

City Council Work Session Transcript – 5/17/2022

Title: ATXN-1 (24hr)

Channel: 6 - ATXN-1

Recorded On: 5/17/2022 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 5/17/2022

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.

I'm now going to convene at

[9:18:10 AM]

9:17 A.M. The city council regular work session here. Today is Tuesday, may 17th, 2022. We are in the boards and commissions room here at city hall. All council members are present. We have councilmember Kelly and councilmember harper-madison with us remotely. The others physically present here. Colleagues, we have today two discussion items, one relating to vmu, one relating to increasing housing capacity on corridors. The thought for those discussion items would be to give us a chance to elevate ideas or thoughts. This is also on the agenda for Thursday. On the agenda item for Thursday, even though it's just a discussion item and there will be no action taken, there is the

[9:19:11 AM]

opportunity for the public to be able to discuss with us. And then probably pointing to June 9th action day. Appreciate the council members that had the open meeting yesterday for people in community for educational purposes, so thank you all for convening that. I think there were people participating in all over the city, so that was a good thing to assessment it will be my suggestion that we again with those two discussion items. I'll call them up together so we can talk about them. When we're done talking about those we'll go to pulled items. There are at this point two pulled items, items number 17 and item number 90. And then we have executive session, which we'll do at the conclusion, maybe after lunch. We'll take a lunch break

[9:20:12 AM]

today from like noon to one. Some of the council members have an event that they need to attend up at the Ibj school, so that will be a relatively hard stop at noon for about an hour. So with that said, this is us and discussion on the two discussion items. Let me recognize the mayor pro tem. >> Alter: Good morning. I want to speak to sort of the second item, which was increasing density on the corridors. And that conversation. Last year as a council we committed to try to move forward with items that were of consensus in terms of how we could meet the need for additional housing. Over the course of the last

[9:21:14 AM]

year or so we've moved forward with several proposals that are in various stages of being implemented. The mayor and I put forward a proposal and frankly I can't remember all the co-sponsors of everything because it's nice that they're all mixed up, but the mayor and I put forward a proposal to allow for residential in commercial areas with an affordability bonus. Councilmember tovo put forward a resolution to facilitate additional ads. Councilmember harper-madison put forward a resolution on equitable transit oriented districts. Councilmember kitchen put forward resolutions related to vmu and I'm sure there are others. I know we've had a bunch of stuff in the domain that councilmember pool has led on. And I'm sure there are number of other items that we've talked about. From those it's clear that we can work together to

[9:22:14 AM]

advance some meaningful change. Back in April we kind of challenged ourselves to think about the questions slightly different than we had been and asked ourselves how -- what could we do if we wanted to increase density on the corridors, limiting ourselves to the corridors in terms of the cool and the scope of what we were doing. What would be the levers that we have and how would we go about that? And to have that discussion we've proposed kind of trying to talk with folks that we maybe hadn't been talking with as regularly and as deeply through the land development code rewrite so that we could hear some different perspectives and think through some issues and better see where we could come to consensus.

[9:23:17 AM]

So I worked with a group that had five council members that represented austinites north, south, east and west, and that is a group that is -- I'm going to do the convention of being in boards and commissions of using first names, Steve, Paige, Leslie, Vanessa and myself. Brand we have some ideas or options or proposal, however you want to style lies it that is limited to our corridors where we've all

long identified that we want to target growth. We don't have it all fully agreed on in terms of a written form, but we're hoping to have a written version by the end of today. There are just a few more pieces that we want to make sure everyone is on board with, but the goal is today or tomorrow to have something in writing. And I think we are posted to have the conversation again

[9:24:18 AM]

on Thursday. I want to thank our staff, my chief of staff, Stephanie, Juli, Sara and Sophia in the other offices. Our staff worked really -- Lisa, yes, thank you, and Louise is a, in councilmember pool's office. Our staff worked really, really hard over the course of the last month and a half to help us have a conversation that focused on where we had consensus. And I was asked to speak on behalf of this group. Folks will chime in to add pieces as we go. We may not get into every detail because we're still working things out, but I also want to acknowledge the work of other council members. I'm just going to speak to what we've come forward with but a lot of this is informed over many conversations over many years that we've had as a

[9:25:22 AM]

community, and I think folks will see a lot of echos of what the planning commission had proposed with respect to compatibility, their working group many years ago. So the basic idea was if you want to add density to corridors and limit yourself to the corridors, the first step is to define what is a corridor. And to understand that maybe not every corridor is created equally. So what we've done is we've tried to create a way to categorize our corridors and then to relax compatibility in parking depending on what type of corridor we're talking about with the most impactful changes being tied to on-site affordability. So what we have done not recognizing that all corridors are equal, which is something that we've heard a lot from the community and amongst

[9:26:23 AM]

ourselves, we identified two categories, and they're not exactly two very original names, but we called them the larger corridors and the medium corridors for growth. And in the larger corridor group we put highways knowledge R. So highways like I-35 and mopac, which is essentially asmp level five. Our project connect rail lines, which are current and proposed. And our existing metro rapid routes. And so those are the things that are highways and then project connect whereas as a community we've identified where we want our density to be. And then our medium corridors question put imagine Austin corridors and the 2016 bond corridor construction program. And so the medium and larger together is smaller than the transit priority network approach so it's really

[9:27:24 AM]

focusing on our larger and medium corridors. This proposal does not -- these set of ideas that we want feedback on does not propose changes anywhere other than on these two types of corridors. And this change is limited to the parcel on the corridor. It does not relax compatibility for any parcel that is not on the corridor itself. So only the corridor parcel itself is granted the increase in entitlement. Over these corridors it is only the larger part of the compatibility change is only for residential and mixed use projects that participate in city of Austin affordability programs. Smart housing fee waivers would not be an example of that. So again we've said we have our larger and our medium, our larger are the things that we've all over the many years agreed on are through votes, through everything.

[9:28:25 AM]

These are the places that we all agree we want the highest density. This is where we would be most supportive of our transit. On those if you participate in the on-site affordable programs, you would be able to reach a height of 60 or 65 at 100 feet from single-family zoning. So in the highest density the larger corridors, we would allow for one to reach 60, 65 at 100 feet from single-family, for the medium corridors it would be 60, 65 feet of height at 150 feet from single-family zoning. So we are allowing there to be variation across different types of corridors so the changes that would be coming or possible would vary thus by context, but in a way that we are able to

[9:29:26 AM]

talk about things. The proposal would allow you to reach 90 feet sooner, but I want everyone to remember under today's code most zoning districts do not allow for more than 60 feet of height, so by and large the 90 feet of height only becomes possible if you apply for a zoning change. So for the larger corridors we're talking about 90 feet of height at 200 feet from single-family zoning and the smaller corridors would be -- the medium corridors would be 90 feet of height at 250 feet. And again, we will have a proposal that you can read and look at, but I wanted to give you a sense of that, of what we would be doing. Again, I want to repeat that most zoning districts today would not allow anyone to achieve more than 60 feet of height regardless of compatibility. So the first part is

[9:30:26 AM]

compatibility and tying that to affordability for changes to where you can do 60 or 65 feet or 90 or 95 feet. We have some other tweaks to compatibility that we would say on these corridors you get automatically -- we're going to wait on introducing those until later or when we have our proposal come out. The second area we looked at were parking requirements. And here I think we had slightly less like clarity on which number, although we broadly agreed that we should be reducing parking more and the larger corridors and substantially and also reducing it on the medium corridors. And we would do that with maintaining existing parking requirements near our schools and we would provide direction to explore options to maintain safety around schools while collaborating

