

Mobility Committee Meeting Transcript – 11/5/2019

Title: City of Austin

Channel: 6 - COAUS

Recorded On: 11/5/2019 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 11/5/2019

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

Please note that the following transcript is for reference purposes and does not constitute the official record of actions taken during the meeting. For the official record of actions of the meeting, please refer to the Approved Minutes.

[1:06:17 PM]

>> Good afternoon, everyone. We'll go ahead and get started with our mobility committee meeting, calling to order at 1:06. So let's see. Do we have -- hello. Okay. Call of order, approval of the minutes. So the motion from council member Flannigan to approve the minutes. >> Flannigan: Sure. >> Kitchen: And a second from altar? Minutes are approved. The first thing we're looking at is the schedule for next year. Do you all need a few minutes or are you ready to talk about that? We can come back to it if you'd rather. Looks fine to everybody? Would you like a few more minutes? >> Yes. >> Kitchen: Okay. Okay. I think we're going to -- so

[1:07:19 PM]

we'll just take a few minutes -- we'll come right back to the calendar, so you all have a few minutes to look at it. We're going to start with the Rainey street, shared streets pilot, I believe, because I think the mayor wanted to join us for it. So we'll give him a little time to get here. So we'll start with the Rainey street shared streets pilot. Are those folks here? I think they're just in the atrium. >> Kitchen: Okay. Okay. Great.

[1:08:33 PM]

Okay? Okay. I think everyone has had a chance to look at the schedule. Do we have a motion to adopt that? Council member Ellis. And a second? Mayor pro tem Garza?

[1:09:34 PM]

Okay. All right. All in favor? Okay. So the schedule is adopted for next year. That's Thursday, February 13th, Tuesday, March 31st, Thursday, an 30th, Thursday August 30th, Thursday October 8th, and Thursday November 19th. All right. Let's see. Do we have the folks here on the Rainey street? They went to go see if -- is it okay to go forward with that? >> I'm informed they're just pulling into the garage. >> Kitchen: Okay, that's fine. >> We apologize, this thought they were going second. >> Kitchen: It's not their fault at all. What about the core transportation plan? Do we have those folks here? Same thing? Oh, okay. All right. Well, we'll wait just a few minutes. >> Sorry. >> Kitchen: Okay.

[1:10:35 PM]

We just heard earlier today that the mayor asked us to wait a little bit on the LCD, because he's going to join us, so that's why we're doing that. Do we have any citizens communication? No? All right. Well, we'll hang out. We'll give it a few minutes. It's not del's fault, so it's okay.

[1:11:38 PM]

>> Kitchen: [Laughing]. Sorry about that. Sorry about that. We switched things around, so -- take a few minutes if you need to get settled. We can take either one first, whatever you want. Rainey or the core transportation. Okay. >> [Off mic]. >> Liane Miller, Austin transportation, here to talk about the Austin core transportation plan, which is our update to a couple of different downtown plans. So I just want to talk today about what the purpose of this planning process is, the scope of the project, our schedule, and what you'll see at the end

[1:12:38 PM]

of the planning process. So first, the purpose is to update the 2002 downtown access and mobility plan, our very favorite acronym the damp. And downtown Austin plans transportation framework. So since that time, especially in downtown, we've had a lot of developments in all kinds of things, transit planning, bicycle planning, improvements to our highway connections into downtown, obviously things like scooters and micromobility have been a total transformation in mobility downtown and how we think about ur wan street design. We have a lot of reasons why we want to revisit those assumptions and plans. We also want to unify a vision for downtown from all of these kind of new initiatives that we have going on, project connect, all kinds of different planning

[1:13:39 PM]

processes, and the -- your Austin strategic mobility plan, which is the update. So we just wanted to orient you with the planning area for the plan. So it's not just downtown, but the connections in and out of downtown. Obviously downtown is a regional hub. We're having people from all over coming into and out of downtown, so the connections are really important. So in terms of looking at -- in this plan we want to look at the impact of some of those projects, like I-35, and our local planning process for congress avenue. We also want to look at systemwide improvements downtown, such as curb management, transit facilities -- going out of order. So we have -- we're not starting from scratch, though, we have a really strong foundation, starting with the great streets master plan in 2001.

[1:14:41 PM]

The damp in the downtown Austin plan framework, all the way up to 2011. So really, that's just a summary of what all of those plans did. And so we want to look back at those, take from them the still works and update and refresh those pieces to reflect our current-day policies, reflecting all of these recent projects and initiatives that you're very familiar with. And reidentify that vision for downtown. So we have with the strategic mobility plan, new policy to achieve a 50/50 mode share. I think we all know that downtown is probably going to need to take on a larger, even the central core of Austin, a larger share of that 50/50 mode share goal than maybe other parts of the region, so focusing on that downtown, really on focusing on demand. Obviously project connect, and the connections into downtown

[1:15:41 PM]

through the Orange and the blue line will be looked at as part of this planning process. Congress avenue street design -- or congress avenue urban design initiative really shows us how we can rethink the space that we do have in downtown in the right-of-way. A lot of downtown is built out. We're not necessarily expanding our roadways, but reimagining how we can allocate that space is something that we will be doing through this plan. And then just really integrating the transportation elements through these other initiatives that are going on. So we have 2016 bond delivering projects, we have the palm district planning process under way. So really connecting between all these different initiatives going on downtown. So the scope of the plan began last year, completed phase 1, which is really a data collection updating a cordon line study we'd done in the old

[1:16:42 PM]

damp plan. And created a project database. We're now going to take that information, do additional data collection, and look at the future conditions of our streets, using the asmp as the foundation for that, and review policy that establishment in other plans in asmp and see if there's anything else we need to be more specific on for downtown and really put all that together into a plan document with recommended projects for you. So project schedule-wise, we just kicked off phase 2 with our consultant team, and we will be planning to deliver a final plan at the end of the summer, throughout this process we will do public engagement to get input on priorities on those recommendations, so we have a database of projects. We wt to refine that a little bit more and get input from the community on what would be your priorities, what do we want to

[1:17:45 PM]

move forward first. So that would be something that we'll be working on with public engagement, and then bringing you a draft plan next year with those recommendations. So just to kind of review what the deliverables will be, you actually have a plan document that has policy, a list of projects, maybe a little bit in more detail than what you had in the asmp where you were looking more of a systemwide. We get into more detail on cost estimates of what those would be, and an approach to implementation for some of those signature projects, and then those would be supported by updated modeling for downtown and renderings visualization so people can kind of anticipate what things might look like with new street design. And that's it for the A.C.T. Plan. >> Kitchen: Would you all prefer to go ahead and present Rainey and then ask all of our questions? Because we can do that.

[1:18:46 PM]

They may have some relation to each other. Would that be useful? >> There is some relation. But certainly -- they certainly are different. Rainey mobility in general feeds into the overarching downtown transportation planning process. >> Kitchen: What would you guys prefer? Colleagues, do you all want to go ahead with the Rainey briefing and then -- okay, we'll go ahead and do that. >> So I'll be the spokesperson for this presentation, Cole kitten, Austin transportation. The street pilot on Rainey street is at a point where we're able to bring these draft logistics to you to solicit that final feedback before we finalize the logistics going into the pilot.

[1:19:48 PM]

So a little background on the Rainey neighborhood, which many of you already know. The Rainey neighborhood is hurting right now. It has been hurting some of the things that we hear is about transit, access in Rainey, or adjacent to, the limited access points, concerned around emergency access, traffic related to the late-night activity, the lack of infrastructure for specific modes, creating the mix of

transportation modes in the streets. So it's all the typical things that you would imagine in a growing urbanizing environment. So some of the initiatives that have been ongoing, or concurrent, are, of course, the shared street pilot, the Rainey mobility study that's being led

[1:20:48 PM]

by atd. And then the next step being the Austin core transportation plan. So the shared street pilot resolution was adopted in June of this year, and that's where city manager was directed to initiate the shared street pilot. But it was important to be coordinated with the local mobility study. So you'll see that a lot of the local mobility study effort included some of that evaluation. We're also asked to consult with the Rainey stakeholders, the residents, the business associations and the mac, and that we were tasked with considering options, other means to get to the neighborhood, and identifying queueing areas for qecs and taxis.

[1:21:48 PM]

So concurrently the Rainey mobility study was initiated in a typical fashion to identify transportation mobility improvements, addressing safety needs in the area. That study was done over the summer, and into the fall. And is currently being finalized. So a lot of the findings that we have play into the shared streets pilot, but also will be carried on into the A.C.T. Planning process. So in regard to the shared street pilot, the data collection really highlighted the need for the potential risk, safety risk for pedestrians. What was observed over a 72-hour period was that pedestrian volumes start getting high around 8:00 P.M. On Thursday night. They peak at 900 pedestrians on

[1:22:49 PM]

a Saturday at 11:00 P.M. And at that time, pedestrians make up about 80% of the total traffic. So there's about 100 cars on the street while there's 900 pedestrians. Some other takeaways from the mobility study was the identification of the red river extension project, which through the modeling and traffic analysis, that was an element that became apparent, that there's a critical need to relieve mobility by providing this additional connection. It also validated or confirmed that, yes, we need to make alley improvements. We also need to make some intersection improvements. But it also was used as an opportunity to test what would happen to vehicular traffic if we were to close Rainey street

[1:23:51 PM]

altogether, for a full day closure. So some of the analysis there was pretty clear and self-explanatory, that without an alternative like extending red river, it wouldn't be possible to close Rainey street permanently to vehicles. So another effort as part of the study was to do some early engagement with the business community, to get feedback on what are the daytime uses, operational considerations of Rainey street. So deliveries, trash pickup, parking, when and where were these occurring. And also, ask the question of, what days of the week and time of day would you support a shared street pilot, or a street closure. So taking all of that information into consideration, here's the basic layout of the

[1:24:55 PM]

logistics around the closure. In coordination with APD, the approach is to do a safety closure. The days of the week would be Thursday, Friday, Saturday nights. Those are when you see the highest pedestrian volumes. The times of the day, 9:00 P.M. To 2:30 A.M. Similarly the highest pedestrian volume times. But the other considerations around the closure is what happens within those closure limits. And some of this can be part of our conversation before the logistics are finalized. But it's assumed that scooters will be prohibited from the pilot area. No vehicles. But it is effectively a pedestrian-only zone at that point. We've also identified where passenger loading and unloading should be, taxi Zones, and where on and off-street parking remains. So the map indicates where the

[1:25:55 PM]

limits of the closure would be. So it's the entirety of the north end of Rainey street, between Driskill street and river street. And it would include the approach on Davis street, just after the alley. So some of the preliminary logistics around vehicular circulation and curb management is shown on the screen, where we could anticipate vehicles to be moving, to make drop-offs, pickups, sharing the space with taxis on Davis street in front of hotel van sant, as well as utilizing the space on Driskill on the curb west of Rainey street. From the south end, we have a similar logistics showing where we would anticipate vehicle circulation and passenger loading and unloading.

