

# Mobility Committee Transcript (MOBC) – 3/10/2022

Title: ATXN-1 (24hr)

Channel: 6 - ATXN-1

Recorded On: 3/10/2022 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 3/10/2022

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.***

[1:02:41 PM]

>> Have a quite full meeting today, so I'm going to get us started if that's all right. It is 1:02 P.M. I am councilmember Paige Ellis, chair of the mobility committee, joined by Kelly, kitchen, and councilmember harper-madison has joined us remotely and mayor pro tem alter will be joining remotely, she's just running a few minutes behind. Those are our committee members and I see that mayor Adler is joining us today. Welcome, mayor. We've got a pretty packed meeting today, so we're going to move tightly through it. We have ten speakers signed up today. We've had some communication about general processes with the committee since we're not usually voting on items. They're typically briefings. But we conferred with the clerk's office and since we have ten people who have signed up to speak today, it is at the chair's discretion that we're going to take all ten but give

[1:03:42 PM]

them two minutes apiece. I hope everyone can keep their comments brief. We are glad you wanted to join with us today. We have two in chambers and eight on the phone, I think? Perfect. So we will now move into public communication. >> Let's go with those who are in person first. So, Anne Stevens. >> Good afternoon. As Christopher said, my name is Anne Stevens. I live at 4004 edgemont drive. I am in district 10. I have the privilege of representing some 80 homeowners on edgemont, madrona, and Glenn roads. We are encouraged that the staff has suggested that this street remain a level one

[1:04:43 PM]

classification. We support it remaining a level one classification. We are asking this committee to affirm this suggestion and approve it as the recommendation to the full city council. There is no need for sidewalks or bike lanes on this quiet neighborhood residential street. We would like to emphasize the need for established neighborhood street improvements to remain as they are and for our front yards to remain as they are. We are asking this committee that such language be included and recommended to the full city council. I appreciate your time. I think I took one minute, so I will share it with the other speakers. Thank you.

[1:05:46 PM]

>> Janis rhineken. >> Thank you, Mr. Parks. Good afternoon, madam chair, vice chair, and members. I am Janice, a resident of district 7 where I live near white rock drive. That becomes relevant in my comments in my experience as an attorney I have worked for municipality, state janices, the private sector and 12 years serving members of the Texas house of representatives. I serve on the board of the

[1:06:46 PM]

allandale neighborhood association. I speak today on my own behalf. I believe what I have to say accurately reflects the concerns of many private property owners in my neighborhood and other sectors of Austin. I would appreciate your close attention. Here's the problem. The prospect of designation of mass right-of-way changes is not about updating a transportation plan. It is about prospective development of a mass rezoning policy. The proposed asmp amendments concerning designation of prospective right-of-way where not merely technical corrections for a citywide transportation plan, they are substantive changes that would pave the way for a citywide shift of land use and zoning policy. As applied to this prospective expansion of right-of-way, the term mobility plan would be more accurately called a wish list for potential land use rezoning. I would call your attention to my other bullet points, 4-7 and I'll move to the end of my remarks. This approach of the mass right-of-way designation raises concerns similar to those protested by property owners of Austin regarding codenext, when the city attempted a mass rezoning of private properties without proper notice to the owners.

[1:07:47 PM]

An injunction remains in effect. Please settle this issue by informing the atd and asmp team to remove these prospective right-of-way expansions from the asmp amendments and map comments. Thank you for your attention. [ Buzzer sounding ] >> If you have questions, I I'll remain. >> Thank you, Ms. Janice. >> Thank you. >> Mark duchen. Mark duchen. Zenobia Joseph. >> Thank you, madam chair, members, I'm Zenobia Joseph. My comments are specifically about item 4, the Austin strategic mobility plan

amendments. As it relates to page 6, the 50/50 mode share, I have a question as it relates to the reduction. There were three northeast

[1:08:49 PM]

metrorapids that were reduced when council voted on project connect. So the 50/50 mode share would seem to me that it would increase traffic congestion as opposed to decreasing it, but the 50/50 mode share that was actually the goal in 2019 has remained the same and not taken into consideration the elimination of palmer, the \$4.7 million metrorapid between Samsung and apple, fm969, and also the central rapid that would have traveled from dessau to the gold line, ACC highland off the community college. Those were three northeast metrorapids primarily serving African Americans and minorities. As it relates to page 25, the long-term vision plan, I do have a question as it relates to that map. Is that from December 17th, 2018 when capital metro adopted their long-term vision plan for

[1:09:49 PM]

project connect, or is this a different map? And as it relates to the transit priority network, it does not take into consideration the disparate impact that has been created by cap remap. And so I would just ask you to recognize that African Americans wait 60 minutes for the bus. That's about ten times longer than southwest and central whites and hispanics. I had these questions and this has this is my technical comment. I was going to ask these questions as a discussion item but I was told because it wasn't on the agenda I couldn't speak. I would just ask you to clarify how the commissions are going to take public input -- [ buzzer sounding ] >> On discussion items like you're taking comments today. I'm not sure -- >> Speaker, your time has has ex-spired. Expired. >> If you have questions, I'll

[1:10:50 PM]

gladly answer them at this time. >> Andrew tiegle. David garano. Joseph Reynolds. >> Hello? >> Yes, please continue. >> Am I speaking now? >> Yes, we can hear you. >> Hello? You can? >> Yes, please proceed. >> Okay. Good afternoon. I'm Joe Reynolds, I live on west 49th street and I'm opposed to the asmp revisions and the way they've been done. They're being done without considering constraints on implementation. Obvious constraints are one, the geology of the roadway, two the ownership of the land along the road and three the use of the land along the road. And this is a process failure. Failure to follow a proper process causes real trouble. Once a plan is approved, the parties implementing its

[1:11:51 PM]

projects never check for problems. This leads to failure. No problem, council approved it. Proper traffic engineering would look at safety. No safety studies have been done to support the changes in road class. Simple stuff like grade of hills has been ignored. How about some examples of future trouble? Let's look at part of a similar council-approved plan, building a section of the urban trail. The design and construction of the trail never looked at well-known geology issues. A faulty design and construction resulted. So there's a collapsed hillside on Shoal Creek that so far has a cost approaching \$20 million. How about asmp examples that are certain but not happened yet? There's several on Barton Springs Road. At Lamar we have a repeat of the trail collapse debacle. There are geologic conditions with lots of history. Dr. Peter was present at UT when a series of hillside collapses occurred at this corner. Asmp revisions include a future failure at least as expensive as

[1:12:51 PM]

the urban trail disaster. How far will the apartments at the top of the hill slide? Throughout Zilker, asmp conflicts with the citizen-approved park plan. There are two examples on Hancock Drive, land use and land ownership. The asmp calls for right-of-way acquisition, but Austin Memorial Park has graves just inside the fence. And Mopac bridge is state right-of-way. There are more on 49th Street east of Burnet. State of Texas owned both sides of 49th. There's a state parking garage with conflicts and the Chris Cole Center is a conflict. Asmp is full of problems. [ Buzzer sounding ] >> Do you want another hillside collapse? >> Speaker, your time has expired. >> State legislature passes a bill transferring -- >> Expired. >> City of Austin. I ask that you consider the consequences before accepting this faulty work. Thank you. >> Chair, there are no other speakers on the line at this

[1:13:52 PM]

time. >> Ellis: Thank you, Christopher. There were a couple other names that you called. Were they possibly on mute, or are they not on the line? >> We don't see them in the queue. >> Ellis: Thank you. To anyone who had longer comments they wanted to submit or wasn't able to call in today, please send them via email to the mobility committee members in. We will look at them and want to hear your input, so thank you for signing up and please send us your remarks if you weren't able to join us today. We will now move through the agenda in numerical order. The first item is approve the minutes of the mobility committee meeting on February 10th, 2022. Do I have a motion to approve those? Vice chair Kelly makes the motion. Do I have a second? Councilmember Kitchen seconds that. All committee members in favor? It looks unanimous with Mayor Pro Tem Alter not joining us quite yet, but she will be here later. The next item we're going to move to is item 2, update from the chair of the urban transportation commission. I see Mr. Champion has joined

[1:14:54 PM]

us. Welcome, and thank you. >> Thank you for having me, chair, committee members. I'll give a brief update. I know there's quite an agenda. At our last urban transportation commission meeting we addressed three times. The first one was a presentation from nefertitti on the racial equity anti-displacement tool. There was no action. We had questions about the benefits and it was very informational, so we appreciate that. We spent the bulk of our time, very similar to the speakers you just heard, talking about the asmp and the street-level changes. I think I want to give a couple of observations that came through. One of the issues, from listening -- we had 38 speakers signed up, maybe half or more showed up and spoke. We talked with Mr. Kitten quite a bit about it. What happened is the asmp street-level classification is not clear what they mean in real life. When people had their comments and concerns, it didn't

[1:15:55 PM]

necessarily jive with what asmp later on declared was the state of the street-level change. Some of it boils down to wording, things like an ideal cross section has the feeling of aspirational, versus a theoretical possibility. So people -- it seemed were concerned this is the ideal cross section, that means we're going to take 20 feet from the driveways and yards and take down trees to add sidewalks and bike lanes. That's never likely to happen. Once that discussion came along, a lot of people were put more at ease. One of the other missteps from the city of Austin staff was undefined words like intensive development. When you look at some of the comments, people really were concerned about undefined words, what does that mean and what does that trigger. So there was a lot of discussion there. If you have the time to read through the comments, it's worthwhile.