[9:31:27 AM]

with our school districts on options for campus parking on the public street. I believe that the proposal, and there are the other pieces and I don't know if you want me to go into these other pieces as well,. I believe this is a reasonable and responsible approach. I will talk briefly about some of the compatibility things that we thought might be things that we could consensually move forward with again only on the medium and larger corridors. And those are things that we thought we could do. So for instance, we thought that we would think differently about the triggers for properties on corridors of what would trigger compatibility. So we would only allow properties on the same side of the corridor to trigger compatibility as opposed to across the street on the other side of the corridor. We would only allow zoning as opposed to the use of the

[9:32:30 AM]

property to trigger compatibility and again these are only on the medium and larger corridors. We would cap calculate for all projects on the medium and larger corridors at 300 feet distance. And then one of the things that we were trying to solve for was this notion of how you get incremental density and changes that we've observed in the heights of floors since the land development code was passed. So we proposed that we would change by five feet the height limits for residential and mixed use properties on the corridors, increasing from 30 -- increasing 30 feet height limits to 35 feet. Increasing 40 feet height limits to 45 feet. And increasing 60-foot heights to 65 feet heights. Then we have -- want to discuss the setbacks that happen within the 25 -- what could happen within the

[9:33:31 AM]

25-foot setback. We wouldn't want dumpsters to be put there, but we were willing to have a conversation within planners about what we might do in those setbacks. I think that covers pretty much everything. I want to sort of reiterate the goal was what levers do we have to increase density on the corridors, limiting it to the corridors and how would we go about that in ways that we could have a large

comfort level across the community, across the dais for exploring. In setting up what was larger, what was medium, we chose to use existing categories that allowed us to do something less than what was proposed when we were trying to use the transit priority networks. We avoid it saying this street versus that street. We were advised by legal not to say we were going to

[9:34:32 AM]

exclude X street or Y street, but that we needed to have categories that we could plan things. That does mean that there may be a few streets that we may struggle with when we get the full breadth of everyone's ideas here and we may need to think about if there are ways to address those concerns. But broadly we are recognizing that we have corridors where we want to see higher density. Not every corridor is the same and we tried to do this as simple a way as possible so that we could provide direction moving forward to our staff to allow for these changes without it taking years to happen. So I think I will leave it there. And again, I want to thank our staff Louis, Kirk, Stephanie and Sara who worked on it. I said Louisa first.

[9:35:35 AM]

And thank them all for their hard work and my colleagues who were open to having these conversations. I think as a council when we focus on, you know, really on the problem and are able to have the conversations and hear from one another about what our concerns are, what the dynamics are in our particular districts, what we know from many, many conversations we've had across the city over the years, I think we can get to results that can move the needle on the things that we all agree on. >> Chair: Alison, I appreciate that. I'll come right back to you, Pio, if I can. I wanted to reiterate the thanks to the staff because they worked really hard from all these offices. I want to speak a little more broadly than that because I think that everybody sitting around this table will recognize all of the elements that

[9:36:37 AM]

were just discussed. They're not new and not things that we haven't already talked about before, so I think any one of us could claim ownership over any one or more of these things. It's more of a compilation of where it looked like there might have been overlap. R. But to Alison's point, we've never really focused on having the conversation in really specific terms on where consensus might be. That's just not the process we've had through the years. The thought of having a different kind of conversation is something that this council said it wanted to do going back to like last November when we were talking about it. And I'm encouraged at the prospect of that. I know that that means there will be advocates in community that have really good arguments for doing significantly more in either direction than what is set out here.

[9:37:37 AM]

I acknowledge that and understand that and in some of those instances I am a believer of that. But that's not the conversation that we're trying to have here. We're trying to have a very different conversation. This also doesn't make it any easier for us because the way we just laid it out, by definition we're not going to make everybody happy and there will be a significant number of people that aren't happy. But we have such a huge affordability issue on housing in the city. We have to be trying to pull every lever that is available to us. This work by itself will not fix affordability, but no one lever will. But we have I think a duty and obligation and this council has indicated a desire to pull as many levers as we can. I think you laid it out real

[9:38:38 AM]

well. I join you, Alison in committing to this group that we will try to have something posted up on the board today, posted in backup for Thursday for the community to be able to see for the discussion where we think having listened and participated with everyone where those points might be for us to perhaps be able to come together. I think you did a really good job of laying it out and filling the holes and we'll have more a definition or tighter range and spark the conversation about where the consensus might be because I think that would be something that would be helpful to the community generally and I'm confident we'll be able to get there. And I know legal has told us don't base this on roads, base this on categories, and we tried to do that. I will just throw out there

[9:39:38 AM]

that my reading of these categories mean that a lot of the roads that historically have caused us to kind of get paused, I don't read these categories to include in either the larger or the medium ones, streets like 45th and Koenig and speedway, when I look at the categories I don't see those roads being included in what we're doing today. Andic that trying to get to that place where we were not going back and having the old conversations that we had that stopped us is a big part of this. So I appreciate the way that you laid it out. And again, while there's a smaller group moving us forward this, could have been any and all of us I think based on the conversations that we've been having. So thanks. Pio and then Ann.

[9:40:38 AM]

>> Renteria: Thank you, mayor. This is -- to me, I'm going to support it, but it's not what I think we should be doing. I think we should even expand it more. I told the council years back that if we don't do anything on codenext that my property would be worth a million dollars and now it's worth a million dollars. I had a neighbor down the street who couldn't afford his taxes and sold for \$1.2 million. When we bought into those houses we were paying 21,000 to \$35,000. So y'all are making us a lot of money by not doing anything. So congratulations. >> Mayor Adler: Ann. >> Kitchen: Well, thank you. I really appreciate all the effort that everyone is putting into this. It's very much appreciated, the conversations that we

[9:41:39 AM]

are having. It will take me a bit to analyze this with regard to the city because on first blush of the -- I would have to say that it's certainly in the ballpark and it might be right there with regard to the distances. So I appreciate y'all thinking about that. It appears to be if I'm understanding correctly, there's a lot of details, but if I'm understanding correctly it appears to be compatibility or with the vmu resolution that I brought and that I'm going to continue with with regard to opportunities for increased affordable housing along some of these corridors. So I appreciate that. I'll do some more analysis. What's giving me a bit of pause that is different than

[9:42:40 AM]

what we talked about before is if I'm hearing you correctly is the corridors that you're talking about, because these corridors don't align with the transit corridors. So if I heard you correctly, that may be okay. It's just new. You've talked about the -- if I heard you correctly you talked about the medium corridors being the corridors that were part of our corridor program, if I heard that correct. That includes slaughter and William cannon, neither of which are on a transit corridor. And neither of which have we talked about and neither of which have anything in the way of vmus. So I have to think about what the impact is along those. There's homes right up to the street on those. And again that may be fine. It's just I've never heard those two talked about with regard to this before. The other thing I wanted to

[9:43:41 AM]

ask about is I'm it not sure if I heard you in regard to the-- in regard to the main, the larger ones. Did you say brt or did you say existing brt? And what's the thinking there? The reason I ask is because the transit -- for me the transit corridors are the key that we want to make sure that we cover transit corridors. But the transit corridors is a project connect map, so it may be that we cover more than that, but I would think that we at least need to do that. So I'm trying to understand the relationship between what you

said and the project connect corridors. >> Was it about the or was it -- brt or was it metro rapid? >> That's what I was requesting. Why would you do a brt and not metrorapid? Because brt is what metrorapid is for.