[1:27:00 PM]

So up to this point, we've shared the concept with the downtown commission. At the time we didn't have the logistics by the 16th of October. It's only been recently, over the last couple of weeks, where we've been able to work with APD to nail down more of those specifics. And it was largely a decision by APD to make it a full safety closure from Driskill to river street. So from APD's perspective, the various divisions within whether it's engineering or the mobility services where we're working with those -- the safety closure limits to see how best we can facilitate the mobility and access around that. Just yesterday we were able to meet with a Rainey task force. So this is Rainey neighborhood

[1:28:00 PM]

stakeholders that assembled their own task force immediately after the resolution was passed. It wasn't until yesterday that we were able to meet with them, to discuss these logistics. And, you know, it should be obvious for anyone that when there's a street closure proposed in your neighborhood, more than likely the result would be negative perception from the residents. So the residents and neighborhood are frustrated with the shared street pilot concept. They didn't really understand where and why it was being proposed. But I think that's completely understandable. In most cases, if someone tells you that we're going to close a street in your neighborhood, you certainly have that reaction. So we're having to come a long

[1:29:00 PM]

way to explain the logistics around a pilot, that it isn't a full-time closure, that it's not every day of the week, that it's not south by southwest, especially that closure. And that it is this -- it's this concerted opportunity for us to evaluate the impacts of closing the street to mobility and safety. So we're approaching it with a little bit more concern and thoughtfulness than just, we're going to close this street, and get out of there. So we're trying to work really hard with the task force to make sure that they're heard, and that their concerns can be summarized, relayed to APD. And I think a big element of the pilot is perhaps making sure that it can be nimble or flexible throughout the duration

[1:30:00 PM]

of the pilot, so that if something isn't working out, we're able to adjust accordingly, including the length of the pilot. So if we feel like what we've done is created a larger safety concern outside of the closure area, we might choose that the pilot can end early. And that's something that we should take into consideration. On the other side of the coin, we met with the pedestrian advisory committee last night, and they couldn't think of another street better than Rainey street to do this pilot. So they were very interested in seeing this actually unfold, and what the results would be. But at the same time, there were

[1:31:00 PM]

concerns expressed about access, and making sure that it's not actually just a street closure to everyone, that -- you know, how much can bicycles, Peddy cabs, scooters, permeate through the closure. So that is

another consideration about, are we -- as a starting point, is the safety closure too extreme, and then is it -- as we progress through the pilot, is there opportunities to make it more accessible. But all based on observation and monitoring during the pilot period. So we're here today. Tomorrow we have a presentation to the mac advisory board, sharing all of these atd initiatives and letting them know what we anticipate the impacts being from the shared street pilot. And then hopefully by the end of the week, based on this

[1:32:03 PM]

conversation and feedback, we can finalize the logistics and send out a memo to the full mayor and council and start notifying all of the stakeholders, whether it's block walking, delivering information, or doing mailouts, all of that would need to quickly happen in order for a launch to occur on the 14 th. 14th. A little bit more background into the launch date. When APD was able to receive the data that was collected and make a reaction, the impression was given that this needed to actually happen immediately, but they gave us this opportunity to quickly do the engagement with the stakeholders and presentations to adjust accordingly. So one last slide is about, how do we measure success of the pilot. Because like we said, we don't

[1:33:03 PM]

want to just go in there and do this for the sake of doing it. We need to make sure that we're measuring its impact, so have we solved the safety issue, what is the satisfaction of the visitors, the businesses, the residents. We could facilitate that through surveys. And then getting back out there during the pilot to observe vehicle volume, speeds, and counts to make sure that we've actually facilitated the same amount of people visiting the neighborhood, but perhaps not driving to the neighborhood. So that's a lot of information, and generally seeking feedback on reactions to the closure limits, the details of the closure, and then ideas on how we would monitor and measure success.

[1:34:06 PM]

>> Kitchen: Thank you both very much. Do we have questions from anyone? Go ahead. >> Sure, I'll go ahead and kick it off. Thanks for being here. I wanted to kind of voice my support for at least providing y'all the flexibility for looking at bikes and Peddy cabs and electric scooters and things like that. It may not be something that pans out to work well, but I think it's important to kind of know that if we are closing down a street and seeing what will work on Rainey street, that we allow for people to be bicycling in as opposed to try to get a ride in. It could alleviate concerns about car, pedestrian, bicycle conflicts of those mobility modes. So I could definitely be on board with that and would encourage you

to use the flexibility of a pilot program to see if that's really going to work well. I made a couple other notes here. Let me see. And I really appreciate you

[1:35:08 PM]

coordinating with the Rainey task force. I know a couple of the people who live on Rainey street have been coming to our meetings to speak to us. Is there any discussion on the table right now about connecting Rainey street to Caesar Chavez? I know someone had mentioned that. Someone who's not a traffic engineer. I'm not sure if that would work, or if it's even on the table given who owns that dirt lot right now. I just didn't know if that was part of this discussion. >> Yes. Currently in the asmp there's that connection connecting Rainey street from Driskill to Caesar Chavez. So that's also an improvement that was included in the Rainey mobility study, and then would subsequently be carried forward into the A.C.T. Planning process. >> Okay. Fantastic. And as far as ems vehicles, would they be allowed to go into closed areas if the case arose that they were needed into a

[1:36:08 PM]

closed street area like Rainey? >> Mm-hmm. Yeah. My understanding from conversations with emergency services is that a street closure is actually more beneficial, because you can remove the barricade and then proceed more unimpeded than a congested environment. So it's actually clearing the path. >> Okay. Good. That's good to hear. And as far as the core transportation plan, are some evaluations being done for mult DI modal transit, like park and rides to let people get close to downtown but not necessarily need to drive to their final destination? I'm not sure if you are all in agreement, but we can't just adding capacity, we're kind of at max road capacity right now. In order to accommodate people in the downtown area is to start improving on our other modes of transportation. So I didn't know if maybe

[1:37:10 PM]

park-and-rides or more dedicated lanes are part of the look at the act act plan. >> Yes. Certainly that's one of the key elements that would be considered and highlighted as probably a transformative project. We talk about I-35, and mopac and managed lanes, and the ability to facilitate the express service from the outer reaches of the region into downtown. So liane did a great job of explaining the A.C.T. Plan so I didn't interject. But yeah, the A.C.T. Plan certainly is supposed to look at all elements getting into downtown, but also facilitating the movement within downtown. So how do all of those fit together. >> That's great. I know the south mopac express lanes are going to be extremely helpful to southwest Austin to try to be a little less car dependent if we've got some dedicated bus lanes, or whatever

[1:38:11 PM]

that might be. >> Mm-hmm. >> That's all I've got. I don't know if anyone else -- >> Kitchen: Other questions? >> Thank you, I appreciate these updates, and hearing more about how we're going to adjust the congestion in Rainey, and future work for the downtown area. Let me start with some questions on the A.C.T. Plan. So can you tell me about how project connect will intersect with this plan? >> So, they are being done concurrently, so that is intentional. Because what we want to be able to facilitate is a conversation about how do we accommodate transit going into downtown, serving downtown, but also our main purview would be, what is the impact to downtown, meaning the adjacent corridors, the serving corridors, along their

[1:39:11 PM]

alignments. So it's a bit of coordination of not only the corridors themselves, but providing support to get to the corridors. >> So this will be done in tandem, and the difference in our areas will be discussed in terms of how it impacts the rest of the goals besides the transit? >> So -- yes. >> Okay. Great. >> It will feed into the A.C.T. Plan. >> And then I wanted to build off something that Mr. Flannigan had brought up the other day, the different context, in that we have a whole bunch of plans we're now looking back at. And we are trying to see what the next steps are. To what extent will you also be looking at how we follow those plans and the success that we had in fulfilling those, and helping us understand why you're modifying certain things? >> I think that's something we

[1:40:12 PM]

can definitely incorporate into the scope and working with, you know, planning and zoning and other departments that have developed some of these plans. And this is an opportunity to update them, to reflect our best practice, and so documenting why we're making certain changes and what policy direction is guiding us to do that. I think it's definitely something we can do as part of the process. >> That would be helpful for us to know where we've been and how we've succeeded moving forward. For the Rainey street, I don't remember us having said anything about scooters, and I'm not saying we want scooters in that area, but can you speak a little bit as to why scooters were not allowed, and then what's happening for bikes and Peddy cabs and what the process is for making the decisions? Again, I'm not trying to advocate one way or the other, I'm just trying to understand

[1:41:14 PM]

the process. >> That's a good question, it was one posed by the pac last night. It was, why not. Generally, my reaction is, we're starting from a point -- or the starting point is purely a safety closure. So the idea behind it is, separate those that don't play nice together. And if it was too extreme, then we can walk back and adjust the pilot, since it is a pilot. But that is a question that we have to coordinate with APD as we finalize the logistics. About, what other observations as far as, how does the sixth street closure work, what are the conflicts that they see. And I think a lot of that is probably what's influencing their position. >> So will the pedi cabs and bikes be allowed?