[1:16:55 PM]

I hope I did a good job summing things up. The last thing we discussed was the budget priority bullet items. We passed a recommendation which outlined our priorities and we hope to pass on to the relevant departments. There's five bullets. I'll read them quickly. Work with partners around high-capacity transit, attain the 50/50 mode share set forth in the asmp, work to realize the vision zero safety goals, and the climate goals of the equity plan, and work to actively mitigate and address equity concerns caused by decades of inequitable transportation system planning. That is a very quick summary. If there are questions or observations, I'm here to answer them. >> Ellis: That was amazingly quick. Thank you. I'm glad we -- the meeting. I think it's really helpful, since you are so grateful to volunteer your service and we appreciate your service. We didn't want you to be waiting until the end of the meeting to

[1:17:55 PM]

give these updates. We really appreciate your participation and volunteering on this and doing the double duty of coming to us to tell us everything that you're working on. I agree. When you said there may be a couple definitions that need to be updated or added into the plan, I think that's something that I've heard a little bit about. I think there may be some of this happening in some other parts of the plan that we want to make sure to identify. I don't know that I have extra questions for you. Do other committee members have any questions or insight to share? Councilmember kitchen? >> Kitchen: Yes, thank you very much, Mario. It's good to see you. So -- and that was very helpful insight as to how people are feeling and reacting to the proposal that's out there. I apologize if I may have missed it, but did you all have any recommendations related to it? >> Good question. We did not have a recommendation

[1:18:56 PM]

because asmp sent out kind of a revamp of many of the concerns the citizens had raised, just the day before. So we did not feel we had enough time to work through all that. It did seem to be heading in the right direction. I think Mr. Kitten was very good in offering details to the questions that were raised. But we did not act with a specific recommendation. >> Ellis: Thank you, Mr. Champion. I believe in Mr. Kitten's presentation there will be more discussion about other opportunities for public input, and which committees -- commissions might be hearing this and talking about it. So there's certainly going to be more opportunities for public input and we'll be able to daylight those here later today. If there's no further questions, I will say thank you for your time. >> Thank you. >> Ellis: Thanks for joining us. Item number 3 is the briefing on federal mobility grant opportunities from the infrastructure, investment, and

[1:19:57 PM]

jobs act. And joining us is director spillar. >> Thank you, madam chair, members, and mayor. This was a presentation I was supposed to give to you last month. Some of it might seem dated, but it's still important to go through so that the public has an understanding that although there is a number of opportunities for federal funding available, it may not be the cornucopia that people think. And it's going to be very competitive. If you'll allow me, I will get to a recommendation on what we are putting forward on the slide. Thank you. The bipartisan infrastructure law -- and it's going by several different names, but it is the federal funding law that was passed by the U.S. D.O.T. Reauthorizes D.O.T. And extends funding for a number of programs for the next five years. Many of those programs will fund

[1:20:57 PM]

annually, so even though the numbers look very big in the bill, we have to remember that, divide that by five and that's likely how much they are releasing each year. Relevant programs are safe streets for all, reconnecting communities. There's new policies, everyone safety, equity, multimodal, and jobs. Next slide, please. This breaks up into a whole range of different projects. There is a grant request available on the streets now. There was a notice of funding availability. That's the R.A.I.S.E. Grant, but there's grants in a number of areas. Remember that these funds, 7.8 billion looks big, but when you divide it by five, that's 1.5 billion a year to be spread over the entire country. And so that means that the actual size projects that are likely to be funded are less

[1:21:58 PM]

than \$25 million per project and localities or proponents of those need to come up with a minimum of 20% match, but really based on our other knowledge of the process, to be competitive we need to be in the 50% range of local monies brought to it. Next slide, please, is a list of future grants that we're anticipating already coming out. And they really run the gambit from just about every time of surface transportation, from traditional roadway, bike, ped, and safety-type projects to transit and through federal transit administration. Bridge discretionary funds may come through our state as formula funds. Those will be something we'll be very interested in. We have lots of bridges. Being a river city, we need to be aware of that. Next slide. So, what have we learned from previous grants? They will be very competitive.

[1:22:58 PM]

We've competed for grants similar to the R.A.I.S.E. Grants available now. Previously they were called build grants or tiger grants. I will tell you that we've had experience going after those before in 2019 and 2020. We pursued funding for the red bud bridge trail and it was not awarded. Economic development applied for colony loop in 2018. That was not awarded. One of the things we learned from that, and I'll reiterate that later, often we found ourselves as a city competing against ourselves. So the feedback we got from the U.S. D.O.T is we asked for your most important project and you gave us two or three projects, how are we to know what your priorities are. So we're being very cautious and conscious about that as we go forward. Certainly there are smart grants or grants that will fall into this smart sort of category. Looking to fund technology. We think we will be very competitive in those, although

[1:24:00 PM]

we have not been successful in the past. We did get significantly along that award trail through the smart cities grant. We think that some of these may be funds that the U.S. D.O.T is looking for strong partners to demonstrate projects in. And so maybe instead of being competitive, maybe they are partnerships with the U.S. D.O.T. We're really interested in that. We did apply in 2018 for a travel information system that was not awarded but we think that this type of grant opportunity may be changing. The last set of funds will be those formula funds that come to the region, the mpo either through the state as pass-through funds or directly to the mpo. We have in the past demonstrated that we can be extremely competitive, as the major city in the campo region. And we are looking to go after funding that may flow through either the state or through the

[1:25:03 PM]

mpo. And that's simply because we have the apparatus set up to really deliver on those contracts. One of the things we hear over and over is that we need to be shovel-ready. We've been hearing this for a decade but it's even true now during this new administration. We know that federal representatives and congressional leads will be looking for projects not just to cut ribbons on, not just to turn dirt on but to actually cut ribbons. We're focused on developing projects that are shovel-ready but also maybe provide multiple opportunities to celebrate wins and successes, to demonstrate to the community that we're delivering and that we're having good success in getting the federal money into projects. Next slide, please. I just want to go over quickly some of the examples. Pittsburgh was very successful in pursuing a r.a.l.e.s.-type grant, a tiger grant. They were awarded \$19 million,

[1:26:05 PM]

total cost \$26 million, about a three-acre cap. Two things to take away from this is I don't think we can get in on a 10% match anymore. Everything we hear is we need to increase the return on investment and so that's probably closer to 50% response and costs have significantly probably gone up since this project in 2016. But a project not unlike one we are pursuing here in the region on I-35. And so I know Mike Trimble is here and he will talk about some of the efforts, or has been talking about some of the efforts we're doing on I-35. But I think caps are certainly a future potential as we remember this funding builds over five years. Next slide, please. Another example is Dallas did a S. M.A.R.T. Corridor, \$4 million, 50% match, as recent as 2020.

[1:27:06 PM]

And that grant funded a series of projects, if you will, along the corridor. And so again, I would submit to you that Austin probably has a number of corridors that look like this that could take advantage that might already have bond dollars. Bond projects are good candidates to add project onto. We know that



those projects are likely already in the Nepa process. They've already been nepa-cleared. And so to add something to them would not be opening up a new federal process. Something else is when you accept federal money, you also accept the appropriate strings that go with that in terms of environmental review and community outreach. And so that also goes into the selection of our committed projects as we go forward. And the third example I think I have -- next slide, please -- is one from Los Angeles. And this really shows you how a

[1:28:06 PM]

community extremely overmatched, which increases their odds of winning a project. In L.A., they took a look at a resiliency zone safe streets component along corridor and matched it at 70. What that represents is the federal money was the last money in and unlocked or allowed the project. We think that is very appealing to the federal government right now, to be able to see that if not for their money, the project wouldn't happen. And so that's something that we're very focused on as well. Next, please. Another area that's going to be very important that the U.S. D.O.T. Will be looking at is are we investing in areas of persistent poverty. Some of you may recognize these as ej or economic justice type issues. Those are the terms that have been previously used. The good news is that already the transportation department,

[1:29:07 PM]

if we can go to the next slide, has developed equity analysis Zones that almost perfectly match as those areas of traditional poverty. And so we think we're very focused on this in terms of identifying projects in those equity Zones to maximize our probability of winning federal dollars. It is quite an effort when you're competing at a national level, to go after these. And so I think after this first year we'll develop a better understanding of how to pursue these. And I would recommend to this council that we be able to provide a return on investment analysis as we go after these projects, because we do need consultant services to help us pursue these to bring the proposal in at the level that is competitive nationwide. Next slide. So where are we in the process? We started this process before

[1:30:09 PM]

the notice of funding opportunity started. We are quite down the area. We were at this green line. We are about to come to council as well as we're talking to other agencies seeking agreement and coordination on a project that we are ready to put forward for council consideration and I believe we're coming to the first meeting in April for your concurrence. And I will communicate to you that we spoke to capital metro and invited them to join our project just yesterday and they're very excited about the project at the staff level. We need to seek not just council but U.S. Representative support.

Councilmember Doggett is interested in the project we are proposing. We hope other congressional leaders will be as well. We need more than just a letter of support. We need active support from our federal representatives to call

[1:31:09 PM]

the secretary or the appropriate office and say hey, we're really interested in this project, and we'll be communicating that as we go forward. Next slide, please. What's important? What is strategic here? I'm going to show you my cards here. Shovel-ready is important. We know that's important. Bond projects are great projects, especially where we can add something that we were not able to through the bond program, specifically add, but we can use those as matching. We need to remember it federalizes the project and so if the project is already on a state property or federal property, it is already going through that federal environmental process, so that helps us in selection. Congressional support, and we need to make it competitive. So we need to be as close or beyond that 50/50% match. The projects need to be regional in scope. And this has been one of the

[1:32:09 PM]

hard issues on some of our projects, is detailing out the regionalism. So it has to be on the mpo tip, or eligible for that tip. And I'll just be blunt with you. We've had several projects -- we have a couple projects that desperately need funding -- outside funding, but they don't rise to the level that the region deems as regional. So that will continue to be a struggle for those projects. What we are quickly doing is developing a long-range grant strategy where we identify a project, develop it to shovel-ready and then look for the right grant. To put that simply we ought to be looking for bridge dollars for bridge grants, bridge grants for bridge projects, and we ought to be looking for transit dollars for transit projects. That is oversimplification because even within the transit portfolio there are elements that may well qualify and compete well for the R.A.I.S.E.

[1:33:11 PM]

Grants. A regional discussion and partnership as we move forward, we've got to get through this first year. It's thrown at us starting in January, but these grants will come back on a regular cycle, and we need to get ready for that. Next slide, please. So -- and one thing is still a big deal. In the past, this region and specifically the city of Austin has been tutored by the U.S. D.O.T that we put in too many grant proposal. S. We try to throw stuff on the wall and see what sticks. We are working hard, within the city we have coordinated and we are putting forward one grant for the R.A.I.S.E. Grant, a combination of projects from two organizations, the corridor program office and public works. I think it's also a really

good story of collaboration. The transportation department is stepping aside to support that proposal as well. It is a really good project.

