

# Mobility Committee Meeting Transcript – 11/8/2017

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 11/8/2017 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 11/8/2017

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[3:03:44 PM]

>> Kitchen: Good afternoon, everyone. We're going to go ahead and call to order the mobility committee. And our first order of business is approval of the minutes. So councilmember Flannigan moves. Councilmember Garza seconds. All those in favor? Oh, I'll second. All those in favor? Okay. Passes. So do we have any citizen communication? No? Okay. All right. The first item that we have is the meeting schedule for next year, so we have -- we're proposing that we do these like we have done this past year, so they're like -- there's six of them for the year. So do these dates make sense to you guys?

>> Flannigan: I haven't had a chance to lay that over the proposed council meeting schedule. Have you had an opportunity to do that? >> [Off mic] >> Flannigan: Yeah. >> Kitchen: Oh, okay. >> Flannigan: Yeah, I'm just curious if it's better to try to make these happen on off weeks and not on on weeks. >> I've had a chance to do that except for a couple of work sessions that should adjourn before noon because they're early on in the budget process. >> Flannigan: Not just -- it would be my preference to be on a meeting when there's not a regular meeting. That way, there's too many agendas to work on at the same time. >> Can someone get us a council meeting so we can maybe table this and come back to it?

>> Kitchen: Yeah. Can you guys look at that now, while we're -- with an eye towards, like, a week that we don't have a council meeting? >> Flannigan: Do y'all agree it's probably best to do it on off weeks? >> Kitchen: Yeah, makes sense. >> Flannigan: Okay. Great. >> Kitchen: On we'll table that for now. Okay. Then our first item is the

[3:05:44 PM]

corridor construction program. Corridor construction program development including criteria for evaluating and prioritizing recommended improvements. >> Okay. Good afternoon. Mike tremble, director of the corridor program office, joined by my deputy director, Susan Daniels, and we have folks from our consultant team as well and corridor office team as resources as well. But what I wanted to do,

chair, is to walk through some of the things that we're looking at -- we've briefed council back in October on the prioritization model. We got some good feedback on that. As we're looking to initiate that process -- I guess I can go ahead and start the slides -- this is a refresher for the mobility bond program but I think you guys are pretty familiar with what's in the bond program and what's up for potential construction as part of the corridor construction program, are those corridors that are in the Orange, the north Lamar, burnet, airport, east mlk, easiest Riverside, Guadalupe and William cannon. We had public meetings last week, we think went pretty well, so we're incorporating those feedback right now to develop those final recommendations. >> Kitchen: Okay. I had a quick question. I'm sorry. >> Uh-huh. >> Kitchen: Before you get into it, because this is more about the corridors. I had someone send me an email and they were asking whether you were going to -- and I just don't remember in the answer, whether you guys were going to be going back and looking at the older ones. The question was specifically about reconsidering bus priority lanes in the completed plans, and the question was specifically about the north Lamar, Guadalupe corridor.

[3:07:44 PM]

So I think the question was whether or not, since those -- that plan was a little bit older, whether or not you would be looking at the plan again and whether, in looking at the plan, part of that would consider bus priority lanes. Does that question make sense? If you cant answer it right now, we can talk offline. >> We can look at it to figure out what they're looking for. We can follow up with the person also, we've been doing that as we get questions in I would say in general we've been trying to adhere to the spirit and intent of the recommendations and updating them with new data about what's going on with the corridor, whether it's new projects that have come into play, site conditions and things like that. We have generally tried to stay with the spirit and intent of the recommendations that came out of the corridor plans. We're also happy to follow up with your office. >> Kitchen: Okay. We can follow up. I think the question was, the thinking was that perhaps the designation as a bus corridor and as a bus rapid transit corridor perhaps had changed, but I'll share it with you afterwards. >> Alter: I have just a quick question. I was wondering how many people participated in those corridor meetings that you just mentioned for slaughter and William cannon. >> Sure. Sarah, you might have a number. You can come up and talk. This is Sarah, our communications manager for -- [laughter] >> Yeah, don't you have to -- >> You can talk to us too. >> This is Sarah, our communications manager for the corridor program. >> Right. Can you hear me okay? >> Yes. >> Okay. So for the two meetings that we held last week, we had 75 participants in person. We are [indiscernible] Input through November 26th, the end of the day, and we are going to be having additional participation opportunities, so not only are all the recommendations online and our survey is online in English and Spanish, but we are going to be presenting to the onion creek

[3:09:49 PM]

homeowners' association next week. We will be in the south Austin neighborhood session next week and hosting a meeting at river city youth foundation, also next week. And we're also coordinating, as we can, to find additional opportunities, so if you do hear of something, please send that our way. >> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you. >> Yes. As I was mentioning, we're starting to initiate the prioritization process and really what that means is gathering a lot of that data that we talked to you about that goes into those indicators and metrics in the -- in the prioritization model, and again just as a refresher, what we looked at, and pulling directly from the contract with the voters, we had indicators of metrics related to the mobility priorities, as well as the community considerations as well. And so we are in the process of gathering a lot of that data right now, based on the recommendations and investments coming out of the corridor plan, so that's well underway. The other thing that we've also started to do is we've also started to look at the development of the actual corridor construction program in the sense of what are those key things that we need to think about as we're developing a reasonable feasible construction program to propose to council because we want to make sure we're proposing something we feel confident that we can get done, particularly with the eight-year goal that council has given us in the contract with the voters. And, again, just the process that we're going through on this slide, you know, we looked at the recommendations, we did some technical updates to current conditions, other information looking at the corridors again. Those investments will be going into the prioritization model and again, we're looking at some of those kind of key aspects of implementation, and that will lead to the development of the corridor construction program. So when I talk about some of those factors that we're looking at, what am I talking about? So there's several things, and they're happening at the project and the program level right now. So what we're doing is we're actually walking through kind of each corridor and really kind of looking at what's in the corridors, when we're talking about

[3:11:49 PM]

utilities, we're looking at what types of utilities exist in the corridors. And so that's something definitely we need to consider. So what's there now, what could there be potential conflicts that we might need to work on where those utilities are located right now. Also, are there partnership opportunities. So are there other projects that may be, you know, drainage or water projects. If we're going to be tearing up the street, we don't want to tear it up multiple times, so we want to see if opportunities exist to get other work done as well. We're having conversations about what's required to be addressed as far as utilities, any initial conflicts, but also partnership opportunities. Scheduling is also another key component. Not just the scheduling of these projects, how they're sequenced within the program, but what other work is occurring out there. For example, are there other partner agencies, such as txdot, capmetro, Travis county, other agencies that will be doing work, and we need to be coordinating with them to make sure we're looking at what projects will be happening when. Are there contingencies that need to occur so we're not in each other's way, also to mitigate the impact on communities,

neighborhoods, and local businesses as well. And as I've mentioned, we try to get out early to neighborhoods and businesses along the corridor to let them know what's in the corridor, plans, in the process, we'll be getting out often beyond corridor construction approval, into design pavement so other considerations, right-of-way. A lot of the improvements are occurring within the existing right-of-way for several corridors, but there are some corridors where it's honestly constrained, from a right-of-way perspective. So there may be situations where we might need to look at acquiring additional right-of-way property acquisitions that may come into play. And real estate acquisitions just take -- they have a longer lead time to them. So they typically take about

[3:13:50 PM]

two years, total, 18 to 24 months, to complete, and that's -- so we're looking at those now we're trying to identify where those opportunities or issues might exist, and then trying to account for those and trying to program them in as best as possible. But those are definitely things that can impact us from a schedule standpoint, so we're trying to account for those as much as possible. Also traffic control. Obviously, we're talking about a lot of significant projects happening on major corridors around the city. So how do we control for traffic and how do we mitigate that impact on our traffic, on our congestion, also again mitigating the impact on businesses. Obviously, access to businesses and the like is a big consideration as we're doing this work. So this is going to be a big consideration too, as we start not just looking at a particular project, but again, looking at that program of projects that we're going to be working on over the next several years. And then obviously construction, once we get into construction, construction is disruptive. There's no way to get around it. The key for us is to look at how do we mitigate those impacts to the community, to local businesses, to folks traveling through the corridor, for the construction that we're looking at doing, and so that's going to be a big consideration as we further develop those projects. So we'll be keeping that in mind, to get in and be as efficient as we can, getting the work done, getting in and getting out, basically, in the corridors, and again, trying to sequence and coordinate that work to mitigate the impacts on traffic, businesses, and the community. One of the things we're starting to do also is we're starting to look at potential risks associated with the projects and the program. When I talk about risks, again, it's some of the things I've already talked about, but there's other things as well. What are some of those things that may occur, that could occur, that could impact our cost, or could impact our schedule? And so we're actually going through a pretty robust process, working with our consultant team, bringing in several departments from the city, you know, watershed, water,

[3:15:51 PM]

development services and the like, to talk about some of these potential risks, then also to talk about what would be the potential cost if this risk were to occur. We're actually trying to assign cost amounts or schedule impacts to those particular risks, so what we're going to do is we're going to build in that contingency amount based on when that particular risk -- the risks are for a particular project and associated costs and potential schedule impacts. There's a rigorous process that we're going to be going through called the monte Carlo model, they run several iterations of how the risks might hit, and what the potential impacts might be. That's how we're going to actually build up the contingencies we may need to account for those things that may occur as we get into constructions. Environmental constraints, there may be endangered species involved in certain sections of the corridor that we're talking about. There could be some [indiscernible] Zones as well, or areas we might be getting close to the Edwards aquifer recharge zone. All of these, obviously, could have potential impacts because we'll have to do additional assessment associated with these. And, again, not a bad thing, but obviously this is something we want to do, but it does take time to do that. So, again, it's just from a program management perspective, just letting you know, it could be an impact to cost and schedule. So we're trying to account for these things and planned for these as much as policy, up front. Drainage and water quality. So several of the improvements we're looking at, we already know we're going to have to look at making associated drainage improvements, just because of the disruption that we'll be doing with these projects, but also we're also looking at how it impacts the drainage systems. So we'll be having conversations with the watershed department to talk about that more at length. We've had some initial conversations about the immediate improvements we would look to do as part of these projects, but then also looking again for how this could impact the system, would they be looking at potential upgrades or other improvements they want to do to partner up with these projects as well. >> Kitchen: A quick question for you then. So as part of the drainage and water quality, are you