[1:42:14 PM]

Or you haven't determined that? >> I think coming from APD's perspective, we're going to push for the greater mobility, greater access opportunities. So where there are opportunities to perhaps allow pedi cabs to go past an initial barricade and go further into the closure, then that to me seems to make sense, as long as there's another control mechanism that says, okay, now you've gone too far, or if there's a true concern about the mix of pedestrians with pedi cabs and bikes as well, or was the initial reasoning being that the concern was vehicles and pedestrians. >> And then you talked about the barricades, and I'm imagining if we did this as a pilot versus permit, those might look very different. How are you thinking about the barricades and what those will

[1:43:15 PM]

look like? >> So, again, since this is kind of a standard APD safety closure deployment, our assumptions are that they would be the standard barricades. >> Okay. And then how are choices made over like Davis and Driskill as the streets that you are choosing either to end at, or to circulate on? >> So, again, kind of reacting to what APD's assessment was, the pedestrian volumes are still high between that block of Driskill to Davis. So I think from atd's perspective, it made sense to just close the entirety of Rainey, because of the consistent pedestrian volumes along the entire length. But that's a good question that

[1:44:17 PM]

I think, since it is a pilot, and we should monitor the volumes during the closure, to be able to say, well, maybe that -- the length of the closure was too much, let's actually make it only to Davis street. So being able to have that flexibility I think is important. >> Thank you. >> Kitchen: Any other questions? >> I have a few. Let me start with the core transportation plan. So I just wanted to understand a little bit better. So the deliverable out of that is a set of projects, right? That would then feed into whatever systems we have for potentially funding them. Is that right? In terms of the end goal >> So the primary deliverable is a plan document. So as you could imagine, it's a

[1:45:18 PM]

document with supporting text, policy framework, but it also allows for perhaps an appendix or, you know, primary part of the body that has a fact sheet or spreads about projects within downtown or serving downtown. It's planning, policy framework, but then also the project details around them. >> Okay. I'm trying to understand the difference between that and the asmp, for example. I was thinking perhaps it was a greater level of detail and then allowed just a listing of projects that then could be picked up for funding. But is that -- but it sounds like from what you just said, maybe that's not the case? >> So it is a deeper dive from the asmp with a primary focus of downtown and serving access to downtown. But then it would go further

[1:46:20 PM]

with detailed project cost, which wasn't a part of the asmp. >> So it would have cost. So let's take the example that council member Ellis gave about a park and ride. So a park and ride could be one of the listed projects because it's on a, you know, on a location that's important to feed into downtown. So if -- is that right? Did I hear you right? So if that project's listed, then we have a dollar amount to it. And so the next step is that kind of project could be picked up to consider for funding through campo, for example, or from a bond or through our budget process? >> Correct. >> I guess I'm trying to get to the point -- I'm not sure if I'm asking my question well. I know that ideas have to get to a certain stage before we can then take them into different funding streams. So I'm trying to get at an

[1:47:20 PM]

understanding that a project could be picked up out of this plan and then taken to a next step for funding, is that right? >> Correct. This is an opportunity for us to really highlight the projects that maybe from a system perspective or citywide perspective, were identified in the asmp, but then we can take it to the next level. Solicit more feedback, more specifics around the projects themselves. And then include those costs for any funding opportunity. >> Okay. >> And I think like one difference that I would note between the asmp and the act plan is you might have seen, you know, a corridor listed as transit priority or needing bicycle and pedestrian improvements. But what the cross section of that street might look like as a concept wasn't provided as part of the plan. If we said transit priority on a corridor, how are we

[1:48:20 PM]

accommodating that and what types of treatments would we be adding to that street to make it more transit friendly. So things like that that we're just taking the next step further if we had, you know, competing or conflicting. How do we make those work all in the same space. So I think that's the next level of detail that we're thinking about. >> Okay. And then -- so then I think related -- council member alter had asked about the relationship with project connect. So -- and this is on a longer time-frame than project connect is. So my guess is that in coordinating, really, you would just pick up the recommendations from project connect and put in the plan. Is that the thinking? As opposed to doing an independent review of how the line comes through downtown. Is that what we're -- >> Well, we're certainly

[1:49:21 PM]

coordinating concurrent to this effort. >> Uh-huh. >> But the opportunity to be able to do an independent evaluation is still there, whether it's actually being done through the act planning process or just simply as a task within our department. >> Okay. >> Is, I think, indifferent. So the act plan will reflect whatever the outcome is, whether it's staff-developed or consistent with the project connect process itself. >> Okay. >> An opportunity with the act then would say, you know, what are the other complementary to other corridors that would increase our circulation or access or operations related to those improvements. So it's our opportunity to present also the companion improvements that we would make as part of an overall project

[1:50:23 PM]

connect improvement. >> Okay. Okay. On the Rainey street, the shared street pilot. So I wanted to just understand a little bit better. So it sounds like it's proceeding as a safety project. So I wasn't quite sure -- I know that y'all are talking in terms of looking at the bicycle and pedicab access. But I'd like something a little more definitive since it may be starting next week, I guess. So is it going to start with that access or without that access? >> My assumption, at this point, is that it wouldn't start. >> Okay. >> With that access. >> Okay. You know, the direction was a shared streets pilot. So I guess I'm having the same

[1:51:24 PM]

kind of question as maybe council member alter had. Because this doesn't sound like a shared street. It sounds like a safety closure. So is it just that as part of all the feedback and the process you've gone through that what you heard was that there was more of a need for just closure, as opposed to a shared street? >> Well, the resolution itself references it as a street closure. I think the only reference and practice that we have is sixth street. And with APD being the primary implementer of a street closure,

that's the approach that would be taken as a typical safety closure. We do have that same reaction that we would like to see it be

[1:52:24 PM]

a little more shared. But what you have to consider is what is Rainey street today? It is, effectively, a shared street. >> Okay. >> In today's conditions there's no way to further facilitate that without more intensive improvements being done. Whether it's moving curbs or what have you. So the easiest thing in the short term to do is to do a safety closure. And, like I said, to keep those that don't work well together apart. >> So if I'm hearing you, if we were to go down the road of a shared street, those would be more infrastructure kinds of improvements, as opposed to

[1:53:25 PM]

temporary testing kinds of improvements, is that right? >> Correct. >> Okay. All right. You know, in reading the resolution it says shared streets pilot. I'm reading it right here. The city manager is directed to immediately initiate a shared streets pilot. Which I'm not sure we're getting. Okay. So it sounds to me like you're thinking in terms of testing both. Like a safety closure and then beginning with that. At what point or how is the decision going to be made to actually pilot the shared street part of it with pedestrian and pedicab? >> So part of the reason for the length of the pilot is understanding that it takes time for travel behavior to become normal. >> Right. >> So there's some normalcy that occurs over several weeks.

[1:54:25 PM]

We could imagine that if perhaps you allow for at least two weeks to occur, if not a month before you make adjustments, to allow for those changes to include scooters and other modes. But I think we should also have the flexibility in that if we know it's not working immediately then the sooner the better. And I think that stuff is just going to have to happen, perhaps organically working with APD. >> Well, my last question then is I guess I would be thinking perhaps you want to try both ways and it wouldn't be that you would try bikes and pedicabs if the closure didn't work. In other words, a safety closure

[1:55:25 PM]

is different than trying it with bikes and pedicabs. But I think I just heard you say that you would only try -- I guess I'll just say this. I would just suggest that it be set up so you actually really do try both and you're not just trying one way and whether you try the other way is dependent on whether the other way is successful. It seems to me you would never be able to test whether bikes and pedicabs worked. Which, I would think that kind of test would tell you whether it was worth the investment for the infrastructure kind of changes to make it more of a safe shared street. Does that make sense? >> Yeah, that makes perfect sense. >> Who makes that decision? Is this an atd pilot? >> We'll consult back with rob. >> Okay. >> And make sure that we are communicating all of this. Like I said -- >> Okay.