[1:34:15 PM]

Next slide, please. So the nofo has been released, the departments have coordinated. We're preparing a project for the committed time and resources going forward. We're pursuing larger projects. That's our advice, and looking for substantial match. Next steps, we decided on one project. That's the next slide. We're going to be coming to you the first part of April as a full council to ask your support for that project. I do not believe that project will require new funds. We've identified the funds through bond programs, so I don't think it will be too hard. Certainly we'll be looking to you all to help encourage the regional agencies to join this, either as a real part of the project or in moral support. And we will continue to coordinate those grants and refine that one to five-year grant cycle strategy. The next slide I believe shows

[1:35:18 PM]

the proposed project we're moving forward with, and if I could have the next slide, please. We're calling it the southeast Austin connector and we're combining three projects that make a lot of sense to combine here. The idea to combine the projects was recommended by our federal lobbyist as we were discussing with his firm how to position this project. So we've been getting outside help all along. You all heard about the Bergstrom spur trail that would basically convert an existing union pacific rail line that is underutilized to a trail and pedestrian connection. What's important about this is you see that blue star that's approximately where the south congress transit center is, it becomes the distributor for people to get to that transit center. One of the things we've learned prior to the pandemic and during the pandemic is how important those personal mobility devices

[1:36:20 PM]

are. Even though we joke about who uses a scooter, when we look at the data we see it expands the reach of transit. This is a needed connection in a pedestrian and bicycle pathway desert because of the major significant roads there. So that's that roadway that forms that bridge east-west. It crosses a significant corridor project that was funded in the 2020 bond program, which is the south pleasant valley connection. I say it crosses it. That's the red blob up above the rest of the red. That is an extension of south pleasant valley -- I forget which street it goes to, but it connects into the arterial system. Right now south pleasant valley dead ends. That is critically important because cap metro needs that connection to be able to run their new metrorapid service on. And that metrorapid service

[1:37:22 PM]

continues on south and crosses the future Bergstrom spur urban trail location. Along with that is country club creek trail extension, another little bit of a trail extension that would then connect all of this into the larger trail system that gets you north up into the lake area, or the lady bird lake area. This is pretty interesting because it crosses a number of those areas of historic poverty as well as many of our areas, equity focus Zones. It crosses at least two councilmember districts. It really gets to a need that is multimodal and crosses a lot of the needs off of the south part of the corridor. We talked to capital metro yesterday. The city and capital metro are partnered on metro bike. A series of electric bike

[1:38:24 PM]

stations along here would give people who are commuting here a chance to move along this corridor fairly easy, as well as a focus by our private suppliers as well. We will work with them to make sure those are there. So we're pretty excited about this and we'll be bringing this to council for that support so that we have that support going forward. And one of the benefits of combining south pleasant valley connection where we have the bond funds to build it and the funds that have already been identified to purchase the Bergstrom spur urban trail right-of-way is that those go to match. And so we think this is -- I think I'm quoting correctly -- about a \$40 million project and we know we can bring half that to the table. So that's my briefing on the federal grant process. I know it was quick, but if you have questions, let me know. >> Ellis: I really appreciate that rundown.

[1:39:25 PM]

I know that in a lot of the committees and a lot of the boards we serve on we're always looking for how to create that match, how can we make our public dollars stretch further. And it's very tricky. Your team is constantly looking at how do we get things shovel-ready in a place that doesn't end up sitting on a shelf because we got it really close to groundbreaking and then couldn't find the rest of the money, or chose not to spend the money there. So there's a lot of calculus happening between the city and with campo and cap metro to figure out who's paying for what, how are we making our dollars stretch as far as possible, so I appreciate you and your team doing that work, because I know it's a lot. >> Thank you. And that's a real departure from the way it was ten years ago where we didn't start the process until we had all the money in hand. And that doesn't work in today's infrastructure market. So we develop the projects and then phase them so we're available to do what we can when we can. >> Ellis: I know sometimes we

[1:40:25 PM]

have to find the money first and then say let's get grant funding and matching so we don't have to spend our dollars on it and we can spend our money in other places. Councilmember kitchen. >> Mhmm. >> Kitchen: Yes, of course I just want to say I'm excited about the Bergstrom spur -- or the project, the southeast connections. It's really a very, very nice way to connect with the pleasant valley brt and the Orange line south and recognize that east-west connection at the Bergstrom spur gives us. And I also want to say I appreciate the work that you all have done with cap metro. It really is a perfect project for that partnership, so. >> Thank you. >> Ellis: I agree. Do we have any other questions? We have now been joined by mayor pro tem alter and councilmember tovo. I see her box there, but her

[1:41:26 PM]

video is not on. Welcome. >> Tovo: Thank you. I've been here since most of the speakers. Thank you. >> Ellis: That's great. I know we have secretary buddha as one of the features speakers for south by southwest, so we're really excited to see what he has to say and welcome him to town. As we've had conversations with some of his team over the past few months, we know they care about reconnecting communities and vision zero programs. They're very like-minded with the city of Austin and trying to support these local efforts. If there's no other questions? Thank you, director spillar. We'll move on to the next item. >> I'm going to stay up here to kick this off. >> Ellis: Next item is number 4, briefing on the Austin strategic mobility plan amendment process and proposed amendments. >> Thank you, madam chair and councilmembers and mayor.

[1:42:26 PM]

I want to introduce Cole kitten, is going to be speaking to this item. But I wanted to say a few things as the director. First of all, this was the first update to the asmp. And as you can imagine, we've learned some stuff. We relearned that the public is very passionate about planning and specifically mobility. We think there will be many opportunities in the future to continue to update this plan. And we'll certainly take what we learned this time about how to communicate and how to bring folks into the tent, if you will, from the very beginning. One of the things that I think we've got to do a better job of is understanding when information is put out how it's being interpreted. As people have said, words matter. But also understanding when misinformation gets out and how we help manage that sort of understanding of misinformation. We started this amendment cycle

[1:43:28 PM]

in may of 2021 with an internal review of the Austin strategic mobility plan policies. The asmp had just published a two-year status update which showed significant progress being made. The amendment cycle was considered an opportunity to make minor amendments to the policy document and make updates to reflect the adopted project connect system plan as requested by council and also reflect on the community's experience over the last two years throughout the pandemic. So we feel we captured an appropriate level of updates to the asmp policy side of the document. There's also the other side of the document, the street network side of the document. And I just want to reiterate that the street network has always been for right-of-way dedication, not acquisition, meaning when major redevelopment -- not remodeling of a house, but redevelopment --

[1:44:32 PM]

when stuff moves to a commercial use, for instance, along an arterial or changes to multifamily, it gives us the opportunity to make sure that the street reflects the needed mobility that we have identified through the strategic mobility plan. For the last few years, with made a long-needed update to the TCM, adopted by rule in December of this last year, 2021 and will go into effect this June in 2022. The amendment cycle has been an opportunity to update the street network to incorporate these updated standards used during the land development, redevelopment process. Attention from the community so far has been on the proposed changes to the street network, however, the street network itself hasn't changed from its adopted purpose, which is that dedication purpose. The street network has always been for right-of-way dedication, not acquisition. It's not a plan to acquire property. The project development process is responsible for determining that actual amount of right-of-way that is needed to

[1:45:32 PM]

deliver a project. It's critical that the community understands the difference between this difference because of the misinformation that may have been shared between the community, as we know. Ultimately it is critical that we update the street network in order to require new developments and commercial developments to adhere to our updated design standards. Because as we know, the city has been built over decades using old standards and we know more now than ever what is needed to allocate space in the right-of-way to our most vulnerable users to accomplish our vision zero goal as well as our climate goals. And so with that I'll introduce Cole and he can go through the presentation and I'll just recommit our department. We're here to work with the community and with you all and not create undue angst, as you would. Thanks. >> Good afternoon, Cole kitten,

[1:46:34 PM]

division manager, atd. So, this is our fourth presentation in the month of March. The purpose of this presentation is to continue to socialize the updated draft of the proposed amendments, answer questions, and allow the community to continue to provide feedback as we finalize the plan. Next slide. So there's a lot of information within this presentation. I'm going to try to go through it quickly, but stay on certain slides that provide important information for the community to understand and still get to the q&a. Next slide. So, to start, looking at the timeline as rob mentioned we started in may of 2021 with an internal review process. We provided memos to mayor and council along the way, but we started the first round of public engagement on October 1st with the release of a policy survey, followed by the release of a street network feedback map

[1:47:35 PM]

on November 15th. And this first round of public comments closed on January 30th. Next slide. In the month of February we summarized the feedback that we heard in the first round and we developed the updated Dr. Of the of the proposed amendments. And then on February 28th we sent out notification through the community registry of this updated draft for comment and that's what started our second round of public engagement. So the month of March has been an opportunity for us to present to boards and commissions, socialize these changes, answer questions, and really respond to the concerns and questions we heard in round one. So the updated draft is very intentional and responsive to those comments that we heard. In April we'll summarize the comments that we received in March and we'll use that to make

[1:48:35 PM]

a final draft of the proposed amendments, as well as a round two public feedback report. And then in may we'll publish that final draft and per Austin city charter we'll be getting a recommendation from the planning commission as well as conducting a public hearing at city council followed by council meetings to consider adoption. And that public hearing will be advertised in the American statesman and a community registry per Austin city charter. Next slide. Next slide. So, a brief history on asmp, what it is. The asmp is both the policy document and a street network table and map. Next slide. The policy document was adopted in April 2019 as the transportation element of imagine Austin. It is a comprehensive multimodal mobility plan for the future of our transportation network. It established our north star

[1:49:37 PM]

and where we want to see transportation go in the future by establishing this 50/50 mode share goal where by 2039 we need austinites -- 50% of austinites to drive alone in their car instead of the 74% that

drive alone today. It includes indicators, targets, policies and action items, all the things that we need to do to make sure we accomplish that vision. Next slide. So the asmp is also a street network table and map. It is a database of streets organized by street name and it includes the existing and future conditions of our right-of-way. These future conditions reflect the policies and transportation vision in the asmp, shared with imagine Austin. And it reflects our multimodal systems. But most importantly, the street network is used to identify right-of-way dedication requirements per the land development code to accommodate

[1:50:38 PM]

these future conditions. Next slide. Now, to take a second and explain what right-of-way dedication is and what it isn't, right-of-way dedication is only triggered for new development or intensive redevelopment, meaning single-family homes that go through the residential review process for a building permit do not require right-of-way dedication. So, again, the question came up about intensive redevelopment. And we can get into this later, but intensive really depends on the type of development and the location of the development. So it is intentionally vague. But the other thing to note about the street network is that it includes improvements to our multimodal systems, but it doesn't mean that right-of-way changes will occur all across Austin. Next slide. Next slide.