[3:17:54 PM]

looking at opportunities to design with gsi, for example, but the green water infrastructure, is that part of what you're looking at? >> That would be part of the conversation we're having. We're moving from the immediate, what is the improvement, what are some of the immediately associated drainage improvements and impacts that we would have, but then we're going to be working our way out, looking at potential green infrastructure improvements and other associated improvements that might need to occur or be desirable to occur as part of the project. So moving into the program -- I talked a lot -- a lot of the things I've talked about so far are impacts we'd be looking for on any projects we'd be doing of this scale, working on right-of-way. But let me also talk about some of the program considering as well. Again, getting back to the contract with the voters -- we had kind of talked about this when we did the briefing to council in October, is, the contract with the voters asks us to consider geographic dispersion of projects and funding, as well as leveraging opportunities. So really, we feel like these really come in when we're looking at putting the program together, because we can look at how projects are dispersed around the corridors, not only how they're sequenced, but also how those projects are

dispersed from a funding perspective. Also, as we start to identify what projects are going into that phase of the corridor construction program, then the discussion around leveraging opportunities, particularly our partner agencies, become more real. So, in other words, once we know more specifically what projects we're going to do and have some improve and buy-in from council what those projects are, there's funding associated with that. Particularly when we're talking about leveraging and partnership opportunities, we're talking about also bringing money to the table from our side as well. So we want those conversations to be real enough to have those conversations. And we're not quite there yet but we're going to be working on that over the next couple months the other thing I do want to note with you, when we look at partnership opportunities, particularly grant opportunities from state and federal level, they

[3:19:55 PM]

typically come with particular requirements. Those requirements may be different from the city requirements, so that's also something we need to account for, and honestly, they could have an impact on cost and schedule as well, just because, again, there's a different level of requirements and conceptions we may need to follow to receive those -- that grant funding. And then again, at the program level, we'll be looking at the package packaging, that will happen at the project level and program level. How do we put these into actual construction programs that would go out to bid on the street. This is really where we've been working closely with our capital contracting office and small women -- small minority business resource department to look at what opportunities may exist and how we should be starting to think about how we package these construction contracts and these bids. So we will be having several conversations about this as we're doing the program development aspect. I do want to note, we are planning for a vendor session on December 6th. And so we're actually going to be inviting contractors and consultants in to get some initial feedback on packaging, and we've also had several meetings already with stake holidays, stakeholders, minority trade associations, to get feedback and we're developing that outreach strategy right now we'll be bringing that back to council as part of our corridor construction proposal in early spring. As we know what projects we're looking at, we can have conversations about coordination. First and foremost, internally, one of the things we're going to be doing is talking to some of our other programs, the sidewalk program, the bike program, we'll be talking to capmetro to see not just where their coordination opportunities on the corridor, but also connecting to the corridor and off the corridor. And so, you know, we don't want to have our blinders on to see just what we're doing in the corridor, but also how are we impacting things off the corridor and can we put together a more complete package of improvements with our partner programs to improve that connectivity

[3:21:55 PM]

off the corridor as well. We think that's going to make for a more -- make for a more complete improvement that we'll be putting in over the next several years. And, again, we'll be looking at project sequencing, looking at what our partner agencies will be doing, as well as even internally, we'll be continuing to talk with our partner department, such as water utility, drainage and other departments, about what projects they have in play that could potentially need to be coordinated with. Also, we'll be looking at strategies for accelerated delivery. And, again, we take the eight-year implementation time frame very seriously, and we're doing everything we can to see how we can best meet that -- that time frame. I'll be honest, it's going to be challenging. You know, we've already mentioned a lot of the realities of implementation, and we're putting a program of this scale. It's a big challenge, but we're going to look for what strategies exist to accelerate delivery and we'll be talking about those again as we bring the corridor construction program to council. A little bit more about managing risks, I've talked about the rigorous cost risk assessments, and again, as we look at the realities of implications, we're trying to account for what are those things we know but what are those things we don't know, and trying to get all those things in front of us as much as possible right now. One of the things that we're going to do a little bit differently for this program, just out of necessity because of the nature of the program, is, we're going to try to really be aggressive in managing these risks and costs associated with that. What does that mean? What that means is that as we manage these risks, if we have costs associated with it -- for example, if I have a certain risk and I've associated a million dollars with that, if we manage that risk, mitigate that risk, I can release the million dollars back in the corridor construction program, into the bucket. So we're going to be looking for opportunities to do that. That's why managing risk is going to be a key strategy as we go forward. We feel like there's a real opportunity as we address those to release money back into the bottom line for the corridor construction program and hopefully get more improvements done that are associated with this. Also, just another part of what we're looking at, when we talk about the cost estimates, you know, there's

[3:23:56 PM]

a high range that we're -- plus or minus 50%, even up to 100%, when you're very early on. You know, we're very early, we're conceptual level, very early preliminary. So there's a lot we don't know. We've talked about a lot of those things that we don't know but we're trying to account for. So as we move from preliminary into design phase, as we get closer to bidding award, as we get into construction, we're going to know a lot more about what's occurring with this project, we'll be able to manage a lot of those risks, and again, we'll get a much better idea of what those costs are. So when we talk to you about those cost estimates, when we bring the corridor construction program, I do want to know -- you'll see a number but that number is going to represent, again, really a range of information running several iterations of costs, of risks, of other factors, and so, you know, definitely, you know, the numbers -- the numbers the number is as good a number as we can get, but it's based on a lot of analysis and

that's going to have to get refined as we move forward through Dell Seton and construction phase. >> Kitchen: So when you bring it to us in the spring, the construction plan, is that vision and planning on this scale or closer to feasible, where do you think you'll be on this scale? >> We'll probably still be vision and planning. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> I think the general thought, Bob -- correct me if I'm wrong, but I think what we've said, we're around 5%. When we think about design, we're at most 5% from coming out of the plans, then even with the technical update, maybe we're getting further in this initial analysis we're doing. There's a lot more work that needs to be done. When we bring the proposal to council, what we're going to be asking for at that point is to give the blessing to move into more rigorous design for these projects. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> And so what this graphic shows is really that -- the main point of this is, earlier on, changes are cheaper and easier to make

[3:25:56 PM]

earlier on in the project cycle than they are later in the cycle. And that's why accounting for all these realities early on, seeing what partnership opportunities exist early on is going to be important. As we look at things coming in, what we might want to do, an impact -- something that may impact our scope, as we get further in it just costs more. And so that's really a key consideration for us to aggressively manage costs. We want to identify system of those leveraging opportunities and -- as early as possible. We are going to have a pretty rigorous community engagement process as well. We know there's going to be a lot of discussion about the corridor construction program as we're bringing it to council, but I also want assure council we're going to have feedback as we're moving into design phase as well to get to actually what we're going to put out on the street for construction. So getting back to, I guess, the prioritization process and the investments we're looking at, when we came in you know October, there's two types of investments coming out of the corridor plans, and a lot of them -- the systems safety and operational improvements are what's showing up in what's called short-term or near-term improvements in a lot of the corridor plans, and these include a lot of your connectivity improvements, they can include intersection improvements, signalization improvements, bike improvements, so when we say the system improvements, you know, that's really for connecting the system as far as, like, sidewalk, bikeways. We talk about safety and vehicular improvement around intersections and the like. These are made without as much disruption to the right-of-way, not having to tear up the street as much, but trying to get some mobility and multimodal improvements in place. And this is what was envisioned by the plans. And then what shows up in the plans a lot as intermediate and long-term recommendations are more of

[3:27:57 PM]



your complete street segments along several of the corridors. And, again, these are your multimodal improvements, but they really look at more of a complete cross-section of improvements to put in place. Several of these also have place-making aspects as well, envisioned as part of the corridor plans. So those are two kind of main categories we're looking at, translating from the corridor plans, that would go into the prioritization model. And, again, as a refresher of how the prioritization model would work, we'll look at the mobility priorities and the indicators associated with that. Do the calculation. And then combine that with the community consideration's index, based on those indicators, and metrics as well to get a combined score. Then we would add the cost, the estimated cost of those projects, and then that would go into kind of where the projects are kind of scoring out on the model, and that chart just kind of shows that. In that program budget, that line will change a little bit again, as we refine the costs understand a load in risks as well, this is going to be a very dynamic process as we move forward. Now, add to that, we'll be looking at the realities of implementation that I talked about, through that implementation lens, and then starting to actually put that together into a realistic, feasible construction program to bring back to council again in early spring, february-march of 2018. In addition to the corridor program, the core set of program and projects, we'll also be bringing several other components to that. One will be obviously the implementation timeline, you know, what's our schedule for getting this work done, how are we looking at sequencing work. We'll be looking at our leveraging strategy, as much as we know at that time. Some of those opportunities will come as we get further into design, but as much as we know at that time, we'll talk about where those opportunities may exist. We'll definitely be bringing the mbwb outreach strategy, we're working on that right now. We'll talk about the procurement plan. And I will indicate we may want to get a few related

[3:29:58 PM]

procurements out as quickly as possible so we can move quickly into design. We may also need to do some additional analysis up front, quickly, things such as surveying and the like, pretty quickly. So just want to kind of give you a head's-up on that. But more information to follow as we move forward with that. Communications and community engagement plan. As I mentioned, we will have a rigorous, robust, community engagement plan, both with neighborhoods, community members, local businesses and the like around the corridors, as we move into design phase, and so we'll be talking more about that strategy all the way through construction. And then talking about where coordination opportunities exist, particularly with other initiatives, and we know you have conversations with other departments and are looking at their priorities. You've asked us to do the same thing. For example, affordable housing. Looking at imagine Austin, complete communities and the like, we are having those conversations and we'll continue to have those conversations with departments such as nhcd, planning and zoning, economic development, to see where, again, these coordination opportunities exist. I know that one of the things that council envisioned as they were putting together this program and the contract with the voters is that there could be other things that could partner in and be included with -- to leverage this investment that we're making in mobility, so we're definitely going to be having those

conversations and we'll let you know where we're at on having to say coordination discussions with other departments and other agencies when we come back in early spring. One thing I do want to mention is that it's been mentioned that workforce development is a key priority, as far as getting this program done, and so through the work of the capital contracting office under leadership of Orlando Fernandez, we've been able to develop a program and put into it our contract which is very similar to a program that the Texas department of transportation has. It's basically an apprenticeship program. This is an example of what that would look like, based on the size of the project, we would have a requirement as part of the contract bid to have a certain number of