[1:56:26 PM]

>> We're going to summarize this feedback and go back to APD. This is part of that process to have this conversation. >> Okay. Well, thank you. >> I just wanted to echo that concern. It seems like we're all saying the same comment of we need to be trying it. And so I want to make sure we give ourselves the opportunity to try something new. We know that our safety officers can create a safety closure and do really well with it. I think that shouldn't be our test run. That should be our last option, if that's really the necessary thing. But we have an opportunity to do this pilot program. You definitely have my support, and it sounds like other council members' supports to try the bike and pedicab version as well. >> I would just like to clarify. I was just simply asking a question about how you decided. So I'm not sure that I have a strong feeling about whether we should use it or not. And I would ask that you be sure to consult the council member who put forward the resolution and whose council district this

[1:57:26 PM]

is before you change what you're doing that you've already talked with people about. Because I have a feeling that they will be the most informed about what's going on the ground. >> Any other questions? Thank y'all very much. Very helpful. So now we'll turn to the next item, which is the land development code revision, the transportation plan aspects of it. >> Good afternoon, chair, council members. I'm here with leadership members of the land development code revision team. Let me lower this chair. There we go. All right. So we are here to brief you all on the transportation components

[1:58:28 PM]

of the land development code and answer any questions you may have at this time. Throughout -- this is a reminder for the public about the land development code. As you all know, and I want to thank you for the town halls that you all have hosted over the last month in October where we've been talking with the community about what is the land development code and getting feedback on T code. What it is and what it isn't. Highlighting that our code needs to be updated to meet the needs and priorities of Austin

today. And also important is the fact that the land development code is not our only solution to addressing our challenges and opportunities and that we have many other concurrent programs that have to work together with the code. Again, thank you for getting folks out to talk about the code in October. We had a very successful October out in the community. While out in the community, we were deep diving on the council direction from may 2 on the

[1:59:28 PM]

scope of the code, why are we revising the code, specifically housing capacity, affordability, the concept of missing middle housing, compatibility, and also parking. So we on October 4th released our staff recommendation. And then throughout the month of October we took a lot of feedback from the community. As you know, on October 25th, we released a supplemental staff report with some refinement to our staff recommendation and also some other changes that we would like to make as we move forward with the process. So that was on October 25th. And it's been really rewarding working with the community and hearing how we can make it better based on the guide post that council gave us on may 2. I'm going to hand the

[2:00:30 PM]

presentation over to Danielle Morren to go through the transportation elements specifically, and then I'll come back and talk about what's next. And specifically we have a few more areas for input with regards to submitting a map, if folks want to, with regards to suggestions on the mapping. And I'll go through that later. So we go straight to parking, and Danielle is going to take that slide. Whoa. Sorry about that. >> Well, I guess I can start. Danielle Morren, atd. So the feedback we heard from council and the community was to ensure that accessible parking was abundant and that we could

[2:01:33 PM]

achieve it. This is the fourth slide, accessible parking. So basically in current code, accessible parking is based on appendix a, which is the parking table in the ldc. If no parking is required on a site or no parking is provided on a site with the current code, accessible parking is based on 20% of parking. So, for example, if you have ten parking spaces that are required, however the development provides zero parking spaces, two parking spaces -- the accessible parking spaces are based on the two parking spaces, and that's kind of convoluted and difficult to understand. However, in the new ldc, we are mirrored it after the affordability unlocked ordinance. All the feedback from the Ada

[2:02:35 PM]

community, we took that to make sure it is based on 100% of the parking requirements. At the end of the day we'll be getting more Ada parking on site versus the current code. So that's the improvement for accessible parking, or the change. Parking overall in the new Idc is reduced in certain areas. We like to refer to it more as we've right sized the parking requirements for the city. We took council direction to allow for zero parking for developments that are located within a quarter mile of transit priority corridors. And the way we're doing that is we will allow for -- go back there. Nope. Yeah. We will allow for no parking on site if there is an accessible sidewalk from the development to the corridor. If there is an not accessible sidewalk, the developer has the

[2:03:38 PM]

opportunity to construct that sidewalk and it would be from their development to the corridor. The other option is if the development is located on a high or very high sidewalk priority index per the asmp. In our discussions with public works, it's our understanding that about 70% of our sidewalks in those areas will be constructed by 2024. So our thought process behind that is that if we allow that zero parking, the fee in lieu that we would allow would go towards that construction in the future. Parking maximum. I will not touch the remote because it will move. So currently there's a parking maximum that does exist in the business district. That's the only place in the code that exists.

[2:04:38 PM]

In the new Idc we are proposing marking maximum city wide. 125% for centers and corridors and 100% downtown. And so our thought process behind that is that does help with our tdm first approach to transportation mitigation of which we can explain a little further. >> Thank you. Good afternoon, I'm the development officer, Austin transportation department. In this portion of the presentation I would like to talk about some of the major changes in the codes that are associated with transportation development review. Specifically I'm going to talk about some of the major changes to transportation management strategies, the impact, and zoning. So transportation demand management currently is not part of the code. So in this new proposed code we

[2:05:42 PM]

are proposing to [indiscernible] Transportation management and we are proposing to have tdm first approach and development review, which is consistent with asmp where we have a goal of 50/50 by 2039. So what that means is for each and every development, the applicant would be required to do a tdm plan for developments, regardless of the threshold on a daily basis. So if there is a development

that generates less than 1,000 trips a day, they will have to do a tdm plan for that, but no tia. So when a development would generate over 1,000 daily trips but less than 2,000, the applicant will have to do a tdm plan. If they can reduce the trips with the tdm below 1,000 threshold, then they won't have a to a tia. If they can't, then they may have to do a limited scope tia

[2:06:45 PM]

for that threshold. And, again, if a particular development generates over 2,000 trips then they'll have to do both a tdm plan and tia. So that encourages multimodal developments and multimodal improvements that could come out of developments and to attain that 5050 or more shared goals that we have in asmp. So moving on to transportation impact. It is related to tdm. They go hand in hand. So currently we have a code provision that allows a tia requirement over 2,000 daily trips. In this proposed land development code, again, if there is a development generating less than 1,000 daily trips, they would not have to do a tia. They'll have to do a tdm plan though. Again, in the threshold of 1,000 to 2,000, they will have to do

[2:07:48 PM]

both. Tdm comes first and limited scope tia. Over 2,000 daily trips, applicants will have to do both a tdm and tia. A couple of other major changes in the tia and the new proposed code is kind of providing a prescriptive guidance. Currently there is no guidance how to select it for the development. Under the current code we provide a prescriptive method how to select it. The other thing we have included in this current proposed code is the validity of tia. Right now there is no explicit expiration of tia under the code, so we are suggesting five

[2:08:50 PM]

years from the approval date of the tia. Because in five years, traffic patterns could change, infrastructure could change, travel behavior could change. So that's why beyond five years there would be a need for a revision in the tia. Moving on to the need for transportation and zoning. In the current code there is no explicit requirement if an applicant has to do a tia at zoning, some applicants opt to do that. Some applicants don't, so we are providing a specific guidance in that process. So at the time of zoning, the requirement would not be to do a hard core or a traditional tia. There is going to be a zoning assessment or a zta, which will provide an overall understanding of transportation network adjacent to the development, proposed more share goals with tdm application, and to provide

[2:09:52 PM]

the city council a basic understanding of potential impacts and possible solutions to the some of the impacts from the developments so that city council can make an informed decision based on that. So these are the major proposed changes related to transportation impact, transportation demand management, and zta, or zoning transportation assessment. I'm now going to hand it over for the next steps. >> We'll have questions, of course, but the next steps I want to highlight that we are still accepting map suggestions from the community. They can be downloaded from the website at austin.texas.gov/ldc and marked upon and handed in at 505 Barton springs road at one

[2:10:53 PM]

Texas center, fifth floor, until 5:00 P.M. Tomorrow. And we've gotten quite a few that we'll be reviewing and forwarding to mayor and council in the coming weeks. And then planning commission is deliberating tonight and tomorrow with their final recommendation to you all planned for November 12. So with that, I'll be happy to take any questions on the transportation components or any other components or process. >> Okay. Who wants to go first? Anybody? You want to start? >> I don't mind kicking it off. I may have to go twice. I saw that there are recommendations from the utc. And I just wanted to ask if your plan was to have kind of a spreadsheet of the few boards or commissions who might review this, to kind of let us know what seems agreeable and likely to be incorporated after the

[2:11:53 PM]

first reading or what may not be possible, just so we kind of know how this will go with some of the feedback that you might get. >> Thank you for that question. Yes. I was at the etc meeting last Friday and they made, I believe, seven recommendations. Some directly to planning commission and some for council. Is that correct, Emily? Or is it all to council? All to council. >> I think their intended audience is both. I think -- Emily Smith, staff liaison. Their meetings usually conflict with the planning commission so they called this meeting to make sure their input was given prior to planning commission's November 12th meeting. I believe their intended audience is both the planning commission and full city council for the recommendations they adopted. >> Okay. That's helpful. And my understanding is by charter the planning commission is the only one that, by our charter, has to provide comment and feedback on this. >> So as far as providing the

[2:12:55 PM]

spreadsheet, like we did in our first staff report for the boards and commissions from our previous work in draft three, we were planning only to do that for the planning commission. But if it's the wish of this

committee to do it for the utc, we're happy to include that. >> Okay. Ann is saying yes. I was just curious. I'm okay with it. I think it's helpful, but especially if the urban transportation commission sent it to planning and council, I feel like it would then be involved in the notes we would look at. >> We'd be happy to include that in the supplemental staff report. November 18th we plan to -- council will be delivered the planning commission recommendation memo as well as our supplemental staff report, our second supplemental staff report that would have the recommendations from planning commission that we agree with and why or don't agree or are neutral on that you are familiar with seeing that many of you were familiar with seeing during the process and we will include the utc as well. >> Okay.