[1:51:38 PM]

So, this amendment cycle is intended to be a minor amendment to the asmp. It is not a new plan, but it is an opportunity to reflect on the last two years to identify significant changes that needed to be accounted for. So for the policy document we've identified three proposed new policies as well as revisions and additions to action items and then various other errata and minor document corrections, which can be found in a red line document found online with an amendment log, with ids and page numbers for easy reference. For the street network, we're taking this opportunity to make corrections and in line with updated city documents. As mentioned earlier, the TCM was adopted in 2021, which is a major update for the city. With that is a need to align the

[1:52:40 PM]

ingredients within the TCM with the adopted 2014 bicycle plan. We're also reflecting public transportation changes based on the project connect system plan, as well as making updates to reflect the mobility bond engineering studies, as well as using this opportunity to remove roadways and identify added roadways. Next slide. So, first I'll go through the first three proposed policies quickly. In reflecting on the last two years, we felt -- we really felt the pressure of the pandemic, particularly on the space that was needed for us to get out and stay safe, and staying socially distant, physically distant. So



in reviewing the asmp we found that we needed to take a stronger policy position by indicating that we should support streets as places where

[1:53:40 PM]

people and community engage in nonmobility activity. So, the full text of this policy can be found on page 95 of the red line document. Next slide. We are also coming out of the winter storm in early 2021, and reflecting on a repeated climate events in Austin. So we felt it was important to identify stronger policy about transportation resilience. So we identified this policy on air and climate to increase the transportation network's adaptive capacity, future-proof our transportation infrastructure and operations to flexibly adapt to climate impacts. And the full text can be found on page 197 of the asmp red line. Next slide. A supporting policy to that can be found in the collaboration chapter, because it wasn't just winter storm uri that we were

[1:54:40 PM]

impacted by, but it's the repeated flood events, wildfires, etc. That we need to make sure that our city is prepared. So the policy reads support larger city efforts for disaster preparedness and emergency response, coordinate with local and regional partners to protect and support community during extreme events. And that full text can be found on page 268 of the red line. Next slide. So our round one policy survey, 958 people provided a response that indicated 70% or greater felt that they support or strongly support the proposed policies. Under our roadway system policy six, people expressed that streets should have more -- many uses for the community and that streets are for people movement, not just car movement, compared to streets are for getting from

[1:55:41 PM]

one place to another and no other purpose. One thing to note is that many of the comments that were in opposition or strongly opposed were actually about the street network amendment. So that percentage is higher because of that. The air and climate policy, transportation resilience policies also were greater than 70% support and many people expressed that it was important to keep our transportation operating during disasters to help safety efforts compared to some people that felt like this policy was unnecessary or overreaction. The full survey results can be found in our round one public feedback report, published online. Next slide. So, moving on to the street network amendments, the important thing to understand is that the street network reflects inputs from various city documents and plan projects. So every amendment cycle we're going to ensure that we're using

[1:56:42 PM]

the most up-to-date information to make those amendments. First the adopted street network was based on draft criteria that was used to update the TCM and it included planning-level right-of-way estimates. So the next few slides I'll go through each of these topics. Next slide. So, first starting with the updated TCM, it was adopted December 2021, effective this year in June. It sets new guidelines on what transportation facilities should look like. It includes new cross sections for ideal conditions. However, it provides guidance for designing streets in constrained conditions, and that's a critical point to make. The TCM includes all of the guidance that we used in the draft street network to develop the right-of-way requirements. So that planning level right-of-way diagnostic process was moved into the TCM.

[1:57:42 PM]

So based on this information, we're proposing updates to the street network street level cross section and required right-of-way to align with the associated TCM cross sections and standards. Next slide. The first thing to understand is that the TCM replaced the old terminology of functional classification, and streets are now organized by street level. Street levels are the same as functional classification, as shown in this chart. The highest degree of land access is a level one street, which is similar to a local street. And then as you move up the chart, the higher degree of mobility is achieved as you reach level five, which would be a freeway or highway. However, many factors play into defining a street level, including desired speeds, trip length, turn lanes, bicycle facilities, is and

[1:58:44 PM]

so going through an example of how we use the TCM to propose changes to the street network, this makes a look that was adopted as a street level two street. It had a future cross section of two travel lanes and a center turn lane and based on the draft, Austin street design guide, used to update the TCM, it required 96 feet of right-of-way to accommodate that future condition. The street network also included a right-of-way remarks column that indicated further study would be required for prioritizing design elements or right-of-way acquisition. Next slide. So based on the updated TCM, you can see that the proposed change would be to correct the street level from being a level two to a level three, because the cross section that replaced the one in the draft design guide is a two-lane divided roadway, a

[1:59:46 PM]

level three. And so the future cross section would go from two travel lanes with a center turn lane to two lanes with a divided median with turn base. Additionally, the required right-of-way for this configuration of street, it would be updated to 80 feet based on the TCM. Additionally, based on feedback that we have received from round one, we have updated the right-of-way remarks column to be specific to the particular street and what the proposed changes are, but often they will indicate that improvements would be made within the existing right-of-way unless there was a proposed future capital project, which would -- which would then need to further study the right-of-way in order to determine the appropriate amount of space needed. But most importantly the right-of-way remarks identified that the required right-of-way is for new development and

[2:00:46 PM]

commercial re-development and does not apply to single-family homes. Next slide. And so moving on from the updated TCM and how it relates to the 2014 bicycle plan. The bicycle plan is a long range plan to identify the recommended type and location of bicycle facilities. It maps short and long-term bicycle priorities. And it's used as an input for the street network to identify the cross-section in the TCM by the type of bicycle facility. So in round one, amendments were proposed to correct level one streets to be level two streets. To align with the recommended bicycle facility type in the bicycle plan. Next slide. So to go through an example of what was being proposed, this roadway was identified as a level one street in the adopted street network, but it indicated that the future bicycle facility

[2:01:47 PM]

should include a bicycle lane. Next slide. So the proposed change to align with the updated TCM would be to correct the street level to show that the a level two street, because a bike lane does not exist in our level one street cross-section but it does in our level two cross-section. Additionally the right-of-way requirements changed to reflect what was in the TCM to be used as a starting point in that right-of-way dedication process. Additionally, the right-of-way remarks were updated to make sure that it was clear that if -- within established neighborhoods that improvements would be done within the existing right-of-way. However, the purpose of the street network is for right-of-way dedication, so the required right-of-way indicates the ideal width in order for development to comply to our updated standards. Next slide. So based on the comments we

[2:02:48 PM]

received in round one, we've flagged this issue for further discussion as we have been doing. And a thing to point out as the changes from round one to round two is that we are maintaining what was adopted in 2019 in the established neighborhoods because single-family homes do not dedicate right-of-way and

we are not acquiring right-of-way from single-family homes. However, we have identified certain segments within the network that are potentially subject to new development and re-development, so those recommendations to change to level two have been preserved and carried forward. And that was communicated in a memo sent to mayor and council on February 25th. So, the other thing to note here is that we're able to hold off on making these amendments within the established neighborhoods, because there is no risk of losing out on

[2:03:50 PM]

right-of-way dedication because those properties aren't re-developing. So since the city is in the process of updating the bicycle plan through atx walk, bike, roll, we're able to have this conversation about the recommended bicycle facilities and the plan and then we'll reflect that decision back into the asmp after the bicycle plan is adopted in 2023. Next slide. So moving on to public transportation changes, the asmp street network was adopted based on the long-term vision plan. It accounted for additional right-of-way in order to preserve the ability to operate transit and dedicated pathways. So since 2019, developments that have occurred along these corridors have complied with that additional right-of-way compliant. Next slide. But in June 2020, the project connection plan was adopted and

[2:04:50 PM]

it replaced the long-term vision plan and with that there were alternative alignments and updates that were made to metro rapid routes as well as changes to high frequency local transit routes. So in this amendment process we're updating the transit priority network and the public transportation system map but we're also updating the street network to reflect the latest engineering plans, and their cross-sections and required right-of-way. Next slide. Similarly, the mobility bond corridors have completed engineering studies, which have updated cross-sections and right-of-way requirements which are also being reflected in the street network. Next slide. So some roadways have been identified to be removed from the plan for various reasons, some are unfeasible and some do not have community support or there's some other sort of special consideration. And in round one, we identified

[2:05:52 PM]

the extension to be removed, and connecting to montopolis, and then there's a couple of other originally identified, but after round one public comments we identified brush country road, Payne avenue and sun rich drive extensions to be removed from the plan as well. And we'll continue to take comments on the level of community support for those changes. Next slide. So since the street network is also an inventory of all streets in Austin, we are adding roadways to the street network that have been platted through the sub-division process. So they've been identified through the land development

process and so we're reflecting those changes in the street network. But we're also taking this opportunity to identify a few new roads and new alignments to be reposed in the street network. Next slide. So we had a public feedback map open in round one.

[2:06:53 PM]

It received 1,600 total map comments, but we also received feedback via email, more than 150 emails were received, providing similar comments. But the majority of the comments were in opposition to changing level one streets to level two. And primarily because concerns about expanding neighborhood streets, and there were also comments related to that about the type of bicycle facility that was appropriate for their neighborhood streets, whether it was a bike lane versus a neighborhood bikeway. There were also concerns expressed about projects that may increase vehicle travel and vehicle speeds. The full map comments and emails can be found in the round one public feedback report online. Next slide. So based on the comments we received in round one, we really wanted these presentations to speak towards interpreting those comments, interpreting these

[2:07:53 PM]

updates in response to the comments. Next slide. So the important things to point out is that the street network is a critical tool for the right-of-way planning. It describes the right-of-way or the space needed for travel lanes, parking, bicycle facilities, trees, sidewalk, and the criteria from various city documents. So recent updates to the TCM and engineering plans required a re-evaluation of the adopted street network. Next slide. However, it is important for the community to understand that while updates to the street network and TCM list an expanded right-of-way for many streets it does not mean that changes are imminent. Street network is a starting point for appropriate cross-sections and required right-of-way for future ideal conditions, however, only new development or intensive redevelopment triggers a dedication of right-of-way. So properties that are

[2:08:53 PM]

single-family homes will not experience this right-of-way change through the building permit process. Additionally for capital infrastructure projects, the street network is used as a reference as a project undergoes its own project development process and public engagement to identify the necessary amount of right-of-way needed for that project. Next slide. Next slide. So, we're now at the council mobility committee and we have been to utc, pac and planning commission, the bicycle advisory council meeting was canceled and informally combined with the pedestrian advisory council meeting and we'll be at the zoning and planning commission on the 29th to conclude our round of board and commission

meetings in March. And then we'll have a meeting at the comprehensive plan joint committee, which is required, for this process in April. And then planning commission will have their recommendation

[2:09:55 PM]

for council on may 10th, followed by a tentative date of may 19th for the city council public hearing, followed by council readings, likely in June. And, again, we're -- we're looking for comments to be received throughout March through our new public feedback forum that is now available online. Next slide. Okay, thank you very much. >> Ellis: Thank you for that presentation. It was really helpful to kind of see you explain how you have presented this to some of the other commissions that you have been working with, and that there is still opportunity for public input, because we want to make sure that people have a chance to understand what the intent of this -- this update is. It was just approved in 2019, and so knowing that we just kind of need to make sure that as the criteria manual had been approved, that we're making sure that our transportation planning objectives are all in line

[2:10:56 PM]

across all of our city plans and goals. And so I know that every couple years they just need to be updated enough to make sure they're all accurate and they're all reflecting the information that each other holds, so you don't end up with two documents that have conflicting information. So that's really helpful. I -- you mentioned the memo that spelled out the intent of, you know, dedication of right-of-way is not necessarily the city trying to encroach on private properties. I don't think that memo is in the back-up, is that something that could be added in? Because I know that has been out. I think that would be helpful. I have a couple other questions but I may open it up to other colleagues. I see councilmember harper-madison has her hand up and councilmember kitchen has her hand up. So let's go to councilmember harper-madison and I'll ask my questions at the end if they're not asked and answered by other folks. >> Harper-madison: Thank you, chair, I really appreciate it. As you all know that we're doing so much work, with us being sort