[9:44:43 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: I >> Mayor Adler: I think it's a possibility to include. >> Kitchen: From my perspective, it makes no sense to not include our project connect corridors as our main corridors, particularly if we're going to include the city's corridors. So, that would mean that the new brt lines should be included. >> I have asked for our staff to give us the maps that show where all of these particular specific corridors are in existence today. That's right. And then we can see where the overlap is, we can see if there are any gaps. We can see what is included or not and should be or should not be. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Pool: And so this is the opening piece. We have to see what the maps are in order to make sure that we are covering everything. >> Kitchen: Yeah, and, you know, earlier this morning, we sent out the materials we developed

[9:45:44 AM]

for last night for the program that we have. Which you all are become to use some good information about, you know, the compatibility, but it also has the project connect map in it, so y'all should all have that. Did you say brts, or did you say -- >> Alter: It was meant to be the project connect things. I think that line, we went through lots of iterations. >> Mayor Adler: I think it was intended to be -- >> Alter: Somebody forgot they were not the same thing. I think the intention was for it to be brt ones that are within the project connect first phase being built out. >> And I just want to add, this isn't us and others. It's supposed to be a conversation for all of us, which is why we are bringing it here today to get those kinds of questions, because when we

[9:46:46 AM]

present this and request the input from our communities, we need to have a very expansive look at how we describe and explain what it is we're trying to do and take in the information, so that we can continue to find that center lane, that compromise and consensus for all of us on the dais so that we hopefully have an end product that we all support and vote for. >> Tovo: There were a tremendous number of details and I'm getting lots of questions about how this impacts some of the areas that were highly contentious last time. Could you please go through the description again of medium and large corridors? And it would be helpful if you would talk a little bit more slowly about what you are proposing be in and out, and it would also be helpful if you could maybe hit on some of, like, streets like exposition,

[9:47:47 AM]

Duval, the ones we heard again and again, if you have a sense of where -- as you did first, but more slowly which corridors you're addressing. And I think as another point, there's also been confusion in the community and was articulated last night about whether this conversation regarding compatibility is talking about with regard to vmu, or if this is a more general conversation. Are we talking now about compatibility with any zoning on the corridors? Or are we talking about areas where it is strictly vmu and it's prompted by the conversation about vmu, too. So maybe if we could start with the second question, and then if you could define the corridors. >> Mayor Adler: Natasha, we'll get back to you in one second. >> Harper-madison: Well, if I may, it's directly in relation to that question. I'm trying my best to follow along, but we've had at least four of our colleagues speak

[9:48:48 AM]

without having been recognized. I'm wanting to make sure I follow along very closely. So I'd just like to encourage everybody to go through the proper channels and be recognized before you speak, so I can know who is saying what and when. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mackenzie. >> I wanted to say a quick thank you for raising that point. I find myself taking lots of notes here, but without a document, it is very difficult to follow. And so, I'm looking forward to that document coming out so that we can review it and talk with people in the community about these things. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: And I promise we'll get the document up. We wanted to have this conversation before we published the document, in case we were already seeing a different consensus or questions were being answered, so that we publish something, it wouldn't make mistakes, that we would send people down rabbit holes with. But we will get that document published real, real quickly. And I want to get back to the answers to council member tovo's

[9:49:49 AM]

question before we do that. >> Just a couple of initial questions that come to mind. The first being about the, for example, when staff did the analysis on council member kitchen's proposal, they came back and they identified that the change of vmu 2 because of compatibility restrictions would only affect about 30%, 35% or so of the properties along the corridors. And I think it's important that we not just arbitrarily pick numbers out of the air, but that we understand, you know, what we're doing. You know, like, for example, on the medium-sized corridors that are 200-foot compatibility, how many properties does that actually open up? How many properties are actually going to be able to take advantage of it. I think that's a critical component of understanding it.

[9:50:50 AM]

I don't want to pass something and again, only a small fraction of the properties would be eligible. I think we really need an open communication with the city manager and the assistant city manager regarding that type of analysis. And the other one would be -- another question that comes to mind right away is the timeline. We have a proposal ready to go. We have, you know, housing crisis that is just, you know, frothing and boiling every day. I very much appreciate the ideas, but I do think in the very short-term, we need to take action on council member kitchen's proposal and move that forward, and then I think it would be great to also look at some of the additional corridors, some of the additional items that the mayor pro tem was just laying out. But that would be my other question, what's the timeline on

[9:51:52 AM]

this kind of proposal. Are we talking about kind of sending it to staff and then coming back, and then, you know, or are we talking about just kind of amending the vmu, council member kitchen's. >> Mayor Adler: Leslie. >> Pool: I want to make sure that we keep these things keep rat. Council member kitchen has her vmu 2 proposal, but what we are talking today is specifically and only compatibility. Now, that does apply in some instances to vmu 2, but more broadly, or if I may, sliced more narrowly, thinly, we are only just talking about compatibility for residential on the corridors, on our major corridors. And I'm remembering back a few years, when we were talking about codenext, it was a different council configuration, but we had significant agreement on increased density for residential along our major corridors. And I see this as in some ways a

[9:52:52 AM]

return to that agreement that we had, and to start the wheels turning to make it happen. As with all things public policy-related, we value and look for the community's input. That takes time, council member vela, and that's because we're responsible for educating folks and making sure that our approaches are crystal-clear and that we understand completely what the community wants as well and then we fashion that consensus compromise position before we vote on things. So by its very definition, I found over the years that these things for them to have good outcomes do take the time, and I think all of us are patient. We recognize the urgency, but we also recognize that we don't want to -- what is it, act in

[9:53:53 AM]

haste and repent at your leisure. We don't want to be in that sort of a posture. >> Mayor Adler: Yeah, I think I agree with that. And I think the way we had set that up, chito, was we would be acting on the vmu item, because that has already been initiated. It's gone through the process. It is now back to us. And we're in a position to consider and vote on an ordinance. The other goal was that in June, hopefully on June 9th, if there are other ideas that we think are worthy, we would then initiate those on June 9th with the goal of having staff take it through the process, the planning commission process, the same kind of way, bring that back to us maybe in September, after it's gone through that process, so that we can act on the broader agenda as well. But no, this private work would not slow down the vmu.

[9:54:53 AM]

That's gone through the process. We may initiate further ordinances to come back to us. First had a chance to go through the process. I want to return to Kathy's other questions. And any one of the five of us could speak on this. But to the question that you raised, I do not read the categories that we have to include exposition or end field. So the larger category were asmp level 5 streets, which are basically highways. And the project connect light ramp. >> Could you turn your mic on? Sorry, I think our colleagues can't hear. >> Tovo: My apologies. Thank you. I was asking the mayor if he

[9:55:53 AM]

could -- so let's start with large, and if you could talk about -- >> Mayor Adler: Asmp level 5 streets, which I understand are mostly highways. Project connect rail lines. Extensions of those rail lines. Though the rail line is in place, is going to have much more frequent transit service. To support development and changing culture and mobility habits. Third category? We had metro rapid routes. Council member kitchen, I could be wrong, but I just didn't remember seeing brt lines on the

[9:56:53 AM]

project connect maps labeled that way. So we were looking -- it would look to be metro rapid routes, which is how I think it was labeled on the map. But the intent was to pick up the brt lines. So if we got that wrong, we got that wrong, but that was the intent. >> Kitchen: Can I ask a quick question about that? So that makes sense, and you're right, I've been calling them brt, but they're labeled on the map at metro rapid. That includes the goal line, the enhanced metro rapid route, and the potential future extension. So that includes pleasant valley, mancheca, and the route to oak hill. >> Mayor Adler: We suggested that it would be the metro rapid route, but we said excluding future expansions, because we weren't sure of the deadline. But we're just throwing that out. To support -- potentially. We have to talk through that.