[2:13:56 PM]

Fantastic. And there was some reference to transportation criteria manual. And so I wanted to know kind of the overlap of the updates to that criteria manual. And the timeline with land use code updates. >> Yeah. So I'll start out and then let Danielle add -- Danielle is the project manager. Of the criteria manuals in the suite of manuals, the TCM is approaching 90% complete. And we've made a commitment to the community. It is a rules posting administrative process that it would go through. But we had made a commitment because it hasn't been updated in so long, to have a public process for that. And we're still working out what that would look like. But we're poised to have it go to about 100% in the spring. So we're thinking about the development review division, and transportation is going to have a third community listening session with the development and

[2:14:57 PM]

design community. Because we've made a lot of changes to the development review process over the last year in creating a development review division in transportation. And as part of that, that is where we would like to create -- we have a bullet list of all the things we have heard through code testing and things we know need to be updated in preparation for the draft coming out, that we can start releasing, for lack of a better word, to the community. So that is where that project is and we feel pretty good that it will be in place next year at some point, probably after the code, but soon after. >> Okay. And the last question I had jotted down was about the transportation director's ability to, you know, reduce density based on vehicle trips. And I wasn't sure how vehicle trips and person trips might

[2:15:59 PM]

change, you know, especially if this is a code that's going to the last for a few decades and hopefully be a living, breathing document that can be very adaptable. How we're going to be able to calculate our ability to change mode share options and what that's going to do to density and things like parking. >> Good question. So one of the recommendation from the utc was to -- and we've heard it from a few

others in the community as well, as we've been getting feedback. In the code there's references to vehicular trip. There's reference to just trip. There's also reference to street, right of way, easement, thoroughfare. And so we are working through -- we have a copy editor on board and we're working also through with public works and others to figure out, you know, when do we actually mean easement and when do we actually mean right of way, et cetera. And so and also defining when we actually do mean a vehicular trip and does it a car trip,

[2:17:00 PM]

does it include a bus trip, or is it a person trip. We are working through that and we'll provide clarity prior to the final code being finalized. But I believe he wanted to add to that. >> Just to add to that. In the current process we also look at vehicle trips, pedestrian trips, bicycle trips, and transit trips. We do not focus on vehicular trips only in the process. And the other question was about the ability [indiscernible]. It was basically for public safety concerns. If there is a development that generates like way more trips that could impede public safety or endanger public safety, in that case we would not recommend that the development -- for the development. >> Yeah, I just wanted to make sure as we're trying to marry the transit priority network and corridors with development that

[2:18:01 PM]

we were calibrating for mode shift and hoping that not everyone is trying to drive a car a half a mile. >> Yeah, the authority provision is in the current code today and is being carried forward with a few modifications for clarity. And it's meant to be used in extreme cases. In my history with the city, over 20 years, we've never used it until recently there was an opportunity where we were able to use it to get some increased mitigation with regards to what we really felt was an important safety and mobility issue. So it was a very useful tool to have. But I certainly understand the community's concern with it. But, again, it is something that has been in the code with a history of, you know, various different policies and direction that the city has had throughout the years. And, again, has never been used, is used sparingly.

[2:19:01 PM]

>> Okay. And I've got one more question, but I don't want to hog the microphone. Okay. I noticed in our open house it was brought to my attention, we have a spot near the white oak hill that had been zoned to r-4 but the bus only picks up twice in the 7:00 hour. And then drops off twice around the time to go home for, you know, a general 9:00 to 5:00 worker. And so I had started working with my transportation policy adviser, you know, is there maybe another option for calibrating places where you don't really have like a 30-minute bus stop or a 15-minute bus stop? So I don't know the answer but I wanted to kind

of put that on y'all's radar that we may be looking at places like that, where my district only has essentially a morning pick up and an evening pick up. And it's not necessarily going to work for people that aren't working 9:00 to 5:00. It won't provide for hourly

[2:20:02 PM]

workers to be able to utilize transit. I wanted to day light that here. Not that I need an answer or a solution. >> So I think that could be a potential strategy in tdm to increase the bus frequency. Like where it is needed for new developments. >> Okay. Thank you. >> I had a follow-up -- >> Are you finished? >> I'm good. >> I had a follow-up question about the transportation criteria manual. Did you say it will be ready -- you said by the end of next year? >> Yes. >> So if we pass -- assuming it passes in February, when every time the code refers to transportation criteria, it's referring to have the current one? I'm assuming? >> Yeah. Yes. The most current one that's adopted would be in play until it's updated. >> Okay.

[2:21:03 PM]

So it would be the one that's in existence right now? >> Yeah. Danielle is saying we're shooting for March for a new transportation criteria manual. So it would be close. But if there was a gap, it would be the old one. >> Okay. >> Until the new one is adopted. >> Thanks. >> Council member alter. >> Yes, thank you. I wanted to go back to the accessible parking slide, if we can get up there. I just want to make sure that I understood what you said, Danielle. So you said that we'd have more accessible parking in cases where we had no parking than we have under the current code. Not that we would have more accessible parking than we do under the current code. >> Sorry. Say that again. >> At one point you said it was relative to having no parking, that we would have more accessible parking. And at one point you made it sound like it was more accessible parking overall. And I wanted to get clarity in which was the -- what you meant to say.

[2:22:04 PM]

>> So currently accessible parking is based on the number of parking spaces provided. And the draft Idc, that would remain the same, unless there's a case where no parking is provided. >> Okay. >> Then the accessible parking is based on 100% of what would be required. >> Okay. So in the case that there's no parking, you would have more parking -- >> You would have more than what's under current code. >> And then if they provide more than the minimum, then the accessible parking is still a portion. >> It's still based on what's provided. >> Thank you. I wanted to get some clarity on that. And then on the parking slide, when you talked about the minimum parking not required within a quarter mile of

center's quarters or tpn. And you talked about the absent sidewalk. But if it was high, very high then it would be okay. It would be considered

[2:23:04 PM]

accessible. If they didn't have a sidewalk and it was high, very high ranking then it would be considered accessible. Is that correct? >> It wouldn't be considered -- well, accessible in the sense of we feel that there would be a close temporal proximity of, you know, a missing middle that went in in the transition zone, a missing middle with a pretty close time-frame that the route would be completed because it's on the high/very high network. High/very high prioritization for absent sidewalk. >> Okay. So does that -- if on an accessible sidewalk route to corridor ranked high/very high apply to all three of those situations or just to the tpn? >> All three. It applies within a quarter mile of corridors, centers, and the tpn. >> Then you made a comment about fee in lieu and how that would help to fund those sidewalks.

[2:24:05 PM]

But I don't know of any fees that would be in lieu of if you're not required to do parking. So is that a sidewalk fee? >> It's a sidewalk fee, yeah. So that was confusing when we first got the council direction. We were trying to sort this out as well. And I will note that in talking with public works, as we were working through this recommendation before we released this staff recommendation, that is when we discovered about 71% of the sidewalks within that quarter mile would be complete by 2024 per the 2016 mobility bond, which is fantastic. It's a higher rate than other parts of the city, so we're really, you know, tying our land use and transportation investments together and policies and investments together. So the fee in lieu for sidewalks, in the current code there is language -- and we talked about this a lot in the previous work with the code. We're strengthening staff's ability to decide when a fee in lieu is appropriate or when we would like the sidewalk

[2:25:05 PM]

constructed. Because we're making such rapid progress on the sidewalk network, our capital improvement program, they have a solid work plan and they know where they're going to be and they will be able to determine how quickly a route, you know, is it better to get the fee because they're working in an area over here and they want to complete that first? Or is it better to get the sidewalk section in front of the development that is happening. And so it was a pretty lengthy discussion and we felt pretty good that this was making progress in that way. So the fee in lieu is not related to the parking, but it's related to the sidewalk fee in lieu. >> Okay. So the proposal is to have more flexibility in whether that gets built or whether it goes into -- >> On staff's side. And it would be either they're going to build the sidewalk in front of their development.

[2:26:06 PM]

As Danielle said, they could also extend their limits of construction and build a sidewalk -- fill a gap closer to the corridor as well in order to not do the parking. But if there's any sort of gap we would still require, I believe, 50% of the parking to be required. So you wouldn't be able to go to zero unless you had that completed route in one way or the other. >> Okay. Explain that again. So I don't have to pay my -- I don't have to build my sidewalk. I can pay a fee in lieu, but if there's no sidewalk I have to build 50% of the parking? >> Yeah. If the sidewalk is not complete to the corridor, 50% of the parking would be required, unless the gap is ranked high/very high. So if the gap is ranked high/very high or if there's a complete route, you can have zero parking. >> Okay. But most of those are ranked high/very high. >> A lot of them are.

[2:27:06 PM]

A lot of them are. And I'm working on a map that will be out with a supplemental that shows all the existing sidewalk and absent sidewalk that are high/very high. We also have, as you probably remember in the sidewalk plan, we also have a prioritization for rehabilitation, which is also in the code -- in the draft that is not in the code today that we can require rehab of existing sidewalks that don't meet our TCM standards for Ada and/or for with. And so that's being strengthened as well. >> Great. I'm excited for us to get this sidewalk network build out. And then under the parking maximums it said that there was a citywide maximum of 175%. What does that mean in a

[2:28:06 PM]

residential area if I want like a circle drive and I choose that and my impervious cover allows that and I've got way more than my two cars. What does that mean? >> So that would mean that if -- let's do easy math. If ten parking spaces were required -- or if one parking space was required, you would have to -- the max you could provide is 1.75, which would round up to two. >> Okay. But if I'm at my own house and I'm deciding -- like, does this only apply to commercial or multifamily. If I'm an individual home and I want to have parking for eight cars for some reason and I have the impervious cover. Does this prevent me from doing that? That may be an extreme example. I don't understand what it means to have 175% citywide, particularly in the residential areas. >> Right. We'll get back. I believe it's anything 6,000

[2:29:07 PM]

square feet or higher is how it's written. But we'll get back to you all on that. We can enter it into the council question for you, if you would like, and respond that way. >> Yeah, I would like to understand that. And then for the tdm, how do you determine that a mode option will work? Like, I think we have some sense from the traffic counts and, you know, when we add it up we know how many vehicles can flow through. It just seems slightly more scientific, although we had some examples the other day where it wasn't so scientific. But how do you know how many people a mode, like a sidewalk or a bike lane serves and will actually come out of that? >> So basically for a particular development, they will have to do a tdm assessment. And we in the transportation department, we have developed a tdm toolbox based on our study all over the U.S.