[2:11:57 PM]

of the ancillary resource and it's the community doing so much work, and patella is doing so much work on colony park. And my ears always perk up when I hear colony park and I see that some of the roadways identified to be removed from this asmp, it was because they have -- they were determined to be infeasible for whatever the reason. Or don't have community support, to your point, Cole, or there's specific considerations for why they're being removed. I'm very curious why the colony park one is -- is not going to be considered? >> Right. >> Harper-madison: Oh, why it's being removed or vacated or don't get the new realignments and I'd like to understand y'all's rationale with that one. >> Working

with our economic development department, they indicated that there's an updated land plan for the colony park master plan that removed one of the collectors that goes

[2:12:59 PM]

east/west. The colony at loop drive is still in the asmp, but it's another collector road that runs east/west north of that, which is being proposed to be replaced by other interior street network. >> Harper-madison: I want to make sure that we're talking about the same -- I'm not talking about colony loop, I'm talking about colony park drive, are we saying the same thing? >> Right, right. >> Harper-madison: Okay, thank you. >> Ellis: Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: I wanted to follow-up for that, and thank you for asking that, councilmember harper-madison. You obviously know the area and may be understanding the answer, but, I'm sorry, I didn't quite get that. Does that mean that road is -- is not going to be built? It's no longer a road that's in the plans? Is that -- >> So it depends. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Working with our partner

[2:14:01 PM]

department, they identified that there was an update to the land plan proposed. And it still has to go through the process for approval. >> Kitchen: Um-hmm. >> But, I guess concurrently we had identified that roadway as having the intent of being removed and replaced by different network within the development itself. >> Kitchen: So, is that going to line up in terms of timing? In other words, that has to be approved still, right? Those changes. >> Right. >> Kitchen: To the -- is there the possibility that we will have voted on the asmp and not yet reviewed the colony park changes? >> Right. >> Kitchen: I guess that we could come back -- so why would you not want to leave it until it was clear that it was coming out? >> We could do that. There is nothing really at risk here because of being in control of who the developer is. >> Kitchen: Um-hmm.

[2:15:01 PM]

>> It's not subject. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> It's not subject to random development. >> Kitchen: Okay, well - I'll leave that to councilmember harper-madison. I just -- not being as familiar with the area, that would be my first question about -- thinking in terms of not changing it until it was clear that it was going to be changed. And the other question that I have -- I want to understand the -- is there any impact or are there changes in the asmp revisions related to sub-standard roads? >> So we have tried to make an effort to identify additional sub-standard roads so that they are basically on a list or inventory of roadways that we did not previously identify for improvements. >> Kitchen: Um-hmm. >> So that is something that's kind of growing over time as more are identified.

[2:16:02 PM]

>> Kitchen: Okay. And so does that mean that -- that they are -- they will now be identified in this revised asmp? >> Right. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> So additional sub-standard streets will be included -- >> Kitchen: Okay. >> In the asmp. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> An additional step that we'll need to figure out is whether or not we need to modify the street impact program to be able to include them towards the eligible street impact fee. >> Kitchen: Yes, and, thank you, you anticipated my question, because we've kind of talked about this, but my understanding is that for this -- for the street impact fees to be available to a particular road, that road has to be in the asmp? I mean, that's probably oversimplifying it, but it has to be indicated as -- as a project on that particular road has to be indicated in the asmp in order for street impact fees to be used for that. Am I saying it right?

[2:17:03 PM]

>> Step one would be to be in the asmp, but it needs to be in the road impact for the fee. >> Kitchen: All right, I'll follow-up with you after that. I think that it's -- at least -- I want to understand that, because I think as we get the street impact fee online, if that starts becoming more and more available to us in the future, we're going to want to make sure that we have taken all of those steps, particularly for me. The sub-standard roads are particularly important because what we're seeing is additional development along those roads and district five case for some affordable housing, and that's really important, but we need to be able to identify funding to actually to do sidewalks and bike lanes and other kinds of improvements that make those -- those kind of roads really doable to build along. So I'll follow-up with you on that.

[2:18:03 PM]

I want to make sure that -- that particular areas that are growing don't fall through the cracks in terms of us finding out later that they're not eligible for street impact fees. So, thank you. >> Ellis: I appreciate that question, because it was on my list and now I don't have to ask it. I see that councilmember harper-madison has her hand up again. >> Harper-madison: And councilmember kitchen did me a solid and expanded on my line of questioning here, in which case, Cole, when you responded you said that there were some changes to the master plan, and who the developer is. So my intention after I ask my question and you answer it, I think that you sort of -- you answered a portion of my question, but the secondary part of my question I intended to just follow back up, but I just want to make sure that we highlight for this body and for my colleagues, there's a very clearly defined -- very large gap in the colony park master plan project. In which case, you know, at some



[2:19:06 PM]

point, you know, they have been working with the colony park folks for at this point years. So if we don't make up that gap and I think, you know, I think that acm Gonzales can answer most accurately, but I think that we're still at a \$65 million gap. So we see changes have been made and future considerations, and to councilmember kitchen's point about street impact -- I'm very concerned about what the implications are for us having this very large gap, for this very important community development. And I don't know that was a question as much as I'm laying out what my concerns are and if there is anybody in the room that could speak to it at all. >> I think that it's a good discussion to with atd and economic development. >> Harper-madison: I think that

[2:20:07 PM]

the additional question that I would have there would be -- because I'm trying to figure out the rationale, and I often think -- like, one of the things that we do as a body, we will defer to the equity office. We run everything through the equity office, everything through the equity tool. But, for example, a thing like land use, for example, the equity office doesn't have a land-use professional. Things like mobility, and the equity office doesn't have somebody whose background is explicitly mobility. And so I just wonder as we are taking into consideration, like, recalibration of sorts and working things through the economic development department, I want to make certain that the level of expertise that our transportation department brings is also going to be a part of that office. And it's not even necessarily because I feel that there's any sort of shortage in competence, I just want to make sure that we're setting people up for success. >> Yes, councilmember. This is Robert, with Austin

[2:21:08 PM]

transportation department. We have been partnering on colony park program since its inception, I would argue. The challenge is identifying funds to do the transportation side. Much of the gap is not the transportation, although the transportation construction is a major portion of that gap. It was not included in the last bond program where the funding was very heavily directed. And so we really have to identify some new funding sources. I'm not sure that the street impact fee in that part of the district will generate the level of funds needed to meet those needs, and so we're working on a financing plan. But maybe that is a follow-up discussion and I'd be happy to have that with you. >> Harper-madison: That sounds like a very significant follow-up discussion and I really look forward to. >> You bet, you bet. >> Ellis: Councilmember tovo.

[2:22:10 PM]

>> Tovo: Thanks very much, and thanks for opening it up to other councilmembers who don't serve on the committee. I have a couple of quick questions. One is whether -- I know in the presentation that it was -- you addressed one of the questions that continues to come from the community which is how it impacts single-family tracks. Would sub-dividing a single-family lot into two single-family lots potentially trigger the right-of-way changes as new development? Or are those really just on a larger scale? >> So a sub-division will trigger a right-of-way dedication requirement, however, it's subject to the development review process, which would evaluate that dedication based on whether it was roughly proportionate to the development's impact to the system. So, taking a single lot and sub-dividing it into two and building one additional unit will result in not developing a

[2:23:12 PM]

significant enough impact to allow for that right-of-way to be dedicated. So it will result in the process being triggered, however, the result being that no right-of-way would be dedicated. >> Tovo: I see. Kind of. Okay, yeah, I think that is causing some -- some level of confusion. Can you help me understand -- you know, I'm getting a lot of really specific questions about particular streets, like, why is a one block street this width instead of that width. Is there any way that you can provide kind of a question-and-answer portal where those questions have an opportunity to be answered publicly, so they can be answered kind of once and others can see them? >> Right. So that's a great suggestion. We have done our best at replying to every email that comes into our inbox, but to have the benefit of sharing those responses would be a great

[2:24:14 PM]

idea. >> Tovo: Yeah, thank you, and I want to echo what you just said. I have also heard that from constituents and I have seen on various, you know, various emails that I have been copied on your responses. So I know that you and other staff are doing a great job of trying to get back and respond to those questions. And I think that sharing that information in one public -- in one public place would really be helpful. Um, let's see -- we may have some other questions, chair, I mean, I have a whole slew of questions that have been submitted that I'm trying to choose among, so if you have someone else who is waiting and could come back to me, that would be great. >> Ellis: I do see mayor pro tem alter has her hand up. >> Alter: Good afternoon, thank you. I wanted to ask about the new collaboration policy 8, supporting the larger city efforts for disaster preparedness and emergency response. In the past, I recall that there was another level below the

[2:25:15 PM]

policy where you detailed strategies. Does that happen for these collaboration policies? Or is that simply what is in the blurb that is under the named statement of the policy? >> Right. So what we have an opportunity to do is to add action items to the asmp as well that can speak towards -- directly towards policies. So, I know that a lot of effort is already in place for emergency preparedness and post-event evaluation, but it certainly is something that can be spelled out as an action item to continue to strengthen that effort. >> Alter: Thank you. I'd appreciate if you could work with my office to work also with the wildfire division. They were not aware of these changes, and that's an area that they're kind of looking closely with in terms of our evacuation

[2:26:15 PM]

plans and it's really clear that we atd, and we need folks who are able to help on that transportation network resilience kind of efforts here related to that preparedness. So if we can facilitate some of those conversations and with the goal of trying to develop some of those action items before adoption, I would appreciate that. >> Ellis: I see that councilmember tovo had her hand up. >> Alter: Did I get a yes on that. >> A head nod, yes. >> Alter: I can't see a head nod through the screen. Thank you. >> Ellis: It's the benefit of doing things hybrid. We saw it. Go ahead, councilmember tovo. >> And a smile. >> Tovo: Thank you, chair. So one person who wrote commented on the fact that the

[2:27:15 PM]

public feature -- the public feedback portal has changed a bit, and now the public file -- the public response to comments on broad policy questions, rather than the maps specifically. Could you talk a little bit about that change and what your thinking was behind it? >> Right. So in round one we had two forms. We had a separate policy survey and then we had a public feedback map. In round one, we did receive a lot of comments of concerns about the accessibility of the public feedback map and from people, particularly that did not have access to computers or from the elderly. So in the second round, we tried to provide a more kind of universally user-friendly platform to do both the policy survey and collect feedback on

[2:28:16 PM]

the proposed map amendments. So it is now a public feedback form that has the first half being about the policies as well as getting feedback on the various other changes to the policy document. And then the second half of the form is a -- an opportunity to provide comments about a street or a set of streets within a neighborhood, and then it allows the -- the participant to identify in the map where that comment applies, if it does have a spatial relationship. And then the end of our feedback form includes optional demographic questions, because we are trying to track who -- who we're able to engage with,

and so that we can change -- change our approach if necessary. And then the last thing that we added to our feedback form was

[2:29:17 PM]

actually a question letting people -- giving people a chance to let us know how we're doing, because we did change the platform in response to the questions that we received. >> Tovo: Thank you, that is very helpful. And then my last question for the moment is an apology if you covered this in your presentation and I just missed it -- does the new map add streets to the new transit priority network, and if so, where would someone find that list? >> Right. So there were changes between round one and round two to clean up some of the transit priority network based on coordination with capital metro's short-range planning staff. So within the second map that's within our story map presentation for public transportation changes, there is a layer that can be turned on and off to show which roadways are being added and which ones are being removed. And there are changes, both being added and being removed.