[3:32:01 PM]

trainees or apprentices on the project to learn skilled trades. So then the contractor would be given an allowance based on the number of trainees or apprentices they would get included on that the project. So we feel this is a good way to start building capacity for skilled trades. We know there's a -- definitely a market concern from our side, as far as this goes, having sufficient sufficient, you know, skilled workers out there to get this work done. And so we definitely feel like this is a good way to do some capacity building on that side. So I think that's all for my presentation. Any questions? >> Kitchen: Questions anyone? Thank you for joining us. Councilmember -- do you have a question? >> Flannigan: I just want to say it's a very complete process you've laid out. It's very encouraging. And all I can say for right now is that my thoughts and prayers are with you -- >> Thank you. >> Flannigan: -- On this process. If there are actual things we can do for you, please keep us in mind. None of these corridors are in my district but I know how important these are to the people of my district. They drive on these corridors too. Please consider our office as part of this effort. I know all the council feels the same way. >> Thank you. >> Casar: Thank you for housing me on the mobility committee for a minute. I know I asked you guys sort of a variety of questions during the full work session and would like to catch up with you offline to see where you all are at on each of those. But since then, I've had just sort of one or two more. One is around transit priority, and I think some of us have even gotten emails, and I don't know if y'all have spoken about this, but I know that the council has passed a resolution talking about transit priority lanes, I know as part of the strategic mobility plan, y'all are looking at what

[3:34:01 PM]

that -- what priority lanes look like, but I just want to understand how that's best being synced with the corridor construction program, such that we aren't building out a corridor under a particular design and then figuring out too late, just after that, that we wish we had done center running bus or had done something -- had done being able to pay for your bus off to the side, instead of on the bus, or whatever.

How does that sequencing work? >> Yeah. So probably a couple of components to that. One, we have been having conversations with capmetro and our own Austin transportation department, asmp team, as far as what we're looking at at potential transit priority improvements. So one of the things -- and this is kind of a theme with the improvements, particularly the complete street segments we're putting in place, is flexible infrastructure. What do I mean by that? I mean that a lot of cross-sections we're with developing have right-of-way reserved, basically, for potential transit investments if they were to occur. So, in other words, we have kind of medians with sufficient right-of-way. We've talked to our transportation department about that on corridors such as Riverside and Lamar, where we have right-of-way reserved in the form of medians as part of the cross-section. It was envisioned out of the plans that would potentially be for transit. So we also are talking to them about potential -- if their transit priority lanes, the infrastructure can be converted to accommodate those as well. Those have been the nature of our conversations thus far. We'll continue to do analysis as we get additional information, both internally but also from other initiatives such as project connect as well. We're doing some analysis now to see, you know, kind of how that would jibe, but that's kind of where we're at right now. >> Casar: Yeah. That's helpful to understand it's being planned if we come in with a new investment, to if rail goes down Riverside, we would have a median that would be replaced by the rail, one challenge was if we decide to do -- my understanding is the burnet road corridor plan has center-running bus listed into the corridor

[3:36:02 PM]

plan. Lamar's doesn't. I'm still not really sure what the difference is between one and the other and why one has it and one doesn't, but if once you put a median in, if we decided a year later that we wanted center running bus, we probably wouldn't have the money to actually do that because even though it's flexible, it still costs money to tear up a whole median and turn it into roadway. I guess I don't know when the decision point is to say, well, if we're ever going to do center running bus on Lamar, now is the time to do it, or if we're not going to do center running bus on burnet, now would be the time to decide. Those corridor plans have been sitting on the shelf for a while and may be different now. >> I'll say this - >> Casar: Political ply and urban landscapewise than they were back then. >> From the corridor perspective, I would say the sooner we know about if a decision is made on making a particular type of transit investment -- and again, based on my little -- I just -- I didn't see it, but just basically the changes are easier to make earlier in the process, like design phase. The earlier we know about those, the more we can adjust for R for those and account for those as part of the design work for the corridors. And so I think right now, just based on some initial conversations, though, based on looking at potential transit investments, we're still looking at the complete street component still, you know, works, but is there going to need to be any type of adjustments, modifications made to accommodate any potential transit investment. And, again, just the earlier we know about those, the easier it's going to make those changes as part of the design phase. >> Casar: Right. I don't necessarily make thoses my. I guess one note for the capmetro board members who are here, it might make sense for there to be a time where

we decide, okay, this is the plan, so that the plans don't just happen to us, but we're being deliberate about, okay, this is how we're doing it, so that if burnet road gets prioritized, we agree that the way the bus lines are set up in that corridor plan makes sense, or if Lamar

[3:38:03 PM]

gets prioritized we decide that's the way it's going to be. If we put a median down the middle of the street, I understand that is more flexible than not having a median, but you can't drive a bus on a median, so it's still not -- it just makes sense for us to do it the best we can, planning for the future, the first time. So I don't know how we would best organize that, but I think that would be useful. >> Kitchen: So does that mean that -- so, for example, capmetro is already indicated, you know, rapid transit on Lamar, with 803 -- it's 803; right? >> 801. It's both for a little bit. >> Kitchen: Yeah. I get the 801 and 803 confused. Anyway, there's bus transit running on Lamar right now. So I guess my question is, as a follow-up, when is the decision made, and who makes the decision about whether there's going to be a transit priority lane? >> So I'll say this we're already coordinated with capmetro on what they're looking at from connections 2025 and the like. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> We're already incorporating that, accounting for those improvements. I guess if there's another investment that's counted or approved, that's something we need to account for, we can do that in design phase as well. But as far as the rapid transit, rapid bus lanes, and the headways and all of that, what they're looking at as far as their operations, where stations are placed, we're having all those conversations right now with capmetro. >> Kitchen: But that may not be the same as the priority lane. So I guess I'm just curious about how that -- how those decisions are being made, because we're dealing with older corridor plans. You know, some of those -- if I'm remembering correctly, some of those corridor plans went through a whole process a while back, and I think you said earlier there would be a stakeholder process to update them but that doesn't

[3:40:05 PM]

come till later. So I guess my question simply is, how do we -- how do we decide and who decides where the transit priority lanes go? >> It's been one of the dilemmas that we are trying to struggle with, too. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> If it's a transit effectiveness issue, I think we can deal with that. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> If it's a new corridor, dedicated corridor, and project connect is in works -- >> Kitchen: Yeah. >> -- But in February you all are going to tell us, go build that corridor, I'm not sure the community will have decided on project connect, we want that corridor to include center bus lanes. So Mike and I have been talking, the team have been talking about that, could be a delay in the corridor program to wait for a decision, and we're pretty concerned about that, with the eight-year time frame. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> So if the community, including capmetro board, city council is wrestling with what the next iteration of high

capacity transit looks like and on what corridors it's going to be on, and if they are -- which they are, on some of our corridors -- we are concerned about -- and you're asking the right questions, who's going to decide that, by when, and can we then design that into our corridors, or are we going to have to put those corridors more on the back burner and go do something else that we are more clearly know that that's going to be built and it's not going to be affected by a transit decision. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> That's what we're spinning now and we're worried that it is going to -- those decisions have to be made to do this right, but we're worried about our time frame, that will they be made in time for us to launch design in March. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Garza: I mean I understand the predicament, but of the two options you gave there, the latter is what I would see -- you said going to work on other things, I just think it creates a problem in our -- with our public, if they see all this huge funding going and tearing up roads, to do something, and then come back a year later and tear up roads to do something different. And so if there's a way that

[3:42:08 PM]

we can work as a councilmember, as a capmetro board member, to bring whatever that project connect is sooner, we should do that, because I understand that there will -- I haven't heard of Riverside, I've heard of other corridors, but, yeah, I -- we need to figure out a plan. >> Kitchen: Well, it may be, too, that -- it may be a process of narrowing down the options. Because project connect is looking at a whole long list of corridors at the moment. So it may be a process of narrowing down. I think -- I thank you for surfacing this. This is something something obviously something we need to have more conversation about. >> Casar: And my closing comments on that would be, yeah, it's challenging because some of the corridors may need the most works, which is why they're being considered the most for transit investments, might then be delayed because we're still trying to figure out how to do it best, and by the time we've figured it out, things could have already changed. That's part of the challenge of living in such a rapidly changing environment. At some point we just have to decide. So whatever table can be convened of capmetro folks and city folks and community members to just make the hard decisions quickly, the better, because, you know, I don't know how much more expensive or complicated it is to do center running bus as opposed to transit priority bus on the edge, as far as no transit only lane at all. This is something you guys know, or have done medians, then have to do rail, as opposed to center running bus, then rail. I don't know how much more expensive any of those options are. But if you're thinking about doing rail somewhere and putting medians in, it's going to end up making the bond measure that much more expensive as opposed to putting center running bus there because you don't have to tear up median, we should be thinking and talking about that. >> Kitchen: Well, we won't get the full value of the bond if we have to redo.