[2:30:09 PM]

So there have been other studies in other areas that provide that. So if they implement a certain type of measures, how much they are going to get. So we have it on our website under atd so the applicants can use that and do a tdm assessment for which particular tdm measure, how many they are going to get in the tia process. >> Okay. And this is a tool kit that's based on best practices? >> It's based on best practices all over the U.S. >> Thank you. And my last question is for the -- I think you said a zoning transportation assessment. If we do it that way, how do we make sure they actually do stuff to reduce the traffic? What are the enforcement mechanisms using a zta and for tdm? >> So for one of the reasons we

[2:31:10 PM]

introduced a zta, not a hard core impact on traffic at zoning is because at the time of zoning, more often than not the applicants don't exactly know like how or what they're going to develop. They have an idea like what kind of development they are going to do. Apart from planned unit developments. So they do like lots of guesses at the time of zoning. And based on the guesses they have to do a tia, which is a best educated guess, honestly, with respect to traffic. And also there are certain other issues that at the time of zoning if they do a tia and identify certain improvements, if they pay us the fee in lieu, we can keep it only up to ten years. So if it goes beyond ten years, then we have to give it back to the developers. Since there are so many guesstimations at the time of zoning, it makes sense -- we thought it makes sense to have a

[2:32:10 PM]

zoning transportation assessment that would provide kind of an overarching transportation assessment to a particular development. And do a detailed tia at the time of site plan. When the applicant knows exactly what they're going to build, what is going to be their number of units and what is going to be

their driveway and everything. >> I would add to that that I understand what you're asking and we would set criteria for what would be included in the zoning assessment in the transportation criteria manual, and we would want council to understand, as he said earlier, what the impacts are on the network as a whole, multimodal, and what the improvements would likely be based on the asmp so council has that information. If you change the land use, if Brent were here he would say it's a legislative decision on

[2:33:12 PM]

the zoning, that you understand when and if a site plan is submitted down the road, you have an idea of what the mitigation would look like and an assessment from the transportation department on would it be -- could it be successfully mitigated. What is the mode share we're looking for in this area, lots of other criteria. So there would be no guarantee, as you say, that any of that would be done unless a site plan is submitted. So the zoning decision becomes a little bit different, right? You're looking at what is the potential impact, what are realistic mitigation options. Does this land use make sense? Can it be mitigated? And we would provide you with that information. And should a site plan be submitted, a tia may or may not be done, depending on how many trips and if they do tdm. And at that point is when the

[2:34:12 PM]

mitigation would be collected and required. >> So that makes some sense. I'll want to digest that a little bit more, because I think it's a different way of thinking. Elements of that sound appealing. But broadly speaking with a tdm, one of the concerns that I hear a lot from my constituents is enforcement of a tdm and, like, what stops them from not doing -- take those steps. >> So with respect to tdm, if we have a multiphase development and if they have a tdm plan at the time of zoning, then we can hold back some of the subsequent site plans, if they cannot comply with the tdm plan they have for the previous site plans. Or we can ask for additional mitigation down the road for any of the unmitigated traffic impacts. >> And I would add that all of the requirements of the tdm

[2:35:17 PM]

enforcement and -- I guess what's the right word? Mitigation if things were not working would be in the plan itself. And that's similar to -- I mean, some of them include counts and phasing, being able to see how the development is performing. And then what we've seen across the country is that the emphasis is on compliance, not so much on the punishment, but really trying to have that relationship with the development to continue to come into compliance. But enforcement is going to be an aspect of the development review division that we're going to need to grow the capabilities for, should this concept

be adopted in the code. For sure. >> So can you in a like q&a provide some more information on that? I think it would be really helpful for people to have that. >> I'll create a question on both of those and put them in the q&a. >> Just to add to that, a key component of the tdm plan is to provide -- from the applicant to provide an annual report on the

[2:36:17 PM]

trip reduction. So like if the comment that they're going to reduce trips by 30%, they'll have to report back on that every year. So when we review the annual reporting, then we can see for sure that they're reducing it up to 30%. If they don't, then they have to do some additional mitigation for those. >> Yes, if you could provide some clarity in that and maybe note that in the asmp it said that tdm enforcement had to be figured out. I don't remember the exact language we put in there, but it had an amendment to that effect. Thank you. >> Thank you. >> So to the circle drive question -- I pulled up the draft. And what I'm reading is that the maximum doesn't apply if you're under 10,000 square feet. >> The parking maximum? >> Yeah. >> Okay. That's right. I thought it was 6,000. >> I'm reading at 10,000 in the draft. 10,000 or 25 or more -- if it's

[2:37:18 PM]

under 25 units in the development, there's no parking maximum. If it's under 10,000 square feet, there's no parking maximum. I'm not sure that's the right way to make that line. I'm going to think about that. But I don't think the parking maximums seem to be intended to mass development at a scale. >> If what's under 100,000? >> 10,000. >> It's not the lot, it's the building, right? >> Developments over 10,000 square feet in floor area. That's the way it's in the draft. >> Okay. >> Sorry. And so that is section 233c3040, parking requirements in the zoning chapter. So that's one thing. I'm about 700 pages into my reading and unfortunately I haven't gotten to the transportation chapter yet but I have read the zoning chapter. The number of parking spaces

[2:38:19 PM]

required, in some cases I think requires a little more nuance. The per unit, I think may be too heavy handed when we're talking about a studio versus a three bedroom. I don't know if the number of parking spaces should be based more on bedrooms or units or how we might think about that in a more flexible way. And as a unit count in a development. And it's also nuanced for all of us to be thinking about how that applies to a triplex versus a 25-unit complex versus a 300-unit large apartment development. And we're getting all of those things all at the same time. And I'm wondering if maybe there's a little more nuance that we may want to apply in some of these parking regulations. I don't have a question. That's mostly what I have been thinking about. >> Thank you for the input. >> But I

would add a lot of other stuff y'all are presenting is pretty great. Good work. >> Thank you. >> Okay. I have a few questions.

[2:39:22 PM]

So let me just ask a more general question. I think that you responded to some of it, but rather than dive into the detail, let me just ask a more general question to make sure I've got all the parameters for it. So generally the parking requirements -- so let's talk in terms of -- yeah, the parking requirements are proposed for each of the new zoning categories. And they seem to be proposed as blanket requirements. So I'm trying to understand how the -- how factors for context sensitivity come into the parking requirements. And that may be what you are referring to when you've talked about -- let's see. When you've talked about some of these aspects of it that you've talked about. But give me the big picture first. How, in general, are you -- or where are all the places you're

[2:40:24 PM]

taking into account context sensitivity when you're talking about the parking requirements. Does that make sense? >> Yeah, it does. I'll take a stab at it. When we developed the new zoning categories that we used draft three per the council direction in creating the new zoning categories. We have the draft that's out. There's fewer of them. So by way of where they're applied and what their purpose and applicability is per the code, that's one aspect of context sensitivity. So the parking requirement is considered on where you might see that zoning district applicable or recommended by staff in the future with a future zoning case. We would look at that. >> Where it was mapped, perhaps? >> Where it was mapped and could be mapped in the future if someone asked for a zoning change in the future. The way that it works now, staff looks at the proposal, looks at the context. And so that was considered as we

[2:41:25 PM]

created the zoning category. So the parking requirements based in context to the use itself, right, on the site parking requirements. And then the context of the zoning. So we looked at the international site manual for modern recommendations on how much parking should be provided for certain uses. So that's generally -- that's the first context. And then it's the zone itself, where it's applied and should we modify what's required by the site standards. And then, lastly, by the quarter mile per the council direction. So it was a three-step of context with what you see with parking and also with the maximums was also context sensitive to downtown corridors and everywhere else.

[2:42:25 PM]

I will also add it's based on looking at the amount of overparking -- we looked at a sample of site plans in different context. Downtown corridors within the urban core mcmansion and throwing out the anomalies, which there were some anomalies. What was the generate of overparking, because we don't have maximums now. And so we came in -- we rounded down on that a little bit, just to make an incremental nod towards our 50/50 mode share. So that's how we came up with those maximums as well. >> Okay. So it sounds like then, if I'm hearing right, so context sensitivity, for example, that relates to sidewalks. We've talked about that. So that's one aspect of it. Have we considered -- or have you guys considered bike infrastructure as a factor in

[2:43:26 PM]

context sensitivity? So, for example, does that play a role at all in considering parking requirements for an area? I think the question that people might have is if you don't have parking on site, the concern, of course, is the tendency to park on the street. And the concern, of course, is parking in a bike infrastructure. So I don't know if that question's been raised to you before, but that's a question we've had. >> It has not but I will bring that back to the team. We have a good history, as you all know, in balancing the need for parking-free bicycle lanes with the need for parking on the street and looking at the user rate of parking on the street, et cetera. But we haven't considered it with regards to the context for the parking. So I'll take that back. >> Yeah, I'm not as concerned about the, you know, bike infrastructure that's separated or protected, in some way. Because you really can't -- I

[2:44:27 PM]

mean, you really have to really want to park in one of those places and run over stuff. But the striped bike lanes present a bit more challenge in terms of the temptation to park in those areas. And so I'm just curious if that's -- so if you could think about that. That would be helpful. >> >> Circle back. >> Kitchen: So okay. And then any other aspects of context sensitivity? I know that those tend to all relate to sidewalks, though, and you responded to the sidewalk question. So I have a few specific questions then. Okay. So going back to the accessible parking, so I want to make sure I'm understanding that. So it's based on the required amount, right? Is that what you said?

[2:45:28 PM]

>> Correct. >> Kitchen: What if -- but I guess I'm a little confused because if there's no parking required, then what is the 80? >> So if there's no parking required, it's what would normally be based -- normally

be required in that zoning category if it were not within the quarter mile. >> Kitchen: What if there's no parking required in that zoning? That's where I'm getting a little confused. So what is the requirement that it's pegged to, I guess is what I'm trying to understand? >> So in the quarter mile, if you have an office use that's required to have ten parking spaces but you Mr. Your sidewalk and you -- build your sidewalk and connect your sidewalk all the way to a corridor and you opt not to provide any parking, then the Ada parking would be based on the ten. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> That make sense? I tried it a different way. >> Kitchen: Yeah. So I think what you're saying is we have parking requirements unless you take certain actions.