[2:30:19 PM]

>> Tovo: Great, thank you very much. >> Ellis: I appreciate those questions. Some of the ones that I have have already been answered. So I have a couple more. I guess one is more of a statement. As councilmember tovo had asked about, you know, a q&a portal of some sort, I know that you have a good faq page, and I one fer that is sufficient or if it needs to be a separate portal. Do you have any thoughts on that, trying to keep it concise and readable and also answer all of the questions. >> We would be introducing another -- another platform for people to have to go to, so we're trying to keep it all in one place but the faq could certainly grow over time, especially as new question comes up that we didn't anticipate and include in the first round. So, I'm open to suggestions. >> Ellis: Okay, I could see either of those options working, depending on which one works easiest technology-weez, but I

[2:31:20 PM]

see the benefit, once people are asking questions and you answer them, I see that they're being answered but I know that you're having to answer them multiple times in a row. And I know that the city has a number of landing pages that can capture all of the questions and sometimes the page grows but it kind of flexes into topics with links and, you know, just other -- other ways to kind of make sure that all of the information is there and it is together and there's one landing place for all of that. So I think that could be an option that works. I have another one about the mode shift goal. I know in 2019, it was a 74% drive-alone vehicle number. How are we monitoring that moving forward? And I realize the past two years have had drastically different single driver car trips, but how do we foresee over the next --

until 2039, trying to -- trying to assess that number? >> Thank you, madam chair, for asking that question. It's been one of our dilemmas is

[2:32:21 PM]

on how to measure it easily. We have work surveys that this region has been paying for on a daily basis, but we have also been looking for maybe a non-survey way to try to figure that out. So I found an interesting piece of data, even just today, that uses perhaps the information that comes from smart cars as well as cellphones and various things, collects data anonymously and combines that with economic expenditure data, retail sales data, to help us to get a better picture. And what that data showed me is that we're actually improving, but one of the areas where we have been scratching our heads trying to figure out is how do you count the number of people that are tele-working. You know, traditionally we thought of that as the trip not made, when reality, it's the trip made via the computer system. So we need to take that into account. Because I think that is what we have learned over the pandemic, that's where many people are going is to tele-working, and

[2:33:21 PM]

not everyone can tele-work, I understand that, but we need to measure that as an equivalent mode to transit or automobile. So right now we have sort of lumpy data, as I said, annual data that comes in that survey and I'm not sure that it's as reflective as what we'd like to see. So we are continuing to explore better data sources to measure that in almost real-time. >> Ellis: That's really helpful to know and I know that the conversation around tele-working is constantly evolving, even today. You know, two years ago we thought that one day things will go back to normal and we know now that is not happening, that many people have adapted their strategies for mobility and how they're running errands and when they're running errands and I hope that we and other big employers in the city of Austin and as the city of Austin can be very mindful of our impact on that as well, and trying to make sure that we are practicing what we preach and showing people, you know, how -- how things can be done. So I know that we're all looking

[2:34:22 PM]

forward to those conversations moving forward. >> Yes, ma'am. >> Ellis: I also appreciate the slide included about spaces for people, streets for people. I know that there's a number of conversations, one that we're going to have later today about the usefulness of healthy streets and expanding into the living streets program which is our next presentation and then the shop the block program that councilmember pool sponsored and I was proud to co-sponsor with her, but those are all creative ways to use the public space in a way that is healthy for people and helpful for small businesses moving

forward. I think that is the end of my list of questions for today. I would want to know next up, because I know that your slide said -- was it the bicycle advisory council ended up not posting that meeting because they met with the pedestrian advisory council? So that looks like March 29th that zoning and platting is the next public opportunity for people to see what their discussions look like.

[2:35:22 PM]

So where should people ask questions in the meantime? And will they be taking public speakers or public input at that meeting? >> Right. So people can continue to send us emails at [asmp@austintexas.gov](mailto:asmp@austintexas.gov), that's the direct email address to the planning team. And in addition to zoning and platting, we'll have the comp plan joint committee on April 14th, that's being tentatively scheduled, which is open for public comment. And then the planning commission's recommendation on May 10th is really the next opportunity after that. >> Ellis: Okay, thank you very much. If there are no other hands up, I think that wraps up today's questions, but thank you so much for this presentation and we appreciate the speakers coming and sharing their thoughts with us as this process continues. Thank you.

[2:36:25 PM]

The next item item is previously stated is an update on the implementation of the living streets initiative, play streets, resident-led healthy streets, and improved block parties. >> Good afternoon, councilmembers, I am Jim Dale, the assistant director for the transportation department. And I'm going to be talking about living streets today, a resolution that was passed last year. We're going to provide an update on where we're at, and then also some staff recommendations. Next slide, please. All right, you can see an outline there of what we'll go through today. One of the things that is happening across the globe is this community conversations are occurring about how do we use public space to the benefit of all of the people. And that's especially true for the people who live next to these public spaces being streets, what can we do there for them, and not only for the folks who just drive through the street. Next slide, please.

[2:37:28 PM]

I wanted to use this slide and we didn't realize who we had captured here at the time, but I wanted to use this slide to stress that in -- as you see as we go through the presentation that there's a big -- we stress safety. And that influenced a lot of our recommendations and a lot of our thinking at the same time we're trying to balance that with the ease of applying for living street and activating that space for community to occur. And so as you see as we go through the presentation there's going to be this tug between safety and the ease of implementing this program. Next slide, please. Just a quick summary of what is in the resolution and the neighborhood block priority program, it's an existing program. There

were recommendations to improve that program. Play streets program, there it's going to be a new program, and we're supportive of that. And also a healthy streets program. We do, as y'all are well aware,

[2:38:30 PM]

is that there was -- during the pandemic council passed a resolution for staff-led healthy street program. And what that means is for staff to identify the locations to implement a healthy street and we went forward and did that, and there's two remaining healthy street implementations today. But, what this resolution asked for is a resident-led one. And what we take that is to mean is an application base, where residents in any part of the city could come and apply for a living street, whether a neighborhood block party or a play street or a healthy street. One of the fourth categories that was asked in the request in the resolution was develop this public-facing web page. And we have developed -- we have a draft in place, and it's under review right now, and we'll be releasing that shortly, but we look at this web page as the city of Portland does a nice job for Portland in the street where is they bring together all of the different programs that citizens can request to activate their particular street location.

[2:39:31 PM]

In just in a summary comment, there were 25 requests in this resolution and we're supportive of all of those. But you will see that there's varying degrees of support for all of them as we go forward. Next slide, please. Just to provide some context about the differences between the streets. We have the neighborhood block party, play streets and resident-led healthy streets is what we're talking about here. And we wanted to go through on what those differences are -- frequency -- you can see going across our neighborhood block parties are basically a one-time event and play streets are more of a recurring event, recurring meaning several times a week, whoever the applicant may come out there and close the street to set up the street. And the resident-led street, that is similar to the implementations today that are 24/7. I wanted to be very clear on what's an existing program and what's not. Neighborhood block parties, again, existing program, and

[2:40:32 PM]

play streets and resident-led healthy streets is not an existing program, one that we are in support of developing. There is funding for the neighborhood block parties but not for the other two at this time. We are looking into ways to fund those. Permit application -- for neighborhood block parties -- and that's going to be likely -- tempted to put a check there but there's also a public engagement process that we're going to go through and we didn't want to get too far ahead of that but we see it likely being a permit application. And we'll require approvals and notifications and engineering and design. When

we are putting people in the street, again, we've got to be very safe about how we do that. And we believe that we can make the streets safe for certain activities in the roadway. But there is an engineering component that will go into that. We have some standard templates for the neighborhood block parties and expect that for play streets, but we see the resident-led healthy streets and that's probably going to be more of a custom -- maybe a semi-custom design is likely where we have some engineering

[2:41:32 PM]

design based on the specific location, but also pulling as much as we can from templates to keep it pretty straightforward. And semi-permanent devices, we don't have those in the neighborhood block party right now. Unlikely in play streets, with the nature of it being recurring and closing it down and opening it back up. But it will be likely in the resident-led healthy streets. And resident monitor, what that means is someone there to keep an eye on the traffic control. And we do have that as part of the neighborhood block parties and we'll talk about that more in a couple of slides. Especially with kids being in the street and playing that we're going to need some type of monitor to keep an eye on the traffic control devices and the kids that would be out there. We see it as unlikely, again, similar to the program today where these are going to be more of a semi-permanent installation for healthy streets and not a need for a monitor. Next slide, please. Next slide, please. So here we're talking about the neighborhood block party program. Just wanted to give a quick

[2:42:33 PM]

recap of what that program is. And some of the criteria. In terms of eligibility, it is a one block with residential single-family dwellings or duplexes on it. No bus routes. It avoids intersections, just because it makes it harder for the citizens to set up traffic control to close an intersection. It does not affect the traffic signals for the same reason. When you are at a traffic signal there's higher volumes and higher speeds more likely and more complicated in how we control traffic. In terms of the program, it is application process. We do require today notification of 100% of the residents, and that notification is verified through signatures. Also in terms of approval, we require 80% of signatures from the residents. And then a permit fee is relatively low at \$50 permit fee, and we'll talk some more about the permit fees here in a little bit. We're looking to see what we can do to lower -- if we can lower

[2:43:33 PM]

that further. And we have also initiated a barricade loaner program so that the residents do not need to go out and rent devices, which can be upwards of over \$400 to rent a typical set-up. We can buy them for less than that and then loan those out, which we are doing today. To the right underneath the



picture, just to give some history of the number of parties -- we started -- the program started back in 2014 through council resolution. Not -- not much traction in those first years, and in 2018, one of the things -- a couple of things that we changed about the program was having -- before the program used to be part of the special events website. Well, we pulled it out and made it its own dedicated web page. That received some more visibility. And the other thing that we did is that we established the barricade loaner program. With that we saw the bump up in

[2:44:33 PM]

parties in 2015 -- I'm sorry, in 2019 -- and then everyone is well aware of the pandemic came in and we put the program on hold for a while until aph gave us the green light to start it back up. And then we also had some criteria in terms of health and safety for those parties. All right, next slide, please. All right, now we're getting into some of the resolution requests. We have numbered them there on the left, and those numbers correspond to a memo that is part of back-up material for this item. That provides a lot more detail than what I'm going to provide here today. So for the -- one of the requests was in terms of the approval percentage. We were receiving the requests basically, you know, the approval percentage of 80% is relatively high. And one of the challenges that we were hearing is that residents are having a hard time finding their neighbors at home to get their signatures is one of those challenges.