[3:44:10 PM]

>> Casar: That's right. So however we can help with that. My last closing comment is on the -- I'm really glad we're thinking about the workforce development and training end of this. I already mentioned acm, I think -- I think that we can do more. I think some of these projects are going to have, you know, lots and lots of people working on them, you know, dozens and sometimes hundreds of folks work on construction jobs that have this level of budget. I'm interested in working with the committee and with the staff on ways to be more ambitious with that program, and I don't think you need that much more budget to make it more ambitious. I think we can have the contractors compete to bring that number up amongst themselves. >> Kitchen: Other questions from anybody else? Go ahead. >> Alter: Thank you. I really appreciate the thoroughness of the presentation and the thoughtfulness in the approach. I had a couple questions. I want to understand a little bit better with respect to right of ways, how that's being fed into codenext. I have a pet example that bothers me, on mobility in my district at Lamar and 38th, we had a building built, Lamar very well. There was no right lane put in from Lamar onto 38th. That should not happen. And it is a corridor, it's not part of the corridor that's being done. How do we make sure that doesn't happen again? >> So -- yeah, so when I was talking about right-of-way, let me clear that up too. When I was talking right-of-way, if we're looking at a potential project, what would be a potential right-of-way we might need to put that project in place. But for that type of issue -- and this is something I should have mentioned as well -- we are working on developing design standards for each corridor, and that's how -- we're also looking to partner and get out of -- when we have projects, private development coming in place, typically we'll look at getting some transportation mobility infrastructure in

[3:46:10 PM]

place as well, as part of working with a developer. So we are looking at getting design standards in place for each of the corridors to basically implement the corridor plans and the recommendations and get some of the private -- that's how we're going to leverage a lot. Private investments. A lot of times the improvements that you will get from private development could be turn lanes, it could be index improvements, improvements right in front of that development as well, as far as putting some of the complete street cross segment in place, or cross-section in place. So we are looking at getting those developed as well, and we'll be bringing those back to council as part of the corridor construction program proposal. >> Alter: And those are separate from design standards that might be in codenext. >> That's correct. These are design standards specifically looking at what do we want to get in place from the corridor plans themselves, we're working with hgr to develop those now and we'll be bringing those -- and we're working with the asmp team and translate from asmp and translate what's coming out of asmp to go into those potential design standards as well. >> Alter: As I look at this, one of the things that's going to be important to me in the success of construction of the corridors is if we have anticipated these things and we're talking about in codenext adding a lot of density along these

corridors, as we do that, we need to be planning for these corridor improvements that we're talking about and not allowing those -- the new density to crowd out what we're going to be doing on that. So I'm not sure you can give me that clarity right now, but it is something that I'm going to be very much focusing on making sure that we have through this process. So you mentioned a little bit about the funding from the private developers. Can you help me understand how you're envisioning, when we have this development happening on the corridors and they do the impact fees and the transportation mitigation, how that's going to feed into the monies that are available for the corridor or how are we thinking about those pots of money moving forward?

[3:48:10 PM]

>> Yeah. So as far as the impact fees, there's a couple of things. One is that I think there's a list of potential projects that could be decreased through impact fees. I know that we're working with transportation to see if their projects related to the corridor construction program -- in other words, things that maybe aren't getting done in the first phase of funding, that could potentially be done there also from the asmp process interesting when they're looking at those recommendations. We're talking to them, as well as potential projects that could help the system, are there some of those improvements related to the corridor program that would be a part of that program as well. I think the initial discussion is, yeah, it looks like that would be part of that. So we are tying back into the impact fees process and the asmp process for what they're looking at as far as potential improvements. >> Alter: Thank you. I wanted to echo councilmember Casar's comments about the workforce job training, I think that's great, that we're incorporating that. Given affordability issues we have, we know one piece of that are on construction costs which come down to having the supply of labor available, and to the extent that we can increase that labor, while also improving the workforce future of many of the people who live in our community, I think that's a double win that we should be looking towards, and as we're thinking about other ways that we are investing some of our workforce dollars, I think it would be useful for us to be looking at those workforce programs and looking at the construction industry. I know we've done a lot on health care and technology, but I haven't heard, since I've been on council, a focus on kind of construction workers and getting that training in because that's critical greatly to the affordability issues that we are experiencing, and after Harvey, those are going to be just even greater. I don't know what that looks like, but it's something that I'm on the lookout trying to see some solutions

[3:50:11 PM]

for. >> And just to note, we share your concern, councilmember, and so a little bit more about the workforce development aspect of this. We have had conversations with ACC workforce solutions and

some other entities to talk about potential training programs that could be partnered up with us as well. One of the issues that we have out there is, there are more training programs in place for the vertical construction, not the horizontal construction. But there's a lot of interest from these organizations to, hey, we know you're gearing up for a big, you know, kind of a heavy highway trades type of program, so can we do some training to partner up with that. So the conversations have been going really well. And, again, kudos to Rolando Fernandez, who's been leading those constructions, and veer on yeah to see where those opportunities exist. So we are having those conversations. Again, I'm hoping to bring that.

>> Alter: We have money devoted to workforce development and we may have other opportunities outside of the bond program and I think we do -- we do need to think creatively here and see if there's a way to accomplish both of those goals, at one, and as you're developing, they -- the contracting mechanisms, it might be, you know, useful to think about, you know, other mechanisms through that as well. >> Absolutely. >> Alter: Thank you. >> Sure. >> Casar: In summary, what is the timeline for having to make -- given the current timeline, as things currently are going, what are the are -- what is the timeline when decisions on the two things we've just discussed, how we handle the project connect and other transit priority issues, and then this workforce development stuff, what would be the points at which, ideally, those things could be -- >> Well, it's hard to say a hard and fast timeline. It's going to be a function of cost. So, again, going back to the chart that I showed the mobility committee, any

[3:52:12 PM]

adjustments or changes we would have to make from the corridor construction program and the projects we're looking at doing, they're going to be cheaper and more feasible to do earlier in design, as opposed to later in design. So, again, as we move further in that design, it's just going to cost more understand a it's going to have more impact to our schedule. That's all I can really tell you is that -- >> Casar: That's on design of the corridor. >> The corridor. >> Casar: But on the contracting requirements as it relates to training, that's just the rfp requirements when you go out to bid for -- >> Sure. Yeah. Right now, we'd be looking at actually getting construction bids out for the substantial projects. We're still probably about a year to two to three years out, depending what projects we're talking about. Even for the system and safety improvements, which are some of the, like, near-term improvements, we're still probably talking about a year out. But we are going to start having those conversations with the vendor community as of December 6th. >> Casar: Got it. But long story short, that one has a little bit more run way than the design elements to the corridors. >> Yeah. >> Casar: Got it. >> Kitchen: At the December 6th meeting that you had mentioned earlier with -- starting to have those conversations with vendors, will you be talking about job training components at that meeting? >> Yeah. We will be talking about some of the new aspects we're looking at for the program, including this on-the-job training aspect we'd be putting into our construction contracts. As a matter of fact, Rolando and Veronica have already had conversations with the agc, central Texas and other contracting organizations to talk about this proposal. So we'll be talking more about it, though, with the larger contracting consulting community. >> Kitchen: Okay. All right. Questions? I have one question about -- and this is the



prioritization model. We talked about this some at the work session that you presented at, and I think at that point -- my memory -- if we're talking about a

[3:54:12 PM]

60/40 waiting, where 60 weighting goes to the priority and 40% goes -- is that correct? >> Uh-huh. >> Kitchen: I've been thinking about that, and I have some level of concern because I don't know how that's going to play out, you know, in terms of what it might do to actually prioritize particular corridors, and when I just look at the individual items in terms of prioritization, I'm not quite sure why we're not doing this as 50/50. So we had some conversation at that time, but I guess my question at this point is, when will we see how the scoring -- what the scoring does? Is that when we get -- in the spring when we get the construction program, we'll get that data, or -- >> So we're planning to come around and talk to council offices about what's going into the draft corridor construction program before we come to full council. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> You know, in spring. So also, that will be a lead-in to doing public engagement process as well. We can talk about how the model actually worked, what came out of it, then also some of these conversations that we're doing to put together the program that would be proposed. >> Kitchen: Okay. So at that time, if I -- we'll be able to see whether 50/50 versus 60/40 makes that much of a difference in terms of choices on what the construction program projects are? >> We can talk about what -- what those distinctions are, as far as 50/50 versus 60/40. The I will say the reason we did 60/40, the only delineation was looking at the mobility priorities and considering these then allow for, and based on talking to our legal team, it was really kind of an interpretation of the contract, but we can also talk about what that looks like as far as 50/50 versus 60/40. >> Kitchen: Yeah. No, I think that you -- I appreciate and applaud what you've been able to -- what you've done, so I think that the interpretation that you made is reasonable, but I don't think it's the only interpretation that could

[3:56:13 PM]

come out of that language. So that's why I'm going to want to understand what difference it might make, if it does make a difference. I can't tell from the math, you know, whether 60/40 or 50/50 is going to make that much of a difference, I just know that in my mind, these criteria carry equal weight. And so I can certainly weight to see. I'm just saying that at the time where it comes back to us, I'm going to have those kind of questions. >> Sure. >> Kitchen: I'm going to want to see if that weighting makes that much difference, and whether, if we weighted these 50/50, if that would give us a different set of projects or not. >> I understand. >> Kitchen: Okay. Other questions? Any other questions? So -- all right. Well, I also want to echo what councilmember Flannigan said earlier. You put it more eloquently. More power to

you. Thank you very much. A lot of work. [Laughter]. >> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you all. So next we will have -- >> [Off mic] >> Kitchen: Yeah. We'll take just a minute to talk about the calendar, but then I want to get back to codenext. I'm not sure -- yeah, it looks like we have some conflicts. And it looks like the next one that we have scheduled -- or we had proposed is on the same day as a budget work session. And that's on February 7th. Now, there's no council meeting that week, but there is a budget work session. So same thing with March, same week. So -- and then -- the March and the October 3rd, same week as the council meeting. So I think that we need to do some more work on this, and if I'm hearing from everyone, we're going to try to set these so they're not on the same week as the council meeting. And certainly not the same day as a work session,

[3:58:14 PM]

because we can see that there's -- yes. Go ahead. >> Flannigan: Does anybody -- there's nothing happening until January 30th, the council work session. Would there be any objection to holding a mobility meeting that third week of January? Or -- >> Kitchen: Instead of February? >> Flannigan: Instead of waiting until after council meetings begin, we could get a jump on things? >> Kitchen: Yeah, that's fine with me. >> Flannigan: Just not waiting till February, using January as an opportunity to have a mobility meeting, but towards the end -- >> Kitchen: I'm looking at the calendar right now. So for January, that would be the third week. The third -- >> Alter: Then the diversity training on Tuesday and Wednesday. >> Kitchen: Of what dates? 16 and 18th? >> Alter: 16th and 17th, I think. >> Kitchen: Okay. The 24th is a Wednesday -- it's the last Wednesday -- well, it's not even the last, it's the -- the 31st is the last Wednesday in January. The 24th is the next to the last. >> Alter: 24th is fine with me. >> The transit board thing is the 24th. >> Flannigan: I'm suggesting, if you want to put a proposal and throw it on the board -- >> Kitchen: I'll do that. >> Flannigan: Then we can get this flushed out. >> Kitchen: Let me just ask this -- >> Do we have to do it on the message board? >> Kitchen: Tentatively speaking does the 31st work for you guys? We're going to tentatively say January 31st, and then we're going to double-check with -- >> Alter: We have a council meeting -- >> Flannigan: There's a council meeting February 1st. >> Kitchen: We will do a poll and check everybody's calendar. Does that work, Donna? >> Well, I think the thought was the work session wouldn't be [indiscernible] [Off mic] Typically they wrap up by noon.