[9:57:58 AM]

Obviously the goal is to support as much of the transit activity as we can in the city. >> Kitchen: Uh-huh. >> Mayor Adler: So we have to figure out where that right balance point is. >> Kitchen: Well, the reason I'm asking is, it's important to look at the whole city. And some of the west areas are coming out later. And so I don't want us to end up not focusing on -- if we only focus on today, and we don't focus on the full picture of project connect, then we're missing our future opportunities and transit is one of the things that is most important for us to build. So that's why I'm asking that question. And at the end of the day, I'm also going to ask what parts -- what part of the city are we covering with this. But today, I'm just going to look at this. >> Mayor Adler: And I agree with what you said. Let's see if we can get consensus on that. >> Kitchen: Well, particularly since the 2016 bond corridors are not transit corridors.

[9:58:59 AM]

That doesn't mean they shouldn't be included. I'm just saying that that's new, for us to be talking about those areas. And some of the imagine Austin corridors too are not. So I just have to go back and look at maps and think about that. I want to make sure we're covering the whole city and not just certain parts of the city. >> Mayor Adler: Right. And if we get to consensus, I'm with you 1,000%. >> Kitchen: I think part of our consensus needs to be that we're thinking of the whole city. >> Mayor Adler: I don't disagree with that. I don't know if the camera can get on this whiteboard that -- I don't know who points to the camera, if it can move, or if that's a fixed frame thing. But over my left shoulder -- can't see it? We'll be posting it soon today. And we'll get it up so people can see it. But let me finish, and then I'm going to come to a page.

[9:59:59 AM]

But in the larger group, we had the asmp level 5, the project connect rail lines and future expansions, the project connect metro rapid routes, excluding future expansions. And that was intended to be brt -- just looked like it was labeled that way on the project connect maps. >> Alter: And if I could just add it was excluding the ones that were not funded in the first phase. >> Kitchen: Well, the reason -- we're keeping rail that's not funded in the first phase. >> Alter: That was just where we landed. We can have a discussion over that. >> Mayor Adler: All right. And then we also had exploring, adding T.O.D. Developments and regulating plans. Similar to larger corridors. Weren't sure of that. I think a lot of the T.O.D.S already have specialized rules that might actually be less restrictive than what we're

[10:01:00 AM]

proposing here, in which case we wouldn't be taking those and trying to make them more restrictive. So we just said hey, let's just take -- we made a note or a flag, let's take a look at that and see what that interplay might be. And then on the medium-sized corridors, we had imagine Austin corridors that have been constructed. And we had the 2016 bond corridor construction program corridors. >> Alter: And if I can just clarify. So we found that in imagine Austin, up north, there were a few roads that were in the imagine Austin map that had never been constructed. So we wanted to exclude those imaginary roads, imaginary imagine Austin roads, we wanted to exclude. It was my understanding that the bond corridors were all imagine Austin corridors, but there were some points that changed if you included the full length of what was covered. That was my understanding.

[10:02:00 AM]

We may have missed some roads. That was when we tried to understand that, that was what we were -- >> Tovo: I'm trying to look at my map on my phone, which is not very helpful, so I look forward to getting those maps. It's been a long time since I've seen them. But basically the -- what I hear you saying is the 2016 bond corridors that you're understanding, that most of those are the same as the imagine Austin. And so that most of those are basically east. >> Alter: There are imagine Austin corridors that are west of [indiscernible], but very few. >> Tovo: Just 183, I think. And 71, probably. >> Mayor Adler: If we can reach consensus even more west of mopac, that's something that I would support. I think what we're trying to do is to find places that will

[10:03:03 AM]

materially move this forward. >> Ellis: I do want to be mindful. I know the five of us in a sub quorum have had the ability to bat some of these around, and we purposefully built it with folks who may not have always seen eye to eye. So we can actually have those open conversations and really look at the maps and figure out what's appropriate. For instance, council member kitchen, Lamar to me is very different than Menchaca. So I think the actual buildout of what's walkable, what's connected is different. And you and I haven't had a chance to talk about that. So we know that there's going to be some areas we need to look at very specifically to make sure that these are indeed the right ones. You know, we just started from a place of what makes sense. In my opinion, I've seen in other communities, your housing

[10:04:05 AM]

and your transportation committees are working -- they're the same committee. We don't have two separate committees like we have here. We have housing and planning, and then we have mobility. So I think the true test of a community that is built to sustain an increase in affordable housing, market rate affordable housing, and also to support the infrastructure of transportation and to make sure it's got ridership and that people can get out of their cars is that we're going to have to look at where is the housing being built, where is the transportation being built, and so for us, it made sense to look at corridors in a place of where we have already committed or completed investments in major transportation lines. But obviously, there's some sensitivities. You know, neighborhood by neighborhood, district by district, where we realize we've been able to have this conversation and completely understand that there needs to be an opportunity for folks who haven't been having this discussion with us to really look at what does that mean for their community and to be able to ask questions and have them answered. So this is definitely a starting

[10:05:07 AM]

point. We've had extensive conversations, like the mayor pro tem said, with our teams and hope to be able to work through just some of these details knowing that we're all going to have a different impact of these. And we want to be mindful of each person's need to respond to their community. >> Vela: So if you turn out your -->> Mayor Adler: If you turn out your light, that's how I gauge who wants to speak. >> Tovo: Could we then get back to answering those questions about the medium and large? >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Repeat the question? >> Tovo: So I'm interested -- I'm still unclear on how the larger and the medium -- well, number one, there was also that bigger question about whether we're strictly talking about vmu areas or not, or more generally. >> Mayor Adler: We were talking about corridor properties. And we were talking about

[10:06:08 AM]

corridor properties and the relaxed compatibility would be associated with affordability programs. >> Tovo: Yeah, and I had questions about the specifics there, but thank you, that's helpful, because again, we got questions last night and also already today about what we're talking about, what is the context for the compatibility. >> Mayor Adler: So we're talking about some compatibility, that would be even without an affordability program? They would still be corridor Frack tracks, but the relaxation in compatibility there was just to increase by five feet the first two categories, so that you could get a higher floor plate on the first floor. So from 30 to 40, 40 to 45 kind of thing. >> Tovo: So within the larger and a medium, I asked you for a couple of specific examples. Do you have a sense of where

[10:07:11 AM]

either of these categories captures exposition Duval, the kinds of places that had 15-minute bases, but were not in most of the communities. >> Mayor Adler: And my understanding, I read these categories, they do not include those streets. >> Tovo: Even if they have 15-minute bus lines? >> Alter: Even if they have, it's not tpm. One of the reasons we didn't have it ready today, is we wanted to have a list of streets. And so we had some of the streets that we knew, which speedway and Duval are not included in those categories. We wanted to have a list that covered more of the city than just what we remembered were some hot button streets that were not clearly corridors for a variety of reasons, such as the level of transit that was going down them.

[10:08:15 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: The goal of this exercise, while being mindful that you can have so many exceptions, if they swallow the rule, the goal of this exercise is to not get hung up on the same hotly debated and properties that we got hung up before, so that we're able to move forward. >> Tovo: Yeah, and I think that's the appropriate approach for this. For me to understand it, for me to answer questions, though, there has to be a certain correspondence between the details and the larger, just so I can start to understand what the impact is of what you're proposing. If we're just talking about categories without looking at some of the streets that are within that, it's really challenging to understand how that works. >> Mayor Adler: Ann. >> Kitchen: I appreciate that this is thrown out for conversation.