[2:45:34 PM]

And we also looked at other cities to see what their approval percentages were and we looked at 26 cities and there's about 60% of them that had an approval requirement of 75% or greater. We are going below that here. We want to see if that opens it up some more and we get some more applications that come in. But it's also one of those things that we can easily change at the administrative level if we start to see some issues in the types of complaints we get and the frequency of complaints and so forth. So in terms of the approval for that 1.1, we are -- our recommendation is to go 60%. And for parties -- we do not have a time limit on parties. It has to occur within the day. There is a noise ordinance that is in effect that the residents need to follow and that's usually 10:30 P.M. Until -- it's either 6:00 or 7:00 A.M. In the morning.

[2:46:34 PM]

So after that there could be some complaints but we have a way to resolve that. And so 60% is our recommendation there. And going further down here in terms of notification, we require 100% of the people along the block to sign off, provide their signatures, that they've been notified. We're also going to reduce that and keep it consistent at the 60%, and for that remaining 4%, we're going to require door

hangers and fliers to be provided to those other residences. And we'll create some templates on our website so that the residents can download those and know what is the best information to put in there to notify their neighbors. We also heard that it is -- in terms of 1.4, the map tool, very difficult to select locations in the portal that we have set up for the application process. We do provide email support today, but we do see that need for improving that map tool to make it easier and that should not be a barrier to someone

[2:47:36 PM]

completing an application and being able to participate in the program. So we're going to increase the access to support, we'll make some web page changes and include our phone number there, and we have also received some feedback about maybe in the -- in the platform that we use for the applications to have some hover keys so that folks get stuck they can call 311 and get support or call us directly. 1.5, to provide alternative application process for anyone that is unable to submit one. That is already covered through submitting through 311. We'll take the applications through 311. And 311 can also transfer to atd if it's during our work hours. Then 1.6, provide application in other languages, like Spanish is listed here. We already addressed this in some ways but we do have our applications only in English right now, and the PDF version of our application is only in English. We will translate that to

[2:48:37 PM]

Spanish and other common languages. And we have already started that process. Continuing to minimize the permit fees, again, we're at \$50. We'll explore that during our current budget process, we're reviewing fees now. I am trying to remember what we saw across this -- about half of the -- there's 26 peer cities that we looked at, and about half of them had a fee. The other half did not. And that fee ranged between \$20 and \$270. Again, we'll review this fee to see if there's a possibility to reduce it. Not -- no promises there on that, but we will take a look to see how we can not let the \$50 be a barrier. Next slide, please. Okay, with travel links with emergency vehicles and this is about maneuverability. If there's a fire that occurs or

[2:49:40 PM]

even a health need that we need to send in ems, we want to have room to be able to get those vehicle there is and to serve that need for the community. We currently require -- we worked with Austin fire department on this. Current program requirement is 25 feet, but, again, throughout all of these we're moving towards the -- towards the request for the theme of the request in the resolution. We're still going to require 25 feet if there is on-street parking, meaning that vehicles actually park. Just because you can park along the street is not the factor, but actually having cars parked there. If during -- so, if

there is on-street parking during the event, we're going to require 25 feet. Buildings greater than three stories, again, for the outriggers for the fire trucks to be able to set up and to reach those taller buildings, needing 25 feet maneuvering area. And church, school, commercial area, brings along some other

[2:50:41 PM]

challenges with those developments and being able to maneuver around them. And then if there's -- if at the end of the block, say, it's a cul-de-sac or there's no connectivity to another part of the street network, where it makes it easy to turn through, we're still going to require the 25 feet. But other than that, say that there is a parking on the street, the applicant has the parking removed and we can shrink that down to a minimum of 15 feet and then they can put more devices or things for the neighborhood block party in the right-of-way that can still be easily be removed. On to on-street parking, I think that I have covered that already. In terms of monitors, I mentioned this briefly earlier. We do require monitors at the barricades. And what that does, is it does prevent that monitor from really participating in the event itself. So we see that as, all right,

[2:51:41 PM]

there's more community that could be had, but at the same time, here's that safety part that comes into play. We want to make sure that people who come into the block party that have to access the residence, and then they get moved and they get put back in the right place. But where we are flexible in terms of the monitors are still going to be required, but they need to be in view -- they need to have their eyes on those barricades and they're still going to need to wear the vest. The last one here on this slide to continue to provide barricades. We definitely -- we have received some really positive feedback about the barricade loaner program and we're going to continue to do that, and we're going to expand that too and there will be another slide later to talk about that. Next slide, please. All right, so there was -- these first three requests are about allowing other land uses to be along those streets where we

[2:52:41 PM]

have those neighborhood block parties. Currently they are not permitted and we only allow the single had of family and duplexes. In terms of schools and places of worship, we are allowing those. And this will require a city code change. But we will require that they do approve -- they are part of the approval process. They have to approve the neighborhood block party as well. It needs to be outside those facility hours. One of our big concerns with we're having activities in the street is being able to estimate the number of people that are going to be there and then the interaction with traffic. And as those two things go up, the more concerns we have, so when we get into places that have schools, places of

worship, there's going to be times when those areas start to peak in terms of the traffic and other pedestrian activities. Now, if those schools or places of worship do decide to participate in the neighborhood block party, that's more likely going to push it to a tier two permit which is a special event

[2:53:42 PM]

permit, which has more extensive review by other departments because we have more people in that area, more things that we need to take a look at. But we are supportive of schools and places of worship and adjusting city code to be able to include those in the neighborhood block program. And that's the same with multi-family residential units. About 85% of the cities that we did take a look at, they do allow multi-family units to participate in a neighborhood block party program. So we're definitely supportive of that and we see some opportunities there. Again, for some community. But we do need to develop some criteria. We just don't want it to be more case-by-case, but if we're going to strive to have this criteria based on the size and location, there's definitely certain -- if we start to get to a hundred unit multi-family unit, and there may be some concerns with, all right, how much traffic -- or how many people are going to be gathering in that area, and

[2:54:42 PM]

is it -- and how do we manage that. But we will include multi-family residential buildings in the new program and updating the city code to reflect that. Same thing for mixed use and commercial properties. I wanted -- so stressing this a little bit different than the previous two, because we think that there's going to be very rare instances that commercial properties or mixed user going to be able to participate, because of the potential to generate a much larger crowd size. And so the way that we -- the way that I have said it here is to preclude it unless approved by the director. So again, like we talked about the one above it with multifamily, we'll have to develop criteria to see what that is so we can easily make a determination about this particular street that has -- maybe it's a small commercial development that we can include that. Again, our concerns are safety concerns and unpredictable attendee size, and vehicle

[2:55:44 PM]

access, it can generate a lot of traffic and we need to develop that criteria but we are supportive and we will include that in there with the update to the city code. And having additional sites for pick-up and we have 1501 Toomey road south of Lamar, and we'll work with other departments to expand our pick-up sites to see where we can spread these throughout the community. So having access and picking up those devices is not a barrier to the program. So we're really focused on reducing those barriers. In terms of public input, we have some more work to do, and we've done -- well, some work in terms of

talking about our peer cities. And also we'll have more data here in a little bit on a survey that we have done of past applicants. We have completed that for the past applicants and peer cities and we still have to meet with the community-based organizations and also the boards and commissions and this is one of our stop along that way. Next slide, please.

[2:56:48 PM]

All right, this is some of that public input that we have received so far in terms of the survey. We surveyed -- we sent out surveys to 63 of the past applicants. We've had in 31 -- 31 neighborhood block parties, and of those remaining -- so we made sure to include folks who did not complete the application and also applicants who were denied, because we wanted to get their input, especially about those who did not complete the application so see, okay, what were some of the barriers to that. What we heard from that -- we only got 20% response rate, but what we heard from that survey is a barricade loan program is a success. Cumbersome application process. And included the survey feedback that is already included in our recommendations in terms of one of the comments, reducing the approval percentage, expanding the barricade lending program. We also surveyed the other cities and I have talked about

[2:57:48 PM]

that some already and what we have found, some of the similarities with other cities our size, I mean, the block parties only on residential streets and standardized barricades, emergency lane requirements. Some of the differences was about the barricade monitor. I think that only about a third of the cities had barricade monitor, and it's something that we strongly believe in, again, to address safety issues. And then also about 80% of the programs included the multi-family, so definitely as I talk before, going through that. And still to do is to seek some additional input. And we're working on that and that's evolving at this time. And it may be on just what you see here on the slide. Next slide, please. Play streets program. >> Ellis: If I may interrupt quickly and I know that we're getting close to 3:00, can the committee members stick around a little bit longer so we can finish this and director turn bull had a couple of updates.

[2:58:50 PM]

>> Kitchen: I have a stop -- >> Ellis: Okay, let's keep going. >> I'll try to maybe move a little bit faster for it -- >> Ellis: It's good information. I know that we have a lot of items on our agenda. >> Well, there's a lot of meat to this one for sure. And we'll be glad to answer questions afterwards, but even through email and other ways as needed. >> Ellis: Perfect, thank you. >> All right, where we are today -- the program doesn't exist but we're supportive and we want to establish that program. Next slide, please. So this was in the resolution, 5.1, to establish a play street to be recurring, complete street closure that

may occur for several hours multiple times per week. Some of the considerations when we're work other developing this program is a big one there with that complete street closure -- that really limits the number of streets that may be able to participate. Because we still have to maintain access to those properties within that block for

[2:59:50 PM]

people to get to and from their homes and especially as we expand to these other uses to make sure that we provide access to them as well. One of our resourcing challenges besides staff and some materials here is also the coordination. We have over 4,000 active permits in the city at any one time in terms of work in the right-of-way and that changes daily. But that's the volume that we see on an average day. And so if there is a play street and now Google fiber has to come in here and install fiber or Texas gas has to do some work or we have to resurface the street, we have some solutions for this, but that coordination does need to occur. Next slide, please. All right, healthy streets program. I made that distinction earlier about the difference between the staff-led program, the staff deciding where the healthy streets go, but as part of that we always work with the community that -- where we installed that -- those healthy streets during the pandemic.

[3:00:52 PM]

But we're also now looking at exploring and we're supportive of that to a resident-led program where we can get applications from the residents. Next slide, please. All right, and covered some of this here. We have a couple of streets that we do not have any timeline in terms of removing them that are left from the pandemic that are healthy streets that is Bolden avenue and south 3rd and avenue G. We do rent the barricades for those locations and that's the process that we went to put this out there quickly previously. And the barricade plans usually engineer plan is required. We inspect these streets once a week, because the barricades do get moved and we do need to move them back. We will, as part of our design, we will consider things that are not as easy to move so that the inspection and the maintenance cost goes down. But things that are also maybe more appealing to the neighborhood than a barricade as well.