[4:00:15 PM]

>> Kitchen: That's a long day for us. I'm hearing people may not want to do that. >> Alter: They say 9:00 to 5:00. >> Kitchen: Yeah, they say 9:00 to 5:00. >> We'll need to check each of your commitments and what dates [indiscernible] >> Kitchen: Okay. With an eye towards January if we can. Does that work for everybody? >> Flannigan: I will say for my part on the judicial committee, we're going to set this

calendar on Monday. Once the calendar is approved by the whole council, it'll be finally approved by tomorrow, and I think the committees can fall in after that. >> Garza: Does it have to be on a Wednesday? >> Kitchen: It doesn't of to be on a Wednesday. >> Garza: What about January 25th? >> Kitchen: Will you be back then? >> Garza: Yes. >> Kitchen: Okay. What about January 25th? That's a Thursday and there's no council meeting that week. >> Flannigan: I'm open to it. >> Kitchen: All right. Tentatively January 25th, and we'll work the rest of the schedule and verify with y'all's office. Okay. Great. Thank you. Okay. Our next item is the mobility-related sections of the draft land development code. Welcome. >> Thanks. I'm with the Austin transportation department, here with Danielle Morin, also with the transportation department. I'll let the others introduce. >> Greg Guernsey, planning and zoning department. >> Jorge, project manager

[4:02:16 PM]

on codenext. >> Steve Hopkins, development services department. >> So we don't have a presentation per se, we'd just like to make ourselves available to answer questions that you might have on multiple topics. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Related to codenext and mobility. So -- >> Kitchen: Okay. All right. Well, I think it might be helpful if you -- if you don't mind, just for the -- just for the public to -- the presentation that you made to the work session where -- I don't know if you have that handy, but -- >> I do. >> Kitchen: Just the first few, where you just -- you reminded us during that time what the top six transportation code improvements were, so if you want to just remind us of that, take a, you know, few minutes of that, and then we can dive into questions. >> Sure. >> Kitchen: Does that make sense? >> Sure. Absolutely. So as we've been working, as this team's been working on codenext and the transportation chapter specifically, we've identified really six areas that have risen to the top that are -- that are areas that are changing quite a bit towards implementation of imagine Austin through codenext. So the number one area being how we look at transportation impact analysis, and then jumping down also how we look at managing demand. So we are looking at for the first time regulating demand management plans within the code, and relating those to what we require with transportation impact analysis. So two sides of the same coin, and really a lot of technical thinking, looking into how we work both of those sides. And if you all recall, when Jeff Tumlin was here, consulting on transportation a year and a half ago or so, you know, that demand -- managing demand and complimenting impact fees were the two number one things that he recommended, that we do to really tackle our transportation problem. And so you'll see that being

[4:04:17 PM]

implemented here with codenext. We're also -- took a very strong look at connectivity and improving loopholes in the sidewalk requirements, driveway guidelines with an eye to really looking at driveway -- driveways from a safety and mobility component and adding strengthening language in the code that allows us to regulate driveways more strongly with a focus to safety and not just mobility. And after I'm through, I'm going to let Steve maybe highlight the street connectivity section, which is in the subdivision, which gets to connectivity, and that being one of the number one priorities with imagine Austin and one of definitely the things we've worked a lot on the last year, year and a half with regards to codenext. And we believe it's in a good place, and Steve can answer the questions that you might have about connectivity and also give you some highlights, so block length falls under that area. And then street trees are a new requirement, prior to drafting codenext, there were no requirements for street trees, space for street trees -- that's hard to say -- space for street trees -- [laughter] We're required with our core transit corridor and commercial design standards, which has been a fantastic regulation for our city with regards to really strengthening the comfort for transit users with regards to our sidewalk network, but the street tree requirement is new and actually requiring them in certain situations. So that's an overview of what I would highlight as being game-changing with codenext. There's also the parking section that's in the zoning code. It's not in the transportation section with the current version. Transportation department has not led on parking, although we have been influencing and we have been working closely with optics and with planning and zoning on looking at what's happening with the parking.

[4:06:19 PM]

Of course that's very important to us from two perspectives. One is, we manage our residential parking permit program, and, you know, the community concerns that come with parking, but we also look at it as one of the biggest levers in demand management, incentivizing driving through -- through free and abundant parking also contributes to congestion, so we're very interested in both sides of those, so we're working very closely with Greg and his team. I think they can -- if you have questions on that, they can speak for specifically to what's happening to requirements, what's going down, what's going up with regards to requirements, what's staying the same. We've been monitoring that. I will say through the transportation demand management drafting that we're doing for requiring demand management with new development, that reduction in parking would be tied to a demand management plan, which is different and stronger than what we have now. And so I'll say that much with regards to whatever the regulations are, we're looking at it creating a process that would -- that could allow reducing further than how you could reduce currently. But it would have to be tied to a demand management plan, so really putting some teeth behind what that would really mean. That's all I've got. >> Kitchen: I think -- no, that's a great overview. I think I'd like to by talking about parking. We did a survey amongst ourselves, what were the top issues we wanted to talk about. So if it's okay with everyone, we'll start by asking questions about parking? Does anybody want to lead off? >> Flannigan: Sure. >> Kitchen: Okay. Go ahead. >> Flannigan: So we've had a couple of mentions of using context-sensitive as it relates to

parking requirements. I'm curious what staff's been thinking about that fairly amorphous conversation council has been having at you, to the extent it's being considered

[4:08:20 PM]

or adopted, what that sounds like, and then related to that, I struggle with parking requirements as a lever on what the market is going to provide anyway. And parking as demand management, to the extent that is true academically, it does require a transit service that we have a chicken and egg problem to create. So if -- and I've had conversations with some folks who are building some properties, and they say, you know, your minimum is two, but I'm building four because I think that's what the market wants. And so has there been any consideration of parking maximums, that if we really want -- if we're really talking about a 30-year vision for a land use code, and the combination of context-sensitive, market deliverable and likelihood, and parking maximums seems like a valuable conversation to have. Because if we're going to do -- not if, that, we are focusing on, corridors, that those corridors have some version of increasingly higher level of service on transit, then we don't want overparked buildings now, but that doesn't mean that a mile away from that transit service, we shouldn't have appropriate levels of parking. So that's where I'm struggling because I feel like we're a little bit too one size fits all, yet I'm also trying to figure out how we solve the chicken and egg problem, transit level of service versus parking minimums versus maximums. So that was a long, rambling statement, but I'm interested to hear where you take it. >> So parking is a very hot topic. First just let me start out. The parking regulations in Austin that are in draft two and most likely will be in draft three, the neighborhood partnership parking program that's

[4:10:21 PM]

administered by the city is not changing with codenext. So where you have those restrictive parking programs already in existence, those would remain. Parking in Austin, we didn't have parking in Austin before 1954. So most of the city that you see in the urban core was built without any parking requirements. And whether it was residential or commercial, they didn't exist. And in between '54 and about 1984, the parking regulations started being applied, and there's a little table, I think, that you have been provided by atd staff that kind of talks about the parking requirements. And they pretty much stayed the same. There was some parking requirements certainly for commercial and residential. The amount of parking that was triggered was probably less. And then in about 1984, when the last major rewrite of a zoning ordinance went into effect, our parking requirements went up. And they increased by quite a bit in some respects. But I think where people are most accustomed to seeing parking for residential, the 454 -- before '54, there were no parking requirements for single family in mid-'80s, it

was just one space, then we jumped to two spaces. The parking that exists downtown, or in the core, or in the areas where they didn't provide parking, they're grandfathered. So if you've never had a parking space, just because codenext goes into effect, you don't need to go out and put in a parking space. In fact, there are many businesses that rely on the parking that exists today that are -- that's grandfathered, and we're not changing that, either. So if you had a business or an apartment complex that

[4:12:21 PM]

was short parking today, just because you do some remodeling doesn't mean you're going to have to bring in the parking into compliance. That remains grandfathered. A lot of our cherished small businesses that we have in the urban core, if you go there and the spaces don't look like they would quite fit, that you could fit a car in, but they've been parking that way for years and years and years, or they're short by what you might find in the areas on the fringe, those parking -- we would acknowledge those parking spaces as existing. If they were to expand the use, we would ask they provide additional parking, but those are still going to be grandfathered. Being contact sensitive, probably the biggest thing is that we have -- that we're caring for the lack or the no-parking requirement that's provided for downtown, that doesn't exist elsewhere in the city. If you are within a quarter mile of a transit corridor, your parking reduction could be taken, up to 20%. If you're within a half mile, between a quarter mile and half mile, that would be reduced to 10%. If you provide car sharing, which is actually -- you get a reduction of 20 spaces today, that's being carried forward, so if you're providing car sharing. There's also some relaxation providing parking if you're providing more bicycle parking, if you have shower facilities, those things are -- actually in today's code, those are being carried forward. But we did make a provision that we've heard a lot from people during this process, about you're putting so much parking in, you're taking out all the trees. So you can actually relax. The parking standard by 10%, if you're doing it to preserve the existing tree canopy that we have. So a lot of the older sections of the city that have a lot of trees, and if you're trying to provide parking, you can actually get a reduction in order to save trees.