[2:46:29 PM]

So -- that relate to the access to the corridor, essentially. So it's pegged to the parking requirements? >> That's right. >> Kitchen: Okay. Let's see. I had a question. That. . . >> Flannigan: I have a quick one, Ann. >> Kitchen: Yes. Go right ahead. >> Flannigan: In the loading areas part of the code, the -- there's no off-street requirement for 10,000 square feet or smaller, there's one loading area required for ten to 100,000 square feet. Greater than that goes to the manual. Do we have requirements related to loading Zones in on-street parking? One of the things that I experience, especially on corridors, is loading happening blocking an active travel lane. And I had just anecdotally,

[2:47:33 PM]

this happened once and I walked into the restroom where I assumed they were loading and I asked the guy about it because there was a loading zone in that building, and he said that it was just easier. >> I have to check the exact code right now that we have, but from at -- , our preference is always to have off-site loading for any and all developments. But for exact language in the current code, I have to double-check that. >> I will say that, in my other role as assistant director of transportation, that is the most common waiver that we get with regards to site plans, especially in the downtown, especially along the corridors. So we are considering, because of that, looking at a way to codify allowing it in the right-of-way, and there's still a lot of discussion that still needs to happen. So if there's any comment on that, I hear what you're saying. >> Flannigan: Yeah. >> So if there's a way to

[2:48:33 PM]

manage it. For example, a recent site plan that we did about will months ago that was off of lake shore, there was a lot of back and forth and we put some parameters on it, on the time of day, and it had to be signed and there's gonna have to be enforcement there, but we are letting maneuvering in and out of the right-of-way. So it's something that we're considering through the lens of units and housing capacity and through the lens of, you know -- it's a lot of space. >> Flannigan: And I'm thinking about -- yeah. I'm

thinking about this in part as more of a design allowance, where you might be able to -- you know, I've seen streets downtown where the sidewalk and the street are at the same level and they allow loading at certain times and at other times when it's more high pedestrian traffic you don't allow it. What spoke to me about my conversation with the delivery driver was how he was making a very simple and straightforward economic decision about his time.

[2:49:34 PM]

So rather than trying to force delivery drivers into a scenario that they will just ignore, maybe we should lean into exactly what that -- how that will work best so that they'll actually use it. And to my mind it would be the loading zone is right near where they're unloading and not requiring them to pull into a complicated loading area which frankly they're just not doing. >> We'll take that back because it is something we're considering and it's good comment and we'll see if we can have some words on that in our supplemental that comes out on the 18th. It's a pinch point for sure with regards to mobility and also balancing the development itself and the units. >> Flannigan: Yeah. Obviously all the delivery trucks that we see photos of blocking bike lanes and sidewalks, finding a way to square that. >> Kitchen: I have a follow-up. So going back to the sidewalk question, if I'm understanding correctly

[2:50:35 PM]

then, the determination within the quarter mile is if there is an existing sidewalk on the ground, and she it's an accessible sidewalk, in other words it doesn't need repair, right, or if it's on the list as high or very high, what if it's not -- okay. Let's talk about -- a little bit about that high/very high. So it doesn't have to be built yet. It just has to be on the list. Is that right? >> Very high. >> Kitchen: What happens if the list changes or this is no funding? Is the thinking it's already funded for everything on the high/very high right now? Is that the thinking? >> Well, the 2016 bond can only be spent object high/very high or that's what we've determined. >> Kitchen: That's right. >> As you know. Then we also have the very high/high am ranking for the rehabilitation, which is new with the most recent sidewalk plan. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> So that's really good that we have those processes in place.

[2:51:35 PM]

Yes, the thinking is that the funding would continue to be -- our investments would continue to be good in those areas because the -- and, yes, the matrix could change and the code would always say high, very high, should it be adopted. And if through amendments to the sidewalk plan that come through council the matrix is changed, then it would still be high/very high but it would be per the new policy that the council puts in place. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> And yeah. >> Kitchen: Well, I'm trying to remember and I apologize. >> It's okay. >> Kitchen: Is there sufficient funding that we've already passed? >> For all. >>

Kitchen: For all high and very high. >> No. In talking with public works, I believe the delta is quite largish, depending on what city you talk to. Other cities have much larger deltas than ours but it's about 250 million, I believe, for -- >> Kitchen: So we're -- >> High/very high to finish

[2:52:35 PM]

that out. We have to consider that a lot of that should be built as properties redeveloped, whether it's a new house or whether it's anything that's being redeveloped in the. -- In that quarter mile would also provide -- would have to provide the sidewalk or pay the fee-in-lieu. So it's a partnership. In talking with public works there's quite a bit of sidewalks being built through the development process as well. And you know that. >> Kitchen: The thinking is that that access from -- that quarter mile access to the corridor and -- which is the reason for the change on the parking would be addressed either by the city funding sidewalks through the high/very high through our existing bonds, or since that money doesn't go far enough or through that particular development either doing a fee-in-lieu or putting a sidewalk in front of their development? >> Correct. >> Kitchen: So we run the risk then in that

[2:53:35 PM]

situation -- or how old we -- how do we address in that situation where you may have one lot that's redeveloped and so -- it's the same problem we have right now. If you have one lot that's redeveloped and so there's a sidewalk in front of the lot. But you don't have the sidewalk all the way to the corridor. What's the thinking about that? I guess I'm wondering why we didn't just say -- why we didn't just say that the trigger for the no parking really relates to the -- something more definitive in terms of getting that accessible route to the corridor. >> Well, I mean, we feel pretty confident that through -- you know, we could write campo grants, there's a lot of way to stretch future dollars with regards to sidewalk infrastructure. And because we know that about 71% will be complete in that area with the 2016 and knowing that the delta

[2:54:36 PM]

would either come from grants, bonds, or the development itself, the impact itself, that we felt pretty confident that the trade-off with trying to -- what we heard from benchmark testing is that the cost of parking is high and if we're trying to -- >> Kitchen: Okay. >> -- Address affordability, so it really came from the housing capacity. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Have and affordability standpoint that we would rather get roofs a quarter mile from the corridor in service trying to reach the 405,000 than the park parking but only in that quarter mile because it does make sense to those corridors that do have multimodal options such as protected bike lanes or transit or what have you, but it certainly is a trade-off but that was the thinking. >> Kitchen: Okay. Councilmember alter, did you have -- >> Alter: Yeah. I wanted to first

say on the loading, I'm not sure I like the idea of them being in a right-of-way and locking our main mobility corridors, and I don't know what the balance is. They may not want to use the -- they may not want to

[2:55:39 PM]

use the loading area that's made available to them but if they're blocking our corridors and we saw this for months on lavaca when they have the right-of-way taken out for construction for various buildings for instance it's the same thing, it just happens and then it clogs up the street, and I don't know what the balance is. I understand the problem you're talking about, but I don't know what the right balance is from a transportation perspective because we didn't want folks just blocking our streets because it's convenient for them either. >> Flannigan: If I might, I agree completely with that. I don't want it to be confused. What I was suggesting is that on-street parking might be a loading space, not that we would allow them to block the right-of-way. That's what I was saying. >> Alter: I did not understand that. Thank you for the clarification. On the contact sensitivity I serve on the committee with the county and the aid and we've been hearing a lot from aid about concerns about parking not being required around schools. Most of our schools do not have parking to address the

[2:56:40 PM]

needs of parents. Parents are coming with small children. They're coming and have to go to work. They have to get to places. A lot of these schools are not accessible by public transit. How might we accommodate these concerns around the schools, some of which do fall in these Zones where you would have no parking, and it's already really difficult and unsafe, at drop -- drop-offs et cetera, but if you add even more car to the streets it will be even more dangerous. >> So we've had one deep dive meeting with aid planning staff and C.I.P. Staff and we have another one this Friday. And then I believe we're also presenting to the joint meeting that afternoon this coming Friday. >> Alter: Okay. >> So I'd be happy to brainstorm with them. It is one thing on the agenda to talk about the quarter mile and the disruptive through the lens

[2:57:40 PM]

of any schools that might be in that area. And get their feedback on that. I'd be happy to report back on Friday afternoon to the joint committee on that. >> Alter: Okay, yeah. I think there definitely are schools that are impacted by this, and just even the reduction down to one in some places, you know, if you start to divide those up enough it's gonna really make enormous impact. I mean, you cannot even go in both directions right now and there's some serious obstacles just given where these schools were sited. >> Yeah. Initially, we didn't define disruptive through the lens of school, but it has come up in several

other venues, even among staff. So with this input we'll be sure and talk with aid about it Friday morning and get their input. >> Alter: If you can let me know afterwards who you're talking with at aid. >> Will do. >> Alter: Okay. Thank you.

[2:58:40 PM]

>> Flannigan: Councilmember alter, can you site a couple of schools as an example so I can go look them up? >> Alter: Sure. Brake breaker woods is one, that's the one in my district we've been hearing about the most and aid had -- the board members had a whole bunch of other ones which I don't remember off the top of my head. It's not every school. I think Pease elementary would be impacted. Now they may be closing that. >> Maybe Casis as well. I don't remember if that's on the tpm or not. >> Alter: I don't know if there's -- yeah there would be a priority network there as well. I just know the ones in my district more. >> Flannigan: Sure. >> Alter: But aid has brought it up for other ones. I think there would be some on the east side like maplewood and cherry, in the cherrywood area. I don't remember which school is over there. But there are a number of them that are -- when you start to define things that

[2:59:40 PM]

are not, like, Lamar corridors and Guadalupe corridors and you start to have the transit priority networks, I think Anderson may end up caught in that as well, although there's no parking on the street there, per se. But there are plenty of them in other districts. I just don't know them. >> Flannigan: That's helpful. I'm thinking that I'm able to see the thing that you're seeing. That way we can have better -- >> Alter: What happens is that the dropoffs and stuff, I mean, there's a lot of schools that if you did it, no matter what school, if you took that away, that it would impact it. I mean, every school I can think of that happens. I'm trying to think of the ones that have the transition Zones near them too. >> Flannigan: If you took what away? >> Alter: If you make it so that you only have one parking spot and the developers actually took that up and only did one spot, that would have a knock-on effect.