[10:09:17 AM]

I also appreciate that -- well, okay, what concerns me, and I'll give it some more thought, is that we're not following the categories that we set. We have some categories and then we're just making some exceptions. So we'll have to think about that. And what you said, council member Ellis, might make sense. And when we think about the characteristics of the roads. But I fail to see, you know, from a -- you know, just from a logic standpoint, why we're including all of the 2016 bond corridors, but we're not including all of the project connect things. So -- now, there may be reasons for that, but what you hear me reacting to is the southern 2016 bond corridors, so slaughter and William cannon, they don't have this kind of bus service, nor are they ever scheduled for it at this point in time. So I'm not sure why we would include them while we're excluding things that are on the

[10:10:19 AM]

project connect list for the future. So there may be reasons for that that we can think through, but I just want to put on the record here that I am not certain from a policy perspective why those are on the list that way, because it doesn't match what we're trying to accomplish. So I need to have some more conversations about why we would do that. >> Mayor Adler: I look forward to us all collectively trying to

help one another coming up with as exhaustive and large a list we can without running afoul of the political issues that would stop us from being able to do it. >> Kitchen: Well, there are political issues in south Austin also. >> Mayor Adler: No, no, I'm not arguing with you. I'm saying I would welcome the help and the assistance in coming up with something that was still broad, but took care of the political issues that exist in this city.

[10:11:21 AM]

>> Kitchen: Well, and I'm most concerned about from a policy perspective getting where we need to get for affordable housing. That's why I brought the V. Because that's my number one priority, is affordable housing along transit corridors. If the feeling is that we need go beyond the transit corridors, I'm certainly willing to have that conversation. But it's just not looking logical to me at the moment. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anyone else want to talk on this topic? Allison and then Kathy. >> Alter: Thank you. I appreciate your thoughts on this, Ann. I think that was the 2016 bond corridors, maybe an area that we have to look at more carefully, and benefit from your knowledge and non those areas. The challenge we had was that we knew that the transit priority network was too big, and we couldn't go -- when we tried to think about how do you do this with street characteristics, it

[10:12:23 AM]

became really very complicated. You know, there are some streets, and if we combined the transit priority network and imagine Austin, then we lost some roads in west Austin where you might want to see some of the growth. And so we were -- you know, we had to -- we were trying to find these broader categories that we already had agreed definitions with to maximize the areas where we could agree on things. And, you know, this is not hard to modify and take out the 2016 bond corridors if that is something that has to be done. We can certainly look at that. Again, my understanding was that they overlapped with imagine Austin corridors, and there are imagine Austin corridors that do not have a lot of transit. So there was that aspect to it.

[10:13:25 AM]

So I just want to clarify. Part of the reason we don't have the written up thing is because we wanted to make sure we had a more thorough list of what was not included in these ideas. But nobody was presenting these as if they were not going to be very other valuable suggestions from other colleagues who had ideas from other parts of towns or had concerns that needed to be addressed. I also support the notion of the illustration. We're talking -- you know, the changes to the compatibility happen only on properties -- the changes to when you can do 60-65 feet, or 90 feet, only happen on properties where

they are participating in the affordability bonus, which helps us to get more housing around the city. The five-foot bump, though, I

[10:14:25 AM]

think is really important. We have a lot of corridors that have one-story buildings. And by allowing us to get to 45 quicker and 35 quicker, we'll be able to get some of those three and four-story buildings, which are the stick construction, which we're not seeing now, because it's different to go from one story to two story. But if you can go to from one to three or from one to four, you'll see more incentives to have the construction. Those can be local developers. You know, the 90-foot construction tends to have to be folks who are outside of town. And so it creates a little bit more opportunity for that construction to take place. So I know the focus is going to be on when we allow for 60 feet and 90 feet when it's allowed under the zoning, but that five-foot difference is really just -- I think it's really important for adding the density and creating the incentives to have that where we want it, and

[10:15:27 AM]

it matches closer -- you know, right now, I think it's below what a house can do in some of those areas. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Paige, and then Pio. >> Tovo: I thought you had said I was next after Allison. >> Mayor Adler: I did. You're right. >> Tovo: So that brings me to the next area that I needed clarification. If you could please go through all of the numbers again. I know you were just talking about the five-foot bump, but again, like the rollout of all of those details just wasn't something I captured. So could you talk about, now that we have a sense of what the larger and the medium are, can you talk about what your proposal is with regard to compatibility for each of those with, as I understand it, on site affordable housing at some level. And then the proposal for a corridor without affordable housing. >> Mayor Adler: So what we had

[10:16:29 AM]

talked about was, for those that are participating in a bonus program on a corridor, that you would get to 65 feet of height at 100-foot distance on the larger corridors. You'd get to 65 height at 100-foot distance. And you would reach 90 feet height at 200-foot distance. Recognizing there are very few zoning categories that allow for 90 feet. So if someone wants to get there, they're coming in for a zoning change. For medium-sized corridors, you would get to the 65-foot height at 150 feet. And you would get to 90 feet at 250 feet. 150. >> Tovo: I thought you had said at 100. So I just want to be sure -- >> Mayor Adler: On the larger corridors, 65 feet. >> Tovo: But the medium is 65 feet at 150 feet. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, at 90 feet

[10:17:30 AM]

at 250 feet. So it's 50 additional feet distance as you go from larger corridors to medium corridors. And there would be some compatibility for properties on corridors, period. And it's going from the 30 to 35, 40 to 45, and 60 to 65. So as to allow for the potential additional for the larger ground floor ceiling height, or commercial. >> Tovo: So the additional five feet at every level is without an affordable housing. In this proposal.

[10:18:31 AM]

Absent of compatibility. This is outside of compatibility conversation. >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Tovo: So I think one -- >> Mayor Adler: And the other two things that Allison had laid out was -- >> Alter: It's not outside of compatibility. They can only build what they're allowed to in their zone. So it's allowing -- it becomes compatible to do 35 at an earlier point. >> Tovo: Yeah, I guess I meant it's outside of the compatibility proposal, in that we're not strictly talking about compatibility, or the requirement to have onsite affordable housing. >> Alter: It's separate from the onsite, but it does have to do with the compatibility. It's not changing the amount of height they're allowed. It's changing how high they can -- like, it's changing the compatibility limits as you progress for the distance, by five feet. That's not tied to affordability. >> Tovo: Okay, gotcha. So if there's not an onsite

[10:19:37 AM]

affordability, the distance levels stay the same with an additional five feet at every level. Okay. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: And then we had talked about having a trigger for compatibility, properties on the same side of the corridor. And we had talked about compatibility being triggered by zoning as opposed to use. >> Tovo: Right. Thank you for those details. I did get those the first time through. So did you have any conversations in your quorum -- and I'm not sure whether this is true for other areas in the city, but it's certainly true in district 9 that you have neighborhoods that are bordered by two of these kinds of roads. And so you could get into a situation where there's very little compatibility left within a neighborhood. Did you all address that at ten-year level? >> Alter: So this only applies to the corridor property. It doesn't apply to anything internal to the corridor. So there's no transition zone where this applies. >> Tovo: I understand that, but if you have, say, the area north

[10:20:39 AM]

loop or heritage where you have small trips of enableds bordered -- neighborhoods bordered by corridors, the distance could envelope a good deal of the neighborhood, so that you have many of the properties within a neighborhood within that -- let me think it through. >> Alter: Yeah, it's a configuration we should look at. But I think by having, it's still 100, 150. I don't remember if north loop is an imagine Austin corridor. >> Tovo: I think it is. >> Alter: There would be 150 feet. >> Mayor Adler: If they were so close together, they would all be covered by compatibility. Because they would be within the 100 or 150 reach or 200-foot reach of one corridor or the other. So it could be blanketed with