[4:14:22 PM]

If you're building more in the suburban area where it's more green field, then you're probably putting trees in, that's something that we looked but in yep our parking requirements go down. Nothing requires you from having more spaces. So councilmember Flannigan, when you say is there an absolute limit it's probably more on the impervious cover side that you would probably see that more than anything else. But we do have a minimum requirement that we're still requiring for a single-family that drops to one space. I think this takes in the consideration that people are using alternate forms of

transportation. This code, codenext does a much better job than current code about looking at transit, looking at bicycle, looking at pedestrian. There's more sidewalk requirements in here. It's not going the same throughout the city. And those areas that may have trash pickup that are done by an alternate standard like say in Hyde park you might not find the standard crew going in with the automated trucks going in picking up trash, but you will still have the crews pulling the receptacles, recycling receptacles by hand because those streets are narrow. That would not stop. That would still kin. But in general the parking requirements are reduced. And this makes probably more sense when you're dealing with some of the affordable housing projects that we have as the parking requirements drop, folks that might be in these more affordable units or there might be along transitways where there's better alternate transportation provided, the parking requirement drops and it makes it easier to build more affordable units on-site because the parking spaces cost from thousands to tens of thousands if it's

[4:16:24 PM]

in an underground or garage space. So that's in there. And I think it also acknowledges car sharing more. We do have the provision to reduce parking for like a cars to go car, but with Uber and Lyft and similar transit opportunities that we have, that becoming more available, continuing recognizes that as well. I think I can certainly pause and kind of go in a little bit -- >> Kitchen: Anybody have follow up? You do. Okay. Then Alison. >> Flannigan: Is sounds like the one per unit requirement as I'm seeing the standards, history of standards that was given to the planning commission in backup is really rather fascinating that we've only had a two-space requirement for relatively, comparatively speaking, a short time, not even for the full life of the existing code. But once you hit one, a 10% reduction -- we're really talking about at scale so we've saved some parking requirements for infill development, which is the one per unit going for to two to one, and when you're building larger developments where you're either combining parcels or you have a large parcel that you're giving up, that's where the 10 and 20% changes really come into play. >> That's correct. >> All right. I'm good for the moment. >> So I'm trying to think about this on some of the streets that I have in my district that don't have sidewalks that are narrow. And you cannot put cars in two directions with cars on both sides of the streets. They're not wide enough, they don't have sidewalks and they're already, without having this shift, full of cars, and you cannot move.

[4:18:27 PM]

If you add more cars you won't be able to move by walking, by biking or by car any faster. So I'm wondering to what degree we can make some of those reductions, particularly when it's single-family or you're going to have multi-family in the midst of a single-family area, if you can have some context specificity for width of the street and the presence of sidewalks. >> In the conditions you're talking

about exist right now, it sounds like. Right now you're saying there's difficulty, someone doing down the street, they have to pull over slightly into someone's driveway in order to get by. And codenext isn't going to build wider streets or build all the sidewalks right away. As you go in and doing the redevelopment, as I said, it doesn't preclude someone from providing parking on their property. If they have an instance where there's difficulty, that they don't have enough parking on the street, there are some things, market factors, that will probably dictate that they have some parking on the property to take care of the tenants or take care of the business that they're in. So I think part of that is working and looking at this situation that you have where most of the areas that you're talking about are already developed with probably an amount of housing that won't be able to fit too much more in. But this code does recognize that if you have an existing residence you could build an accessory dwelling unit, a garage apartment, and not have a parking requirement. So that's already -- the lack of having a parking requirement within a quarter mile of a transit area already exists today, but it's being expanded under this code to basically say any Adu where there's an existing residence, primary residence, would not be required. So there may be additional parking space that might have to be provided on the property, even though there

[4:20:27 PM]

isn't one required, because the landlord might want to have that space provision for the tenant or for the owner that might purchase the Adu as a condominium. More likely if it's an ownership situation that the owner will actually provide that space on the property. To meet financing requirements of a lender from marketing requirements for the sale of it. >> Alter: On one example I'm thinking of already has that and one has the sidewalks and is not already like that. There are lots of different permutations where we have these narrow streets without the sidewalks. And you can't get to the transit on the corridors because there are no sidewalks and then you're walking down these streets. So there is a problem of exacerbating that even more. And you put the commercial it there and you have the commercial and they all park in the residential area and you can -- it's a whole process on every street in Austin that will be residential parking only, and those requirements are really high. So there's this interplay between the residential and the commercial reductions that on the ground we have to be thinking ahead to how those interplay. So the street that I'm thinking of that's so crowded is crowded because we had Lamar central go in and they didn't have parking for their employees and their employees are parking in the neighborhood. And now they have to do the residential parking stuff and it's like this whole domino effect because it wasn't planned when we put in that commercial development where these employees are going to park and your employees can't just go park in the neighborhood nearby. And you're reducing -- so on one level it's what's happening to our residential streets where we do not have the sidewalks and the others, and if you're doing the commercial, you're not making any distinctions between different types of



[4:22:28 PM]

commercial, as I understand it, in terms of the reductions. You have doctors' offices that will have virtually no parking, at least in the first draft. I don't know how much those have changed in the second draft. >> So there is a distinction on types of uses and the parking requirements. So the parking requirement is higher for restaurants or for medical office. That's in that chart that you see. It's actually higher than you would find for a standard office or you would find for retail. >> Alter: Did that change between draft 1 and draft 2? >> I don't believe that changed -- the numeric number changed. But we have a parking requirement that is more restrictive, requires more parking for certain types of uses. And that's consistent in today's code and also in draft 2 and I believe even in draft 1. I don't think the numeric number was adjusted up or down for medical office, but it is more restricted for medical office and I think it's basically similar to what we have today at one to 200. >> Alter: I'll lead to look back at that. It's my understanding that you're going to have medical offices that don't have much parking at them and that you're expecting people who are going to these physical therapists and all these kinds of places to get there by transit, that's five blocks away from the doctor's office and with one or two spaces at those places. >> As I look at the chart, it looks -- it's the same as it is today, one to 200 for freestanding, one for 75 if it's in some sort of mixed center building. >> Alter: Can you share that with me. I may of looking at the wrong thing or being incorrect information. I want to make sure I'm looking at the right thing. We've heard a lot of people concerned about how the commercial is being handled and how that interfaces with the residences nearby when we don't have the transit in

[4:24:33 PM]

place. >> Well, they would not necessarily change that parking requirement for medical in this case, but if they were along a transit line and it was a medical office building they could take advantage of that reduction that I mentioned for being within a quarter mile. >> Alter: I'll take a look at that. I may have some more questions. >> Kitchen: I have a follow-up. I wanted to go back to the question of context -- context sensitive parking requirements. And I understand what you're saying about how the market will dictate. The questions that I'm hearing, though, are concerns about what are happening or to one neighborhood in particular that I'm familiar with that is because of the market. To redevelop, the pressures to tear houses down and redevelop along these streets that are narrow streets and have no sidewalks. So my first question is with with a single-family home that is a tear-down and it's rebuilt. It's a tear-down and you have a new home there, are they grandfathered with regard to the current parking requirement so they would have to have two, or does the code kick in at that point so they would only have to have one? >> If you were actually, I guess, demolishing an existing single-family home and you're putting back, you're saying an entirely new building. You would still be having that same requirement of what was there before. >> Kitchen: So under this

[4:26:34 PM]

new code, the new code would not apply in that circumstance and they would still have to have two parking spaces? >> They would. Now, if you had-- hang on, let me explain. If you have an incident where you have a single-family home and you were to tear it down, the requirement was two, and you're building a new one, they could take advantage of the current code. If the current requirement was higher for whatever reason they would be gathered because they could still take advantage of it. So by the same business I was going in, I -- >> Kitchen: I'm not talking about business now, I'm talking about residential. >> Okay. So if you were going in and putting a single-family home where there was one, the requirement would drop to one. >> So it's not grandfathered. >> It's not grandfathered in that sense, is that correct. >> Kitchen: Okay. So that exacerbates -- that could potentially, it depends on lots of circumstances. And that's why I'm asking about the ability to consider context sensitive because that could end up exacerbating a situation that exists currently because you're right. We obviously know that these are -- this is why the concerns being raised is because there are existing concerns along these streets, and I don't know how many of them there are in the city. I don't know how often that's occurring, I just know that in -- in one of the neighborhoods that I deal with and possibly others, there are some and where there's narrow streets, no sidewalks, current issues with parking, difficulties walking because they have to walk down the middle of the street. That's the fear is. And this is a concern that this is a neighborhood where you also have those kinds of tear-downs going on. So the concern is that in that set of circumstances -- and yes or no, I don't know how often that occurs across

[4:28:35 PM]

the city, but in that particular set of circumstances you do have the potential to exacerbate a difficult situation. Now, I understand what you're saying about the market and the market dictating, but my question is why leave it up to the market in those kinds of circumstances. If we can narrowly identify situations that are specific to a particular context. I guess it's a rhetorical question, but I guess I'm wondering why wouldn't we want to put in some kind of context-specific requirements? Because we're making a change here. We're going from two down to one. Why aren't we doing that everywhere? Or why don't we go from two to one in areas that make sense or in areas where we don't have the potential to exacerbate existing conditions. >> As I said, most of the core that we're talking about may be going down between Oltorf going as far as almost up to Justin Lane area. A lot of that was built in the early 50s and so they didn't have a parking requirement. Now, there were a lot of parking spaces that were actually provided on the properties because homeowners wanted a place to park their vehicle. But their parking requirement for a residence was only one from that time period. In fact, if you went -- actually, it was none. And then I went to one between 54 and 1984. We do allow tandem parking so that

can you park and count one space in front of another. So you see a lot of single driveways in central Austin where you'll see more than one car parked and we actually can count that under our code today. Sidewalks, if you were tearing down the house or

