me understand when you're talking about percentage of people moved across modes how you're going to -- like what do you see as good versus bad in that? Does that make sense? You could have a two percent increase in cars moved. How does that look like to a 30% increase in the number of people moved by bus? >> Yeah, that's kind of why we wanted to look at people moved across all modes. I think that's where some of the transportation best practices as far as looking at how transportation mobility movements occur is going. And so we're looking at the total people through-put. And this is using some traffic modeling called vista modeling so the consultants will be using this modeling and looking at the total number of movements through the corridor as they model. They're going to be modeling out into the future. So they'll be looking at your traffic modeling out to 2035, I believe. And so that's how that information is going to be gathered. So what they're going to be looking for, again, since we're doing that comparative analysis, they'll be looking at the modeling across the corridor and at investments or recommendations coming out and saying how does that particular component perform? Again week just trying to get down to down this

[4:24:43 PM]

comparative analysis. When we put the -- this goes back to the outcome metrics. When we start putting everything back together on the mom. We look at how everything performs on the corridor and based on what we're doing there. It's -- we're having to take this comparative step and put it back together as we look at the program in general. >> Casar: As you put it back together, I think that -- again, I don't think this maybe part of the comparative part, but part of whichever core we do, to improve level of service especially in a car, there are two ways to make sure that people drive as fast as possible and potentially stop along the way, or what is a slower, but steadier speed and you can achieve the same level of service without killing the walkability and the environment on the corridor. So I think this isn't for the prioritization part, but once you get down to the corridors and you're measuring level of service, I think that figuring out how we are getting people as fast at the highest speeds through the intersections, but st.edward'sly, I think kind single-family a way of us keeping that in balance. >> One quick comment on that. I think Mike can correct me if I'm wrong, we're looking at all the modes but adding them together. So we're looking at total people through-put. But we didn't want to look at people or just transit. So we're look at every mode and then adding those up and that's the increase in vehicle through-put through that corridor for that project. See what I'm saying? It's not just looking at automobiles, transit, bike, walk, we're looking at every mode and then adding them together. >> Casar: I think the issue there is if you take just one lump number, then a two or three percent increase -- maybe you can answer this then for me. How do you lump all of those together? Are you just doing the percentage increase? If you're just doing the percentage increase in people moved and you aren't looking at the mode, then a

[4:26:43 PM]

two percent increase in the number of cars that goes through could quickly out strip whether -- you may not even be looking at people walking or buses moving if you just have a significant opportunity to move tons more cars. Does that make sense? I think that's my original concern here is does it even matter what the other ones are doing if they're so marginal compared to existing car usage, which is something we want to get away from? >> Yes, but I think your biggest bang for your buck there is going to be transit. If you increase transit dramatically, it's going to out strip the other people through-put through the corridor. So Mike can add anything he wants to that, but I think it's the other way around. It's not the vehicle that's going to move the needle there, it's the a transit effectiveness issue. >> Casar: I think that may be helpful for us to see what those look like broken down separately across the corridors and lumped together. My nervousness would be that the transit thing could be excluded if in the end you just turn it into more of a car gut or you may be able to beat current transit usage numbers and may it look like there may be lots more people, but not in the way that we would like. >> I definitely understand where you're coming from. I want to mention too you had talked about not just increasing speeds. And safety is a big component of when we're looking at the level of service. So we are looking at delayed intersections, all that, but we're also looking at the safety aspects. We're also looking at the number of crash instances at intersections and seeing what improvements are made in that as well. I did

want to reassure you that we are looking at the safety component of that as well as looking at the performance of the modes. >> Casar: Okay. I don't want to monopolize this time, though. Okay. On page 17 now, two pages later, you have your level of service tool, which seems really thorough and I appreciate that. What -- when you say you will be looking at the street width or sidewalk

[4:28:44 PM]

width or amount of parking, are those things that if it's a wider street it's going to rank up more or if it's a narrower street? What does all of this bake into? If there's more parking, leg parking planned, what is it? >> I guess I'll just call them submetrics that go into the multimodal of service tool. So this was a way for us to do is to look at the level of service for the modes other than vehicular. So a lot of the -- the current modeling practices really focus on the vehicular. So it allows us to look at the different aspects of that. So we're looking at street width, sidewalk width. Obviously that goes to the quality of potentially bike level of service. It could go to sidewalk improvement as well. Obviously with wider sidewalks. Also when you're talking about the number of vehicles going through there's a safety component to that as well. We'll all work together to get that level of service kind of score for the quality across some of these different modes. And there's actually more than listed here. These are just some examples. There are several more actually in the tool itself. >> So if there's a street that currently has a very wide sidewalk and the corridor improvements wouldn't widen it because it's about as wide as we want it to be, does that rank it up because it has a higher level of walkability now or does it rank it down because some corridors have no sidewalk at all and you have the opportunity to put in a wide sidewalk so you would improve the level of service for pedestrians significantly with that delta? I guess I'm trying to understand what comes out on the other end of this formula. >> So the prioritization model does account for the current level of service and then what the improvement would be. So in other words, something would get kind of more scoring if it's a D level, you know, getting to a B level versus something that's going from a B to an a. So that level of service -- if there's really a quality