[10:21:40 AM]

compatibility. >> Tovo: Okay. >> Alter: So we should look at that. I mean, I think part of what we have to do is figure out what are those weird configurations and see how this would play out. We did try to design it so that it -- >> Mayor Adler: If we're looking at it wrong... >> Mayor Adler: We may be looking -- >> Alter: We may be looking at it wrong for a particular area. Such a strange configuration. >> Mayor Adler: When we were doing this the first go-around, some of those areas were turned into all transition areas. And that was one of the objections that came from those areas. But by not engaging on that, I don't think we deal with that challenge. Paige? >> Ellis: That conversation mostly covered, you know, what I was thinking. But I just wanted to make sure it was really clear to people following along, that this doesn't change anyone's zoning. It's just about when and how and

[10:22:41 AM]

in what distances and heights they're able to utilize the existing zoning. So this would in no way take a loft that's not zoned for height and let them do that without coming through the normal zoning change process and having council deliberate that one in a specific situation. >> Mayor Adler: Pio. >> Renteria: Yes, mayor, and I was looking at the board here, it's the medium. It's 2016 bond corridor. So like airport boulevard, that would be also included as a medium, and martin Luther king also considered. >> Alter: I think those are imagine Austin corridors, too. >> Renteria: Okay. >> Pool: The compatibility and the height would only be on the side of the street where the change would be made. It wouldn't reach back. And it wouldn't reach across the

[10:23:45 AM]

street either. So only -- so triggers for all properties on the corridors would only allow properties on the same side of the corridor, as opposed to across the street on the other side of the corridor to trigger compatibility. >> Alter: If I could just clarify, like if you were on the same side of the corridor and across the street, and you triggered compatibility, it would still trigger accountability. Across the corridor, it would not. There are situations where you could have a property on the corner, with the street, and

then there's the corridor, and there could be across the street something that triggers, but just not across the corridor. >> Pool: Right. This is not across the corridor. >> Mayor Adler: Right. And then the other element was that the compatibility limit would extend to 300 feet. And that would be the outside range of compatibility restriction. >> Tovo: So from 540 to 300.

[10:24:46 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Right. One, our 540 appears to be a couple hundred feet, several hundred feet more than any other city we could find in the country. Even at 300 feet, we're still at the farthest limit. But when we looked at the slope lines and the like, 300 feet, a football field's length away seemed to be the compromise number recognizing that there are a lot of people that are already pushing back against that concept. Because it seems way too far for them. So I'm sure that some think too far and some think too close. Ann, and then chito. Hang on a second. Paige?

[10:25:46 AM]

>> Ellis: I just wanted to flag that Natasha had her hand raised. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Natasha, let's go to you. You haven't had a chance to speak as much. >> Harper-madison: Thank you. I appreciate it. And thank you, council member Ellis, for pointing that out. I have a lot of questions. I think everybody has a lot of questions. I think this subject matter, this conversation is interesting, and I really, really look forward to having the written version of this proposal. I think we all know that we need more housing. We need it yesterday. That said, I really am concerned about trying to maximize new affordable housing on those -- you know, we have these conversations all the time about environmental justice in district 1 on those large roads where air quality is lower and the risk of traffic violence is higher. I appreciate that a couple of our colleagues have sort of pointed out already that even in

[10:26:47 AM]

this first pass, I'm detecting some pretty severe inequitable distribution. I'm also concerned that we are leaving out the possibility of new housing along corridors in some of our more privileged parts of town. At first pass, that's how I'm seeing it. I think we all have a lot of questions, and my concerns are highlighted during the course of this, you know, disjointed, in my opinion, conversation. I think we're doing this backwards, frankly. I think if we had a written version to start with, then we would literally all be on the same page, and I think when it comes to discussing this kind of subject matter, most particularly because my colleagues -- not all of us were on the dais during the course of these conversation, and to another one of my colleague's points, offering some clarity for those trying to follow along. I've got to tell you, without having the document to actually follow along, I think for a lot

[10:27:47 AM]

of people, this is not an easy conversation to follow along with. In which case I don't necessarily see the utility in highlighting these questions, issues, what's been worked on already without actually having a document to work from. Again, I really look forward to seeing that written document and really trying to wrap my mind around all the different maps that we're all going to need to go and study now. But obviously, you know, like a couple of my colleagues, I'm already concerned and I'm already feeling like maybe this conversation is happening prematurely. Thank you, chair. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. We'll try to get some of them published here. >> Alter: I just wanted to clarify that one of the reasons we included imagine Austin corridors as our definition is that we could loop in some streets in west Austin, like

[10:28:48 AM]

medical parkway, like jollyville road, like lake Austin boulevard. So there are streets that are in west Austin as well. And as well, we are -- we aren't able to pick and choose streets, and we used to use categories and the more expansive category of the tpm did not work for those districts. That was how we landed on imagine Austin corridors. >> Mayor Adler: Ann. >> Kitchen: I think -- oh, did council member -- harper-madison, did you have your hand raised again? >> Harper-madison: I did, council member kitchen, but along the lines of what I was encouraging everybody to do earlier, I'll wait until I'm recognized by the chair. Thank you. >> Kitchen: Okay. I wanted to talk about some other aspects, and I wanted to say, I see a lot of very, very positive ideas here. I want to emphasize that.

[10:29:50 AM]

For example, not triggering compatibility if you're off the street. I think that that's a -- that's very, very important to do. That's really one of the low-hanging fruit that we absolutely must do. I think the consideration for the distances make a lot of sense to me. I think they build off of what a lot of previous work that was done by the working group and others under the previous LVC. I think that's really important. Appreciate what you were saying about the additional height that's -- the additional five feet, I think it was. I think that's helpful. So I think there's a lot here. I'm also interested -- it will be interesting to see what all we're thinking about in terms of -- I think you said other things like what can be built in the setback. I'm not remembering all the

[10:30:53 AM]

details. Basically, there's some other design issues that would be useful to look at that relate to noise and light and vegetative buffers and trees and things like that. Sounds like y'all are talking through that. I think that would be helpful to consider also, because I think that that's a part of what's important. I don't know if y'all have considered this, but I think we'll also need to look at things like rear setbacks and side setbacks, although I'm not quite sure, but I think maybe you're not changing those, because there are some places in the city where you have -- and some of this is what council member tovo mentioned, where you have lots that are sort of wrapped around. That may be next to the corridor. So anyway, I did want to say that I appreciate the work

[10:31:53 AM]

that's been done. I think this is good conversation. I do want to say that I really do want us to get to move forward with the vmu. So mayor, the way you laid that out as moving forward with the vmu, and initiating other actions may be the best way to do it. We've been working on the additional affordable housing piece of vmu for quite some time now, and I'm really hoping that we don't slow down that aspect. But the way you laid it out worked well. I don't want to spend a lot of time speaking on that. I've talked about that before. I've posted it for Thursday, so you all know that that's there. One of the key things I need feedback on is the levels that we're proposing for affordability. Because they're a bit more aggressive than what staff brought forward. If we can, I would like to do that. So we set a minimum of 15%

[10:32:55 AM]

reserved as affordable, if you're setting it at 60% mfi. And we also set a minimum of 12%, if you're setting it at 50% mfi. So those are -- that's an area we need to talk about. And so I often invite people to think about that, and would like us to be as aggressive as we can in terms of getting the affordability. So that's one of the things I bring to your attention. The other question that I have that I think relates to V also is I think what council member Ellis mentioned, and that was that what we're talking about with these changes, the changes you all made -- if a property is not zoned in the ways that you all are talking about, for the height that you all are talking about, that that would have to go through the zoning process. So that makes sense to me also. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Leslie.