[4:30:36 PM]

basically adding on I think 50%, if I remember right, we automatically require a sidewalk to be constructed on the property. True, it doesn't go connecting all the way to the corner, but that is what the council enacted in 2008, a sidewalk requirement to try to make sure that we had some sidewalks that were provided, although they might be piecemeal in nature. I know working on cip projects with public works and transportation and looking at the neighborhood plans we have or small area plans that we have, there are priorities given to those routes that are coming from neighborhoods to the arterials. They might not be in every street, but those major corridors that you would see are given more priority pref reps for funding of new sidewalk projects to connect those areas. >> Kitchen: I understand the perspective, but what I'm still seeing and I'm still concerned about is what's on the ground right now could be two parking spaces along a street that's impacted like this and could go down to one with somebody parking on the street. So I had another question related to the rppr program, the residential parking permit program, that's what we call it, right? Can you just remind me what the parameters are of when that's possible for a neighborhood? Is it-- can a neighborhood choose an rpp program if they choose it or are there only certain situations in which they can choose to do that. >> Certainly. Robert spillar, director of transportation for the city of Austin. It is a neighborhood-generated request process and so a

[4:32:39 PM]

neighborhood requests a study be done to see if there is a parking issue on the block. They're also required to take a form of petition around to show support from a percentage of the blocks. We have gone from a program that focused on longer sections to try to do it as small and restrict active as possible to give some flexibility to a community so you might have a block that's rpp and other blocks that aren't. Our tact is to try to apply the least amount of restrictions possible to obtain the goals that those neighborhoods have, but the program is generally open to any neighborhood or neighborhood block, if you will. We can't do this house by house, but block by block through a request process. Now, for streets within a core transit corridor it is a little -- a bit of an accelerated process, but it is still the same process if they're within a transit core, I believe council direction is they certainly have a right to rpp, but we go through the main process, we just try to accelerate that process. >> Kitchen: Okay, thank you. >> There is a cost to the residence R. Residents for that. To get your pass as a resident you have to

pay a nominal fee to manage that. I don't know what it is offhand. There's been discussion if that's fair because certainly there are blocks along certain or parallel to certain commercial districts where there's a desire by the neighborhoods to keep the commercial districts healthy. But yet a desire to have nobody but the residents on that block parking there. And that is really where the point of conflict occurs is

[4:34:41 PM]

that trying to find that balance. Absolutely. >> Kitchen: Okay. I'm sensitive to our time. We could spend the whole time talking about parking -- >> Flannigan: One little thing just to wrap it up. I know the full council will want to debate this thoroughly, so I wanted to float a few more data points that if it were possible to know it might be useful. The parking program I doubt those are the only areas that experiencing that problem. There are probably neighborhoods that are experiencing that concern that don't have that program. So there you go. So I wouldn't want that to be the only way I consider which neighborhoods are having that problem. There aren't that many in district 6 experiencing that. To get a sense of the scale of the issue I'm not sure how to measure that. That's for staff. I think it's important to try and quantify what we lose and gain with two versus one. And this may be a modeling question, but is there a number of units that we lose with two parking required or is there a number that we gain with one parking required? We're finding a way to quantify the people impact, not just the vehicle impact to what those rules might be. And to the extent that anything we talk about in parking is a Pandora's box and any number I ask for will be picked apart in how it was obtained. Nonetheless, I think those are valid concerns because I think we all want to prioritize the people over the vehicles and if the trade-off is less or more than I have invented in my mind it would be good for me to know that. >> Alter: I think part of the concern is we're not getting affordable housing in these neighborhoods as a result of reducing the parking. We're getting housing that's more expensive than the housing that already exists and we're getting people displaced. So we have to think about some of the size issues. We've been talking about sidewalks and with the streets, but maybe it is if you're putting a 500 square

[4:36:43 PM]

foot Adu you don't have to have a parking space and I would be totally comfortable thinking through that. But if you're going to put in a 1500 -- 1100, I guess is the maximum, square foot Adu, then maybe you do need a park space. And maybe it's if you have an Adu and you have a house, then you need at least two spots. There are ways to think about it I think that do keep that in mind and I think what we're hearing and the reaction is we're not getting any affordable housing out of this process. >> With two parking we won't get affordable housing because we don't get it now. >> Alter: Anything in this process we won't get more affordable housing. >> Flannigan: That's a debate I want on this council because I

don't think we're in agreement on that conclusion. >> Alter: I think in some neighborhoods where we're experiencing this issue with the parking you're not going to get affordable housing in those areas. The lots themselves are going for so much and you cannot build with the impervious cover the multiple units given the size lots that exist historically in those areas. [Laughter] >> Kitchen: So it may also be a question about -- we need to look at the parking in the entire context. So if we're wanting to make it more affordable for smaller -- for people to have adus, then we align our parking with that. Solike you just said, if you have a certain size Adu then not requiring parking makes sense. So anyway, I just want to think about all the -- I want us to think about what is it that we're trying to incent and how can we use parking to incent that? In the context of what our different neighborhoods are experiencing? So that's really the

[4:38:43 PM]

question I'm trying to ask when I say context specific. I don't want to -- I don't want to exacerbate existing issues that we have right now and so I'm trying to think about the extent to which our change in parking might do that inadvertently in certain areas and also not to lose the opportunity to have a change in parking to actually incent what we're trying to do in some of these neighborhoods where we're really trying to look at keeping them more affordable, which means the ability to have ads, it also means the ability to have smaller homes and not more expensive homes, where some of these neighborhoods are just turning over into just very high, large -- not that there's anything against that, but it's definitely changing the character of these neighborhoods. >> Madam chair, if I may? There has been a constant theme in your conversations when we've gone out to the community is providing parking is very expensive, whether it's a driveway leading up to a parking space or actually providing a parking space, whether that be commercial or residential. So far it does have a direct impact on the provision for considering affordable options. And one of the constant themes is can you give us options in the code? The option to reduce the parking requirement from two to one is an option when you're talking about a minimum set of parking requirements. It doesn't force someone to put in two, but providing these options we think will start the conversation in the right direction of saying can we have an impact on some of these factors that have the potential to affect? >> Kitchen: Here's what I'm saying is we're putting out what we think could be helpful without tying it to what would be helpful. >> Sure. >> Kitchen: So maybe we should only be talking about reducing parking if you're going to get an affordable home? Instead of putting out a

[4:40:43 PM]

requirement like that and assuming or hoping it's going to get you affordability and instead it just gets you a larger, more expensive home that does that. >> And the expectations by reducing the parking requirements, you're going to get an affordable unit. Make sure that that's not the expectation of the code because the code itself cannot legislate the requirement for affordable units unless there is a subsidized portion that is done through the public sector to do that. It does have an impact on the overall cost of construction, so from that angle I think there is ample room for discussion to have at the policy level wildfire the trade-offs are made because you still have an impact on flooding, still have an impact on impervious cover. All those that still contribute to the provision of those parking limits. >> Kitchen: I just want us to deliberately think about our incentives in a way that recognizes the differences across our neighborhoods. >> Garza: To that point that recognizes the differences across our neighborhoods, what's affordable in -- what's affordable is very relative to the part of the city that you're in. So if you you have a half-million-dollar home and you decide to condo it and build a R. An Adu and sell it for 400,000, that's affordable if the average home in that area is \$500,000. A 400,000-dollar Adu would be affordable. And I think we should be careful about making broad statements about this is not creating affordable housing because in some parts of Austin it will. It will allow a homeowner who wouldn't because of impervious cover limits couldn't build an Adu, making it affordable for them, the homeowner, and because of the part of town it is probably my district and districts like mine would provide an affordable option for rent, so you're

[4:42:45 PM]

helping a homeowner build something as well as a renter. And there are situations where they couldn't do that if they were required to build a parking space in addition to I think it's Obama's toolkit about housing talks about how lower income families -- it makes housing more expensive for them because they're paying for that parking spot even though they might not be using it because they don't have a car. So it's all relative. And we do have to look at it in different contexts, but it's hard to give staff direction to say some neighborhoods are not going to be building affordable units because that's relative to that neighborhood. We're never going to make as much as I would love to, make tarrytown and Hyde park affordable for families like mine, it's never going to be that way, but it's all relative. >> Kitchen: But we've got neighborhoods that are close in that are being turned over to what is affordable for the people that are living in them now because they bought 25 years ago. That they couldn't buy in right now and can barely still stay in because of property taxes and other things. But the point being is that we have differences across -- we have lots of differences across our city. Why do we have to do a one size fits all on all of these requirements? Why can we not be using our requirements to actually address the kind of situation that councilmember Garza is talking about, to address the kind of situation that councilmember alter is talking about? Why can't we be morphine tuned? Parking is a -- you said it was a Pandora's box. It's because there's a lot of -- parking and transportation there's so many things that is impinges on. So many levels it pools. So why -- I'm just asking why we can't be -- why we

[4:44:45 PM]

can't think about this in a more -- in a more defined -- not such an aggregate way I guess is what I'm saying. >> As I said, there are some things if you're close to transit, if you're building an Adu and you're going to tear down your house in front, there actually is a parking requirement for an Adu if you're in a circumstance where you're tearing down your house and building a new house and an Adu. The way the parking works it speaks to basically waiving that parking requirement if there's an existing dwelling unit on the property. So if you're maintaining the house in front you would only have to provide parking for the unit in the park, the Adu. If you're tearing down the house and building a new house and an Adu then you would be required to have two spaces, one for the house in front and one for the house in back. So there are some -- >> Kitchen: So you do in those circumstances. >> When you are building a new house and a new Adu, but if you're preserving the house in front, then there's no parking requirement for the Adu in the back. So it's a way of trying to maintain the older home that might be in the front that may be more affordable than somebody building a brand new house that would cost more, but also providing again an incentive to do the accessory dwelling unit that most likely would be less expensive than the unit in the the front. >> So we have already some differences in how we handle parking dependent upon the things that we're trying to incent, it sounds like. So I think that I think some of us may just be bringing up other factors that perhaps could be considered as part of these parking requirements. >> Alter: And I agree that it's context dependent. All the contexts are