[4:30:46 PM]

I guess improvement or infrastructure there now, and the improvement would be incremental, that problem is not going to score as much as something that is a much, you know, stronger change in improvement to the quality because you're actually going to have a potentially greater change in the potential to get a mode shift. And again, that's one of the premises for some of the improvements in the corridor plans is to improve all the modes, but then also start seeing some of the mode shift as you get better quality across multiple modes. >> Casar: So it's a delta issue. >> Yeah. >> Remember, this is all compared project A with project B. That's the beauty and the simplicity of what we get to do. It's not a

systemwide noises that unique is doing in the strategic mobility plan, it's looking at what project a it >> Casar: As far as improving the effectiveness of transit and since these comparative formulas are the delta, how much better can we make it? My recollection of listening to y'all's 2025 discussions is that one of the key ways to get more folks on transit isn't just level of service, not just how fast the bus gets from one place to another, but how consistent and frequent the service can be. When buses bunch up together and it takes longer, people get frustrated and don't go back. I don't know if there is a good way to measure how much improvements we can make through our own infrastructure and helping service be more consistent? I know frequently likely has to do with the cap metro resource issue, but maybe y'all can chime in. This seemed to be one of the most important parts for me in reworking our corridors and it seems like we're not measuring much. I just wonder if there's

[4:32:48 PM]

more that we should be doing. >> Kitchen: I think it's worth a conversation. I'm not sure. It's a pretty -- transit operations include measurement of ontime performance and it's a fairly sophisticated level of mutter and it's getting more sophisticated all the time to track where buses are, how far behind they are and also to -- also to do things like work with the driver to adjust how fast or slow they are to get them on time. But I'm not sure where that intersects with what we're doing on the road. Now, I guess it would intersect with the timing of the lights. And the telling that -- >> And some of the things that we could do. That's where we will be evaluating. >> Kitchen: Would that fall into these measurements in some way? >> The hardscape will. So what we can do -- you're right, there's a lot of system that cap metro will have to adjust, but if we provide a better opportunity for transit to work effectively in that corridor, it will score higher on project a therein project B. >> Kitchen: So maybe one of the measures has to do with the presence or the ability to add the kinds of signal -- signal optimization and prioritization. There may be other examples? >> There will be. >> Kitchen: That's what I'm thinking of. >> Garza: I have one on to add and I'm sorry if I missed the discussion of this. Won bus priority lanes and not just -- that helps with the bunching up because the budging up happens because of traffic and they can't get to where they need to go and they get stuck at a late and that kind of thing. I don't know where that policy discussion happens, but that would be us allowing them to prioritize lanes even if it's from 7:00 to 9:00 and from 4:00 to 6:00. >> Huge. There are a lot of things if the investments are recommended to do these

[4:34:49 PM]

things and they will score higher in the transit effectiveness side. If it doesn't do anything, then you're right, it's more of a cap metro system and it won't score very high in that category. >> Casar: It seems when you're talking about level of service that it determines how quickly the bus can get from one place

to the another. I don't know if there are other challenges to consistently, though, besides level of service. Maybe level of service is what makes it inconsistent. But maybe not. >> Safety and reliability are components of the transit level of service and we're also coordinating with cap metro as well looking at the connections 2025. That was one of the plans that we used to kind of do our technical update, so we have been talking to them about placement of stations, connectivity to the stations. We've been talking about signalization and some of those things, where they're looking at going with their improvements to the operations and how these improvements could potentially support that as well based on what's in the recommendations. >> Casar: I would say as you continue to review the corridor plans if there are changes that you make to those that would significantly improve this,, the chicken and the egg issue, I wouldn't want us to not look at certain corridors because the corridor plan didn't include certain transit supportive elements that we might be able to include. And then may very last question on the affordable housing slide, which I think is 21 so similar question to the one that I asked earlier, when you are looking at the number of market rate affordable units or subsidized units, does that mean that you're more likely to provide the bonds funding to that kind of corridor because it is a -- because it's a place where low income folks often times live in areas that are less powerful and have less resources or is it something that we're thinking about prioritizing less because we're afraid of the gentrification pressures of that -- that come with development of a public infrastructure? >> Yeah.