[10:33:56 AM]

>> Pool: Thanks, and I wanted to especially thank folks who were not -- we weren't able to talk with in the crafting of this draft proposal for pointing out that their specific knowledge and familiarity of their individual districts is really at play here. I think all of us should rely on their colleagues for that specific information on situations in their districts, and if we can all start at that point, then we should have a

good connection with our communities and we should have a really good product at the end. And so, for example, council member kitchen, your conversations about slaughter and manchaca, we need to bring that back to the larger conversation. And I can talk about issues in district 7 and specifics. We have a lot of the major corridors and project connect corridors in district 7.

[10:34:59 AM]

And a T.O.D. Even. So there's a lot of things happening in my district that I'm able to, because I represent that area, I'm there all the time, I can bring that level of familiarity to all of you and rely on you to bring back what you know, council member Ellis, about district 8, and council member harper-madison, on district 1. And that's really -- that will inform our final product. And I would like to suggest that maybe that's where we all start, is we look at home, essentially, at the things that are happening in our districts, and bring that information back to the larger convening so that we can have the kind of document that will be something that the entire city will be proud of and support, because I think that is our goal here, to bring something where we can all be supportive at this point in time, knowing that things will also occur five, ten years from now and people -- other people will be coming back and making some adjustments and amendments

[10:36:00 AM]

to the work that we will complete here, hopefully this year. So this is a never ending project, but it will have our imprint on it at this point, and I want to invest my work with the knowledge and familiarity that each of you have in your individual districts and support that work. >> Mayor Adler: Anyone else before we move on? Yes, chito. >> Vela: We haven't really talked about parking, and that's I think an important piece of providing additional housing. You know, basically, get rid of some parking spaces and allow for more housing. Where is this proposal in terms of parking changes? >> Mayor Adler: Yes, and frankly, the group of us have gotten to a closer point, but

[10:37:00 AM]

not quite to the point we were ready to put a number in a document. But we will have a number in the document, and what we'll post here quickly, just as a place to start that conversation. But it would probably be cast in terms of a reduction in what would otherwise be parking for lots on corridors for both the larger court order. And then a reduction for the medium corridor. It will also contain provisions that say exceptions near schools, so as to potentially provide for that. They may suggest certain dvm requirements in order to be able to take advantage of that. >> Vela: With regard to the schools, why would we want more parking I guess around schools as opposed to -- is that what

[10:38:02 AM]

the proposal, if I understand it correctly, that there would not be parking reductions around school? Or is it the other way, that there would be additional parking reductions around schools? >> Alter: It would be that there would not be the parking reductions close to the schools, because it creates havoc for our older schools throughout our city who were not built with expansive parking, and were not built with the ability to maneuver around the schools. This was an issue that came up over and over again when we were doing codenext and when we were doing the land development. To the school areas. This is only for school -- you know, schools that are within a certain number of feet from the corridor would trigger that. >> Vela: Okay, I need to wrap my head around that a little bit more. >> Mayor Adler: And part of that

[10:39:03 AM]

for me, chito, is having gone through this process before, I think that there are disagreements with respect to what is actually safer or not safer for children in terms of street parking and the like. I think that's a really important conversation to have. But our community is pretty deeply divided on that. And we can either try to resolve that deeply divided issue as part of this process, in which case you'll find that it will be all that you're talking about in two or three months. Or we can say we're just not going to have that conversation here. We're going to pass everything we can pass now. And then those other topics can be addressed at some point in the future. But this exercise is about trying to get as much done as we can get done to not let the

[10:40:04 AM]

perfect be the enemy of the good. I think we agree conceptually to a lot of this. It gets really hard when you start actually writing it down in specification. We're all going to have to deal with that. But I for one would like to be in a place in September where we can say to you future councils, we were at least able to do this, and this is a significant advancement. And we can get this done. It doesn't have us in court for two years. People can start applying this now. Let's go ahead and do that. And then if you want to have the future harder conversations that are more divisive in the community, that's a different process than what we're trying to set up here. >> Mayor Adler: Mackenzie. >> Kelly: Hello. Thank you for acknowledging me.

[10:41:05 AM]

I'm sitting here and getting feedback already from the community that as a whole, they're upset that they didn't get a heads-up on what's going on, and as a council member who really doesn't know the specifics, I just want to express that it could be a little frustrating for me and some of the other colleagues when we don't have all the information in front of us. And my biggest concern, I think, is just like what council member harper-madison has said once, where she said you can't put the toothpaste back into the tube once you squeeze it out. So I want to make sure that when we're having these discussions in the community, that we have all the information laid out in front of us. And I know that you do plan on posting this later today, so I really appreciate that. I think in the future, out of respect for all of us as a whole, it might be better to post it ahead of the meeting so that we can all be on the same page and have a really productive discussion about what's going on here, because the notes that I'm taking about what our colleagues are saying, there's a lot of questions and unknowns, and I just want to make it clear that I would have felt a lot better walking into

[10:42:05 AM]

the work session today having that information ahead of time. So, thank you. >> Mayor Adler: And it will be on the agenda for us -- it will be posted today. We have it set on our agenda on Thursday to talk. And we could have said nothing about it today, but we thought at the very least, we would raise it today, so that people would know that it was coming. I didn't know we would be going into this level of conversation, but happy to have done that. And I would point out to the community generally that I'm not sure over the last six to eight years there's any topic we have discussed as much as this topic over a six to eight-year period of time. Nothing really new and anything that we've talked about today, we've seen similar proposals from different working groups, from different consultants, from different planning commissions, from different zap discussions.

[10:43:07 AM]

I mean, we've talked about this up one side and down the other for a really long period of time. And we're not talking about passing an ordinance other than vmu, which has gone through the process, until the fall. But to set up a process to engage the community more on a specific kind of proposal. And we've talked since at least November about getting to this point. And we've been following kind of that schedule that we've laid out in November to be able to air these issues. But to your point, Mackenzie, I think you're right. And we'll post something today just as quickly as we possibly can to help with that conversation. Pio. >> Renteria: To let my colleagues know that we've been

[10:44:07 AM]

discussing this for 16 years. So... And counting. So just want to let you know that this has been a long, long process. I remember my wife being on the project, on imagine Austin, and serving four years, and that was before I even got elected. And we had over 16,000 people participating in that process. So this has been studied, and the people in the corridor spoke up that we didn't do it the right way. So this is an opportunity to get something, because we desperately need something. I'm losing all my friends and they're all having to move out. There's no place in Austin that's affordable. Our kids are having to move out

[10:45:09 AM]

of the city. And so that's very alarming to me that we can't provide affordable and decent housing. So this is an opportunity, especially along our corridors, because of how expensive it is in Austin that we're going to have to have reasonable affordable transportation to get back and forth. That's what's been going on. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else before we move on? Chito and then Kathie. >> Vela: On that note from council member Renteria, kind of researching and talking to different members of the community, builders included, about the vmu type construction, four story, five story, six story type of construction that we do, that is the dollar per square foot, the cheapest housing we can build. You know, when you have your kind of first floor concrete pedestal with your, you know,

[10:46:11 AM]

four to five stories of wood frame apartment building on a dollar per square foot basis for construction, there's no way that we get cheaper than that. Of course, you've got to factor in land costs, of course. But it's to me just critically important that we foster that type of construction, and that we do it in a broad of a manner as we possibly can. Just with the rental statistics, there was a good article, I think it was in "The statesman" on basically rental fraud now that is happening, where people are kind of tricking other -- you know, who are so desperate for apartments, they're putting like a deposit or they're doing something and the person is just -- it's a complete fraud. It's a bait-and-switch, or just a theft, really.