[4:46:47 PM]

relevant and what works in one part of the community may not work well in another part of the community. We are not seeing houses that are coming up, even if than the current value of that property. They end up costing more than that one just times two. >> Kitchen: Okay. Anybody else want - anything else on parking or should we move on? Okay. What issue would you all like to talk about next office. >> Flannigan: I have a tdm question? Do you mind? I don't want to jump ahead. I went first last time. There's an element of the tdm requirement, as I get back to my presentation, where it talks about the on-site tdm coordinator. And I was trying to make my way through the draft in how this is defined and at what level this is required. And there were some folks that provided interpretations that I don't think were as clear that their hair was on fire about it. I'm not sure the thing that it's saying, so I am asking staff what is this on-site tdm coordinator, what levels of development will be videoboard to have one and what is the vision for how that actually gets implemented? >> So there's an element, which you probably heard of enforcement that needs to happen with tdm, so the idea behind it is to have -- it's only for commercial. The idea is that it would be for commercial development so mixed use or fully office or fully retail, that there would be an on-site coordinator who would oversee, administer the

program as approved with the site plan or with the development permit. And also provide reporting back to the city. So we are -- the guidelines

[4:48:47 PM]

and criteria for specifically how the tdm would work so the trigger would be in the code as to when it would be triggered and then how the details would work on the duties or of the coordinator would be in the transportation criteria manual which we have kicked off last month. As you all know, the criteria manuals need to be updated as well in order to implement codenext. So the tdm guidelines specifics would be in the criteria manual and that's being developed concurrently with how we're still looking at - staff is still examining how the tia and tdm regulations work together. So I don't have a lot of detail, but I'm going to ask Danielle if she has any other details. She's been working more closely with our tdm program manager who has worked in San Francisco before and seen how their code requirements with transportation and land management have worked with coordinators. So Danielle, did you have anything more to add? >> Not much to add, just more that we are looking at the tdm program currently and at different cities and how this can -- this can work well in Austin. So we are very context specific for Austin. We want this to work for Austin so that we actually get reduced car trips out of tdm and not justice sort of level that we ask the development to lower their trips by. But we want to see something come of this program. So the tdm program coordinator were not -- it's still a little hazy, but we're working on that. >> Flannigan: And honestly, my concern is that you take a project like the foundation communities project is reduce their parking requirements, they build more affordable units, but do they have to pay someone to be a tdm. And it's a question of what does that person have to do? Is it five minutes a month? To the extent it's just a

[4:50:48 PM]

property manager duty they're already doing, is it checking a box? And if that's all it is, then is it really doing anything? >> This is really good feedback and timely. I would also add that another idea that we're flowing around is we have our downtown transportation management association, which is movability Austin, and the idea we're thinking about too, they've just changed through their board, their mission to be more of a regional transportation management association and we're seeing how we might tie in some sort of fee-in-lieu of that coordinator to have that entity that's already set up to monitor the demand management plans that would come through the development process? So that's another idea that we have that might make it more streamline? Because again the idea of the code is to make things more streamlined as well and so that just came up in one of our meetings a couple of weeks ago. >> Flannigan: That's an interesting idea. It just made me think of the role of merchants' associations on



certain corridors that they might find themselves playing in the role of tdm coordinators and how do merchants manage the parking and the inflow and outflow of customers. So that is kind of an interesting way to frame that and I think just the fear that I'm hearing from some folks is that they're now going have some full-time on-site tdm person and it wasn't clear to them that it was only for commercial and mixed use, it wasn't so clear to them in draft 2 that it was limited to projects of a certain scale. So maybe tightening up that definition will be helpful too. >> We will do that. >> Flannigan: Thank you. >> Kitchen: I have a question about the connectivity section. My question really relates to multimodal connectivity. I notice that that particular section of the transportation code only speaks to street connectivity and I was hopeful -- I guess I'm asking a question. I'm hoping that we can expand that section or

[4:52:48 PM]

sections so that we're talking about multimodal connectivity. So does that make sense? We talk about the importance of connectivity, but all we're talking about is street connectivity instead of bikes, pedestrians in addition to street connectivity. So have you gotten comments like that? To date? >> No. That was the first one on this section. But the -- this section it started out in the subdivision chapter in the current code and it was very narrow, not much to it. It just said this is your block. One block everywhere. So what we did was make that context sensitive, move it into the transportation chapter so that we're looking at the street layout not the connectivity. The connectivity might be a bit of a misnomer since it's not looking at the broad sense of connectivity. It's looking at creating a framework that allows you to enhance connectivity. Does that make sense? >> Kitchen: Yeah. I think we're talking about the same. It's 23-9-h-1020. >> Correct. >> Kitchen: It's now under section -- it's labeled connectivity and it talks about street layout and alignment, but then you also have the next two sections after it that relate to it that talk about accessing streets and dead-end streets and stuff like that. It just seemed to make sense to me that we might want to expand that section. So it sounds like you haven't gotten that kind of comment before. >> We haven't. Is that addressed elsewhere in the transportation chapter? >> For transit connectivity or multimodal? >> Kitchen: Multimodal connectivity. >> I will add that we've added in dead-end streets. We are prohibiting dead-end streets unless there's a to

[4:54:49 PM]

go although revenue natural feature or other conditions and that's unique in codenext. The great thing about this section is if we do allow a dead-end street we are requiring a multi-use trail easement at the end or a cul-de-sac to connect to an adjacent roadway. So that's an example of a way that we would gain multimodal connectivity. >> Kitchen: Okay. It just seems to me that multimodal connectivity is part of the assessment of whether a street is appropriate to be a dead-end street. That's how I was reading

it. Was I reading it wrong? >> You're asking if that's something that we review? >> I was reading it to say that you could have a dead-end street if you met all these criteria and one of the criteria was including that other kinds of access. >> So it starts out with -- so it would have to be an initial circumstances and it's director approved so it would be an administrator approval if you follow those conditions. One, two and three. >> So the topography, the natural features or the unusual conditions? >> Uh-huh. >> Kitchen: Okay. What about safety? Have y'all -- maybe you haven't gotten -- my broader question is has this section come up? Have you gotten comments about this section or not or any of these sections? >> Not from the public portal. >> Kitchen: That answers my question. We can talk offline if I'm reading it correctly according to the intent. >> I think over time I know we've had a lot of requests for multimodal connections in the past on zoning cases and we've made provisions with conditional overlays to allow multimodal only connections in additions.

[4:56:50 PM]

So with codenext we're using all that past history of wanting that type of connection and allowing it by right, but then -- and disallowing the non-connectivity portions. So we've continued seeing people want that multimodal connect, not necessarily the automobile connectivity. >> Kitchen: So it's a new section. I thought I heard you say that the rest of it was moved from one place and then over here. >> Well, the concept of block length was moved over. And -- but most of this in -- under the connectivity, most of that is new or cleaved or enhanced somehow. >> Kitchen: Is 10-30 a new section, about access streets? Is that a new section too? >> That does exist in the current code but it's -- it is different in codenext. It's been expanded. >> Kitchen: Okay. All right. Other questions? Do y'all have other questions? >> Flannigan: I have one question. We only have three minutes left if there's something that you need to close. I know councilmember Garza had to leave right at 5:00. You're good? So here's my pet question that I didn't include in our list upfront. To what extent do these regulations impact freight delivery and dropoffs because certainly not just driving around these streets downtown, but in other parts of town you will see delivery trucks blocking lanes of traffic. And as we have designed streets to be one lane in each direction that's become an issue. Even when the buildings they're dropping off into clearly have delivery bays. And I don't know if that's a choice that's being made that's in violation of the code, if there are thoughts around how that's being considered or requirements under developments of a certain size having enough

[4:58:51 PM]

facility and space to do delivery dropoffs off the public right-of-way. >> It's certainly a choice for the driver to block. >> Flannigan: So right now that would be something I should call in is what you're

saying? [Laughter]. Because I will start doing that, putting streaked on notice. >> Kitchen: And first. >> We still have requirements under the code for something called loading. It's under 23-40-3070. But it's based on the square footage of the building and whether or not there's going to be loading requirements specifically provided on the property. >> Flannigan: And that's of the entire building, not just >> That is not just. Tenant taking delivery. >> That's the building we're talking about, so up to 10,000 square feet there's none required for -- one space between 1,000, 100,000 square feet, so we don't have a large requirement for loading that's under the code, but there is a requirement for loading that we have. >> Flannigan: And that requirement means they can't make their drop-offs in the public right-of-way. >> They shouldn't be. That doesn't mean they don't. >> Flannigan: That's kind of the crux of my question. >> In the downtown context we are allowed to unload for certain times, usually they'll put up a sign, but typically you're not necessarily allowed to block a lane it's my understanding. >> Yes, hi, councilmember, Robert spillar again. In the downtown area, that's correct, many of our commercial areas where we have multiple lanes we do allow them to stop in lane. Second street, yes, we know that delivers do -- deliveries do stop there. They're not allowed to do that during peak periods, although some of them do, but the reality is that curb space is at such a premium in the downtown we try to work with the distributors, we used to give their truck drivers many tickets for stopping in a lane and we've now worked out a permit process where we allow them

[5:00:52 PM]

in off-hours, for instance out here, to stop in the outside moving lane. Now, other cities have the luxury of having three-lane roadways, second street is a two-lane roadway as opposed to a three-lane and that he actually allow many of their deliveries in that middle two-way left-turn lane. We don't have that luxury in many of our arterials. >> Flannigan: Right. Something that's been bugging me and I wanted to ask since everybody was here. >> Garza: So it is a violation to do it otherwise because it often happens on south first, coming from south Austin into city hall moving truck so that's illegal, right? >> If they get caught, yes. >> Garza: If they -- yeah, okay. [ Laughter ] >> Yeah, it's often -- councilmember, it's often they're running in to drop a package and unless the enforcement officer just happens to be there, it's pretty tough to stop. >> Garza: Okay. >> Kitchen: Do you have anything else? Thank you all for coming. I know you have a lot on your plate, and I really appreciate you taking the time and coming and talking with us. So thank you. Meeting adjourned. [ Adjourned ]