[4:36:49 PM]

So for this particular measure I think really more the context was what are the current units there now, housing there now. And what potential impact and risk there could be. If we're coming in, for example, with a multimodal complete street type of improvement wrote it could have an improvement on the housing from making that infrastructure improvement. I will say that we are capturing other aspects of the prioritization model, serving the existing population. So a lot of the population numbers we looked at were based on serving the existing population, so connectivity to transit, for example, and building that in. And a lot of that was based on serving existing populations, but onnestle, there's going to have -- but honestly, there will have to be other initiatives and priorities to partner up with the improvements to either further mitigate some of the risks or take advantage of the opportunities that are kind of being identified because again this is all mobility infrastructure so everything from that perspective. Obviously there would have to be other things to either leverage opportunities for new affordable housing or to mitigate risk to existing affordable housing based on what we're looking at. >> Casar: Yeah. I think we really need to focus on what you just mentioned at the end. I would hate to tell low income folks in my district who say the number one concern is the danger on the street nearby them. Sorry, we're just going to leave this road terrible because it could gentrify you and then we just end up propagating continued infrastructure and neglect there for what may sound like a good reason, but isn't good enough. So I'd be really interested in ways that if we could make sure that we're going to do a mobility bond investment near low income housing that isn't protected by income protections, income restrictions, that we pair it with affordable housing investments to preserve existing housing, but I think

if we start baking into our models that we don't want to do infrastructure improvements near low income people, that's not -- that's not a

[4:38:52 PM]

good thing that has potential moral and legal implications. So we've got to figure out how we're doing both. And I just -- I guess I would express some worry that we be baking into our model that we don't want to put infrastructure improvements near low income folks. I think it makes sense for us to flag it and for us to recognize that there may be unintended consequences and we might have to do extra work, but I don't think we should bake into the model that there should be like point deductions from areas where people who tend to actually need the improvements more live. >> To that note, councilmember, that's one of the reasons because we did have some of these indicators and priorities coming out of the priorities with the voters. I think that's where we're using a consideration index so we're looking at a composite score looking at all the community considerations. So it would be the mobility priorities, the mobility aspects, level of service, and then combined with this community considerations index. So it will be a total composite score. I also want to let you no he that we will be continuing conversations with departments like nhcd and our departments to talk about what other potentials would be partnered up to again leverage some of the opportunities that might arise from these improvements or to mitigate some of the risk that there are potential risks. >> Casar: I appreciate that. I think regardless of the outcome, I think from a principle perspective it's a little odd to say we don't want to put infrastructure in near people who are low income or poor. >> And that was part of our challenge, as Mike said, opposing forces, we're building roadways. But you all put, rightfully so, reserve housing. That's not Galer connected with us building roadways. So it's a challenge as we look at these community considerations to prioritize the mobility considerations, but as you've said make allowances for these other things.

[4:40:52 PM]

And that's the R to what make and his team are putting together. >> Casar: And one thing to potentially consider, I don't know how possible it would be at this phase, is that since some of the property owners nearby where we might be considering mobility improvements have some economic gains to to be made if we improve the public facilities nearby them, figuring out -- since we haven't quite said exactly where on which corridors we'll be making investments, figuring out how many of those property owners are to help support completing the infrastructure and provide affordable housing and those other things because I imagine that some of them would be willing to have the affordable units or a pid or tax assessment or what have you in exchange for knowing that the improvements are coming their way.

And I think that competitive -- that competition has helped us in other areas and might be able to help us here. So that's all of my questions. I would say the main things that I would want to flag are the vehicle miles traveled issue, making sure we break up level of service across those modes so we can at least see what those look like instead of lumping them all together all the time. Flagging sort of corridors that have lots of low income folks nearby them. For extra attention and work, but not necessarily saying that we want to reduce their priority because of that. And finally, I think the partnership with nhcd and looking at pids and tifs and other tools to help leverage revenue would make sense. You have done tons of good work. I don't mean my questions to mean you didn't. There are lots of questions because it's a really big issue and you did lots of work. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Anything else on this? Again, I think this is looking really good. I do like the idea of trying to figure out there was that initial group working with the general market outside of the Normal things and that was a real change in

[4:42:53 PM]

innovation that I don't hear a lot of people doing that are real market context sensitive stuff and it would be good to see if there's something that shows up there. Anything else? All right. It is 4:44 and this meeting stands adjourned. Thank you.