[3:00:41 PM]

Of course you don't know what the developers are going to do in those areas. They may do two spots because that's what the market bears, but the schools are often very sort of hemmed in and we don't -- they're not planned always for the capacity that was there and then the number of people. And we don't offer school buses in a lot of places beyond a certain point, and so if you're gonna try to get to work as much as you'd like to walk your kids to school, et cetera, if they're over -- if they're a mile and a half away and you're going to try and do that did it becomes prohibitive to do that. >> Flannigan: So I can understand, that's because there are schools who use areas that would otherwise be allowed for

on-street parking, they use it during drop-off and pickup? >> Alter: It's used for safe drop-off. When you have a kindergartner you don't just let your kindergartner off. You get out of the car, walk them to the classroom, kiss them goodbye or you have schools that have assemblies

[3:01:41 PM]

and so you have -- you know, not every parent will show up at an assembly but you could easily have 50 parents showing up for an assembly and there's no parking, there's no parking lot, it's just all on-street parking at the same time people would still be at their houses because the school started at 7:30 and so it's not -- you know, the timing, you know, particularly for the morning isn't it work and there are schools that barely have buses because everyone is, you know, kind of coming in and you get an inclement day and then everything -- weather changes. >> Flannigan: Part of that, too, is there are schools that don't provide on-site parking because they were built many years ago is? >> Alter: Most don't provide on-site parking for their parents, they provide them for teachers and when had you get to high school for the parents. When parents come for a parent evening it's usually the students aren't there or some people are walking and then it's, like, all over the neighborhood. But a lot of the elementary schools that have a lot of parent involvement, they

[3:02:42 PM]

have parent meetings on a regular basis. It's not like this is happening once every three months. You know, they could have an assembly two or three mornings a week. So it's something that they're very concerned about from a safety perspective, and it would be very nice to see a solution in the code that's not compounding that. And it's -- >> Flannigan: It would be good for some of us, I'll just speak for myself, most of the -- if I would maybe argue all of the schools in my district were fairly recently constructed comparatively speaking so this is a lot more on-property routing and parking and things that are provided in those schools so it will be good to go and check out some of the examples that you've got. >> Alter: I don't even think bryker woods has enough working for the teachers because they're portables. Casis would have the same thing. There's barely enough just for the teachers because of when they were built. O'henny would have the same thing and then you have high schools and then the students are parking so there's not -- I mean, I

[3:03:43 PM]

think it's more of an elementary issue because you're going in and dropping off and you're coming for, you know, the assemblies and other things. >> Kitchen: I think zilker is like that too but I'm not sure if it's actually within a quarter mile. Have to go get my tape measure out for the zilker area. >> That's a close one. >> Kitchen: It's close but I'm not sure if it's a quarter mile [overlapping speakers] >> Alter: Bring a

map and we could have some overlays. Just while we're talking about schools why there's some concern about schools as a broader LDC issue in terms of what they're zoned and what that means for aid but also how the zoning choices we're making line up with the capacities at the schools. And to what extent that is factored into the mapping approach? >> And I'll add that --

[3:04:44 PM]

>> Alter: And I haven't been able to get my head around that, but I have had trustees who are calling and asking about that. >> Kitchen: Yeah. >> Alter: And it would be really helpful if we could somehow think about the land development code project connect and aid closures and how these things sort of overlap. But also the capacity issues that aid has because while you have undercapacity schools in some places you have schools that are at 125, 130%, and even after the bond they are still going to be at those levels. >> Kitchen: Okay. I just have one quick question because we're a little over time but this will be quick. So little bit of different shift in question. So when a tract is on the corner of a corridor, so, for example, I'm wondering about where ingress and egress is. So, for example, if you've got a tract on the corner of

[3:05:44 PM]

a corridor and on the corner of a corridor and then a small residential side street, what's the criteria for determining whether the ingress and egress is actually on the corridor or on the residential street? And is there criteria? >> So that criteria is the distance from a measured road. So if there is a corner lot, they can have drivers on both the streets. It could be on the corridor or it could be on the residential street. So there is no good provision to prohibit an access to either of those roads. >> Kitchen: So how is the decision made then? >> We -- >> Kitchen: Or who makes the decision might be the question? >> So at the time of site plan, when we see the traffic impact analysis or any sort of traffic analysis we make sure that there is no queuing issues or safety issues in any of those access points. And based on the assessment, we make the decision, like, which driveway could be better for operations and

[3:06:47 PM]

safety. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Or if there is one driveway that is not consistent for safety or operations, then we only recommend one driveway on the minor road. >> As a order of process, that would be caught if a TIA is required or it would be caught during the review of the site itself when we do water quality, we do transportation, just a general review. It would be caught at that stage and that would be at the decision of the transportation department to determine. >> Kitchen: Okay. My very last question then. So we were talking about contact sensitivity and parking. So was there any -- was the width of the street considered as part of that at all? Again, condition the quarter mile? >> No it was not. >> Kitchen:

Okay. >> We're quite aware in transportation because of just everything we deal with with regards to speed mitigation and other things in the urban core that many

[3:07:48 PM]

of our residential streets are 30 feet face of curb to face of curb, which presents challenges when there's parking on both sides, there's pros and cons to that with regards to creating friction and slowing traffic down by emergency access is something that we talk about. But it did not come up with regards to the definition of the disruptive parking. >> Kitchen: I'm sorry. Is that -- >> Is that what you asked? >> Kitchen: Well, I was asking the contact sensitivity is a factor to consider when looking at the parking requirements, and so my question is, was the width of the street and related issues like you just mentioned around emergency access or other kinds of issues that occur when you have a narrow or substandard street, was that considered in determining the parking requirements? >> The parking requirements overall?

[3:08:48 PM]

>> Kitchen: Well, so if you're gonna -- so we've talked in terms of reducing -- or changing the parking requirements within a quarter mile, right? So if that quarter mile is on a narrow substandard street because it just comes in -- there's a few places this occurs, where it comes into a corridor or tpm, then did that -- does that impact -- in other words, the requirements that we have right now for parking is that -- relate to whether there's sidewalks, so we talked about that. But as -- as a contact sensitive factor. But was there any consideration given to the road itself which really when you're thinking about the impact of parking along both sides of a narrow or substandard street? So that was not considered? >> No. >> Kitchen: Okay. All right. Does anybody have any other questions? All right. Thank you, all.

[3:09:48 PM]

>> And I remember reading this in the code about the ten-year or they can -- has -- do people -- has that ever happened? >> Are you asking has it happened that we have had to return funding? >> Garza: Yes. >> Yes, that has happened. >> Garza: Do you know at what rate that has happened? >> I'd have to talk to Andy and get back to you. It's not very high but I could not give a number if it's five or 20%. >> Garza: That's basically if a sidewalk isn't eventually built in front, right? >> Not just sidewalks. >> Any type of mitigation funding. >> Of funding that's given for traffic impact. I believe that after ten years we would have to return it if requested, and I believe that we have done that before. >> Garza: Okay. Thanks. >> Kitchen: So the last

[3:10:48 PM]

thing was a process thing that you had -- you had talked about the people can submit maps. I have two questions about that. Can they submit them electronically? >> Right now we don't have that set up. It's just a hand drop-off. >> Kitchen: So they can't email? >> No. >> Kitchen: Okay. That would be helpful if there was a way to do that because some people have the capability to scan and it's much easier for them to email. To drop it off requires them to actually come to a place and drop it off, which can be difficult. >> I'll look into that with the corporate Pio team and see if we can update the website to allow for that. >> Kitchen: Okay. Or just an email would be great. >> Yeah. >> Kitchen: So okay. And then I've had some folks ask me about what happens next after they submit something like that. And I've told them what I read on the website. I just want to make sure I told them the right thing,

[3:11:50 PM]

and that is that the team, the ldc team, I guess, would be reviewing that based on the form that y'all have posted. And then from there you pass those along to the district, the councilmembers, or -- >> Correct. >> Kitchen: Okay. So you will be passing along everything that you receive, right? >> We'll pass along the actual maps with the cover sheet, the comments to the councilmember whose district it's within. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Then we committed to creating an overall summary that we would create. >> Kitchen: For everybody. >> Correspondence to everybody that kind of outline the themes we saw with the community mapping. >> Kitchen: Okay. So I reassured someone who asked that you wouldn't be rejecting maps. You will have comments of course. >> All maps will be forwarded with comment to how well they were within the boundaries of the

[3:12:52 PM]

council direction. >> Kitchen: Right. Okay. All right. >> In what mayor pro tem was saying about returning fee-in-lieu fees that aren't used within ten years, is that a state mandate or a municipal regulation? >> I believe it's a city code, but I can double-check. It's only for transportation fee-in-lieu mitigation. >> Ellis: Interesting. Thank you. >> You're welcome. >> Kitchen: All right. Other questions? Thank you all very much. This is very helpful. I don't think I'm on -- what is it will hundred you're in? >> Flannigan: I'm 700 in. [Laughter] >> Kitchen: All right. Thank you, all. [Meeting concluded]