[3:01:52 PM]

Considerations -- went over many of those. And maintaining access is always a challenging one and we have talked about maintenance. Next slide, please. All right, now this slide is about the play streets and these are the resolution items that included the healthy streets. And the approval percentage was supportive, 60%. And we do see it being more of a permit, especially for play streets and the healthy streets may be more of a permanent installation. And being valid for six months. The permit is fine, it's

already covered by city code. Establish 60% resident approval for removal. This was a good one, we're supportive of that too and also consider renewals and modifications. And this 5.6 is really about making it easier and reducing the barriers to participate in the programs. Many of the things that we talked about with the neighborhood block program are applicable here. We still need to seek input from the community.

[3:02:52 PM]

Adopt all feasible options to reduce the costs of the barricades, and we're definitely supportive of that and we talked about that. Create a web page, yes. And it's in draft right now and we should have that out here in the not too distant future. Next slide, please. All right, so this is the slide that's been on my mind since I started this presentation. And I feel like I may disappoint you here in terms of the schedule. But I want to provide some context to that. We know that there is a strong desire in the community for this program. We hear that. We are supportive of it. And we are moving forward to -- to launch this program. But there's a number of steps that we need to do to get there and that's going to take some time. This is a preliminary schedule, and I would say that this schedule will change. As of right now our challenge is how do we resource this program. Resource it from the standpoint of how do we develop the program, and then also how do we

[3:03:53 PM]

run the program. What staffing and other resources are needed for that. That's what we're working through that the time. Now, the -- why is that a challenge? Part of it, and this is -- this is just our resources are stretched thin. You look at "Project connect," and it's a generational project and it requires generational effort to do the reviews and make sure that program goes well. And the time dedicated to that, and I-35, and vision zero initiatives, and maintaining what we build too. We are getting more assets out there and we have to maintain those and the quality that they provide the outcomes that we want. And also we have over a billion dollars in mobility bonds. I know that Mike Turnbull is going to talk about that, hopefully today. So those are just a number of things. But no means is that -- we're so excited to be able to work on these things and in terms of any

[3:04:54 PM]

city across the world, if you are in transportation, you want to be in the city of Austin to get to work on all of these different projects. It's very exciting for us and we're very honored to get to serve our community. So with laying all of that out, here's what I can promise. And I feel comfortable stating here is that within the next six months, we will publish the living streets web page. We will figure out how to resource the program, and we will go fast. We have already been talking about this for a while and just

figuring out ways how we can go faster and launch the program. Develop a high-level schedule and publish that to the web page. And update the neighborhood block party program, both the process, web page, and also bring into council here in the next six months the city code changes. And then explore funding for fy 2023 and we're right now in the budgeting process and so looking at staff as well as when we get stretched on time we also

[3:05:55 PM]

start to look for consultant support for that. And bringing in not only their time, but their expertise to us from programs they've worked on around the country. And, so I wanted to -- next slide, please. And so, thank you, and a lot of information there and I'd be glad to answer any questions. >> Ellis: There was, there was a lot of good information there and I appreciate you and your team sat down with us a couple of times to really go through this, prior to this presentation, and to understand what the expectations were and just all of the details of how to make sure that this program is built right and built so that it doesn't need a lot of adjustments moving forward. But we know that there needs to be an assessment of the resources needs and which just part of the programming already work and which parts of the programming are new. But I appreciate that y'all are being flexible with us and really trying to work with us on how to make some of the things that we don't know how to build yet into something that will

[3:06:55 PM]

work well with the community because there's a lot of excitement about this. >> Yes, there is. >> Ellis: People want their play streets yesterday. >> I was going to put that on there too. But I left that point off. >> Ellis: I know, I know. And so we'll keep getting updated and moving through this because there's a lot of community excitement around this, and we want to move as quickly as possible and I appreciate you spelling out where we are and where we need to be. Any questions? Quick questions? >> Kitchen: Two seconds. Just a big thank you. This is a very exciting program and I think that -- we appreciate the work that everybody has done on it. >> Ellis: I know, you have that healthy street that is there and I saw it the other day and people are very excited about it. And I do just have to say, though we rolled out healthy streets in may 2020, that the transportation department was already looking at how to help with the pinch points along the longhorn dam and along Riverside adjacent to auditorium shores. So I know that was something

[3:07:55 PM]

that your department was already clued in on before the council took that step of really creating a program. And now we're taking it one step further and into letting more residents to advocate for their neighborhood to have a healthy street. And so we're very excited about the next steps in this program.



>> Definitely a team effort. And I'm just the one speaking here about it and there's a lot of folks doing a lot of work behind the scenes. >> Ellis: I know, I know, and we appreciate all of the work going into it. I think wraps up our question. Director Turnbull, I'm sorry, we're giving you just a couple of minutes but there's information coming to the full dais soon, so we didn't want to postpone your item. >> Yeah, thank you, Mike Turnbull with the program office. I'm not even sure that it's worth to pull up the presentation. I know that you have the full presentation in your back-up, what I would like to do is to give you key takeaways from the presentation and then some key updates. Primary things to know is that we're making good process on the corridor construction program. We have over 20 critical safety

[3:08:57 PM]

mobility improvements that we have already completed as part of this program. We will also be moving several of our larger design bid build projects into bid and construction this year. We are anticipating between our idq work and signals, bike and ped projects and other projects about \$150 million of work, and construction this year. That brings us to about half of our program in bid and construction by the end of calendar year 2022. And we're on schedule to have all of our projects either completed or under construction by 2024, which was the eight-year goal that council gave us in the contract of voters. So we're very proud. A lot of work has been going into that and we have a lot of people to recognize and thank and I won't do that now. But it's been a village to get this done. And I really appreciate all of the partnerships and all of the work to get to this point. On your April 7th council agenda you will have two of our design, bid build projects and coming before you and as well as a contract for some of the idq work on signals and bike and ped

[3:09:58 PM]

improvements as well. And also I will be setting up time individually with your offices to give you a more in-depth update, particularly within your district, of what projects we're going to be doing and giving you those updates and allowing you to ask any questions that you may have about those. With that, chair, any questions that you may have. >> Ellis: That's great, thank you. Council member kitchen. >> Kitchen: I just want to get on your list again. Thank you for coming by. I've got -- I want to understand what is happening with Lamar in particular. >> Absolutely. >> Kitchen: Thank you. >> Ellis: Do I see any other hands? Negative. Thank you, thank you for sticking around a little bit longer to help us to get through that before the information comes to the full dais and we always know where to find you if we have questions about what's coming up. >> Kitchen: I'm sorry, one more thing. >> Ellis: Yes. >> Kitchen: What is going to be on our agendas, which ones did you say? >> Yeah, so you will have contract awards for a project on airport boulevard as well as

[3:10:58 PM]

burnet road, burnet road intersection improvements. >> Kitchen: Thank you. >> Ellis: Perfect. And then I saw the assistant city manager had to step away. I know that she always provides her back-up. I see director spiller. >> Yes, I'm filling in for assistant city manager fiandaca today. We provided you with the Austin mobility outcome report and as you can see from this meeting today and the briefings that we've been helping the assistant manager to provide, this is going to be a busy committee for the next few years. And I think that the mayor even mentioned something like the golden age of transportation. It is the busy time of transportation here in Austin. So it will only continue to get more busy. So thank you for your time. If there's any questions that I'll try to answer. >> Ellis: That is absolutely true. And I always appreciate the assistant city manager's memo that she sends out with this committee, because it keeps - it keeps us aware of all of the things that maybe we're not calling up for presentations or getting briefings on, but that are still happening in the

[3:11:59 PM]

background. So we appreciate all of the work that your department is doing. Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: A very short question. The longhorn dam bridge -- is that funded? >> Yes, it is. Is that -- >> Ellis: I believe that it's part of the 2020 -- >> Kitchen: I thought that it was. >> Yes, yes. >> Ellis: That was my understanding because it would need to go through environmental review, so it's a first out, last completed type of project. >> That is correct, yes. >> Kitchen: Okay, great, thank you. >> Thank you for helping me. >> Ellis: Future items, we're always happy to take other items of input. We have a running list, and as director spiller said, there's a lot of work to keep us busy as the mobility committee in the city of Austin. But we've always got corridor programs and we know that director Turnbull had provided a whole presentation that has a lot of good content in it. And the transportation criteria manual that was approved in December of 2021.

[3:13:00 PM]

Discussion on dedicated transit lanes for "Project connect", and south first street bridge conversation is happening and we know that utc has this on their radar as well. For may, we are planning on doing another bike month so we'll do an update on the atx walk, bike, roll update. And I'm just running through my list here. I-35 is on our radar and we have bond funding from Williamson county for the folks that live in d6 that are in the city of Austin and also in Williamson county and odd are automated vehicle panel about private efforts in the public right-of-way. And I still have councilmember harper-madison's riding dirty item, and if you love that in the official record, we have the implications of not being able to keep all of your registrations and all of the vehicle updates that we have to do to be vehicle owners. We know that is very expensive to keep a vehicle maintained. And so that is on our radar as well.

[3:14:00 PM]

If you have other options that you want us to add to the list, we're happy to do that. I see councilmember harper-madison's hand up. >> Harper-madison: Thank you, chair. It brings me so much joy when you say riding dirty, it brings me so much joy, so thank you for reiterating. I think that councilmember alter and some members of the community that had brought forward an electrification item a couple of years ago. And I know that we weren't -- in my mind's eye, I didn't think that we were quite prepared as a community to be thinking about making that investment over some of the other investments but I'm coming around to recognizing how they're inherently connected. So I wonder as we're talking about the expense of car ownership, the expense of maintenance, of, you know, your -- I had ao2 sensor go out one time and your o2 sensor goes out and you can't get your forth, so I'd like to figure out

[3:15:01 PM]

-- maybe you and I can get together and figure out how to articulate the ask, but it's, like -- not just the cost of keeping up the records, but the cost of maintenance and repair and, you know, really just thinking through what are the true benefits of having a vehicle that you don't have to put fuel in. You know, especially as we're taking into consideration the increases in fuel cost and some of those sorts of things. I'm not articulating well how it all goes together, but recognizing that it does indeed all go together. I'd like to get with and you to figure out how to add an item that really has us taking the opportunity to think about all of the things that are implied with vehicle ownership and being able to get around and be mobile, in addition to some of our not vehicle mobility actions. Thank you. >> Ellis: I very much appreciate that. We all know that the biggest cost drivers of a family budget is putting a roof over your head and then how your commute works and do you have a car or do you

[3:16:01 PM]

have good public transportation options. So I think that is really ideal for us to discuss here at the mobility committee. And on that note without objection, I will adjourn us at 3:16 P.M. And as always, thank you to Christopher parks who was our staff liaison and puts a lot of work behind the scenes into this and my policy director Julie Montgomery who also helps to make sure that all of the information that we need collected is here and ready for to us have all of these great conversations. So, thank you all.