[10:47:12 AM]

So the housing along the corridors ultimately, I mean, that is working class housing. That is the cheapest housing that we can build in Austin today. We need to move that forward as soon as we possibly can. >> Mayor Adler: Kathie. >> Tovo: I have two very quick questions. I just wanted to understand who the proposal is coming from. I caught you, mayor, mayor pro tem, council member Ellis, council member pool. >> Mayor Adler: Council member Fuentes. >> Tovo: Thank you. And my second question is, council member vela, I haven't heard about the rental fraud you were describing, but I couldn't completely

follow what you were saying. So they put -- would you talk -- would you just take a few seconds and explain that? >> Vela: Yeah, I think that people are so desperate for -- to find an apartment, because there's waiting lists and things like that, that there's kind of a fraud scam basically has developed around what people are

[10:48:12 AM]

offering and signing fake contracts, you know, to rent somebody an apartment that they have no authority to rent, that they have -- so again, that's just an indication of how desperate people are, that they're willing to kind of give somebody \$2,000 as a deposit, and it's a complete fraud. >> Tovo: Thank you. I hadn't heard about that. Thank you for explaining. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anybody else? Good conversation. Let's go to the pulled items. 17. >> Tovo: I think -- I have questions about the confidential memo that we received yesterday. I think a lot of the information, it would seem to me can be made public. But regardless, I'd asked if I could ask some questions about

[10:49:14 AM]

it in executive session. And I think the staff have indicated that Thursday is a better day for that. So I don't need to talk about it any further. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. We'll put that on executive session for Thursday. Item number 90, council member Ellis, you pulled this one. >> Ellis: I did. They seem to be very much in line with the work that environment Texas has been talking to a few of us about over the probably past couple of weeks. And so I just wanted to see if I'm on the right track with that one. And then just wanted to daylight -- I wanted to make sure I had enough time to kind of check with stakeholders in the community. You know, people who build urban trails and other people who care passionately about the environment, which we know there's a ton of lovely folks in our community that do so. But I just had only taken a look at it yesterday, and was still trying to work through what questions I had and who I needed to connect with to understand that. So I just wanted to daylight it. I might be able to work through

[10:50:15 AM]

that by Thursday, but was curious if there was any further background about where the ideas came from. I know some of these have historic conversations with previous councils. Some of them might be newer ideas. Can you just kind of daylight where the idea came from. >> Sure. Multiple places. You mentioned environment Texas. I know environment Texas worked with council member kitchen. They've worked with my office. I think my office first reached out to them back in February or something like that and had our first conversation about some of the ideas in here. Council member kitchen had done a resolution that's cited in here on functional green, I think. You can talk more about what tell. S of

that were. And so certainly that was one basis for this work. Two are the ideas that environment Texas has raised, which I think are very aligned with the work that council member kitchen had done. And then my senior policy advisor has worked in these

[10:51:17 AM]

areas for a long time, and some of these come strictly out of her background and her recommendations. I would say, you know, we have vetted these with city staff, with whatever protection they've provided us. We've worked pretty closely -- my office has worked closely with them in the development of this over the last couple months. They do have some suggested edits that will be in the version that we address on Thursday. And the same is true of the water utility. I think the water utility has some suggestions that we're going to incorporate for Thursday as well. >> Ellis: That's great. I appreciate that background. I obviously appreciate the experience with water shed protection. The folks always kind of helping make sure that we're addressing everything we need to address from the policy standpoint to keep our community protected. I also completely agree that there's an imbalance of how we protect the environment, and I always want to think about, you know, is the water leaving our community just as clean as the water coming into our community, so that we can be good neighbors for the folks downstream who may be using that water as their drinking water source as well. And I'm not sure if this is for

[10:52:19 AM]

the sponsor. But as far as implementation, I just want to make sure I understand the timeline of -- it says come back in September, and I know budget season will be something that takes a lot of our attention. A month prior to that. But how -- will there be stakeholder engagement so that city staff can answer their questions, and we can help answer questions, just with the tighter turnaround for something like this. >> Tovo: Yeah, thanks for that question, because that reminds me of one other really important source of this. A good deal of the code amendments were actually in the various drafts of the land development code that went through the planning -- went through the environmental commission, the planning commission, and then, of course, council up to the second reading. So it is -- I mean, September is not a lot of time, but that's for the body of amendments that have already been for the most part, you know, workshoped and had lots of feedback about, and I think had a lot of support in the land development code. So I don't anticipate any additional stakeholder input

[10:53:20 AM]

beyond what is part of the regular code initiation process. But again, a lot of that work has already happened, and we've been talking with staff about that deadline, and while it is soon, it is also true, I

think, that most of that's drafted. It would be my expectation that most of that's drafted. And for what is not drafted, if there needs to be more time, certainly, we're open to that. >> Ellis: Okay, and I'll just close out my comments on -- I do appreciate the focus on picking up topics that we've already discussed in some fashion. I think that's something that just came up with compatibility. We've had these conversations, and I do appreciate my conversations taken care of by Thursday, just so I know if there's any impact to folks viewing private/public in my district, I want to make sure I have a chance to touch base with them. I also look forward to seeing the updated version too so we can see a look at that.

[10:54:24 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: I appreciate this work, and generally, directionally, I'm in favor of it for your reasons and Paige's reasons. I haven't had a chance to read it yet and I'm not sure I'm going to be ready to vote on it on Thursday because I haven't had a chance to go through it. So I just say that out loud. Leslie, and then Ann, and then Allison. >> Pool: I just wanted to mention that I wanted to -- I think I've talked with both council member tovo and Fuentes about adding my name to -- and council member Fuentes's case, item 88, which is the reproductive rights resolution. Appreciate adding me. Thank you. And also, council member tovo, on your item 90 we were just talking about, on environmental protections and water quality. I wanted to be listed as a co-sponsor if possible. Thanks. >> Tovo: Thanks. We've already made that happen at the agenda office. >> Mayor Adler: Ann. >> Kitchen: I just wanted to add that this resolution is something that I was bringing

[10:55:24 AM]

forward, and combined with council member tovo's. And so I just wanted to reiterate what she said. There are parts of this that are picking up what was passed in the second reading of the ldc, and so might be helpful to point out what those parts are. So we'll try to do that. That might be helpful to you, council member Ellis. There's parts of it that are broader than that that council member tovo has brought, but parts of it are just focused in on those changes that were something that were already vetted through that previous ldc process. So I will do my part to help point out what those are. >> Ellis: And I appreciate that. I know I wasn't here for codenext, but I was here for the ldc rewrite, so it would be helpful if there's additional background and timelines. It can be hard sometimes to go find the meeting where the input was taken.

[10:56:26 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Allison. >> Alter: Thank you, council member tovo and council member kitchen for bringing this forward. I think it's a really important step and long overdue to address some of these issues. I think we had some conversations in our water oversight committee as well where we talked

about the importance of moving forward with these amendments and I too would like the agenda office to add me as a co-sponsor for this item. I wanted to just flag something we're working on, which is related to this notion of going back to our previous discussions and bringing forward elements of the land bill in the code rewrite where there was strong agreement. There's some pieces of urban interface code that are embedded in the changes that were proposed in the line development code, with respect to secondary access, to building in the interface code. Those are already drafted, already ready to go -- we'll be

[10:57:30 AM]

bringing a resolution asking staff to bring those forward in the fall. That's a really important step as we move forward with making sure that we're not only the first big city to adopt the code, but really do it at a high level. We currently have 300 houses being permitted a month in the interface area, so it is really important that we don't repeat mistakes from the past where we don't have secondary access for folks who find themselves building in that area. So if anyone's interested in joining with us on that, let me know. >> I am. >> I am as well. >> Mayor Adler: Is there a reason, Kathie, that this has to be voted on this week, as opposed to the 9th, so we would have a chance to vet with people? >> Tovo: I'm willing to consider it. I think that there's an urgency here with several more industrial spills that have happened in recent months, and as I think several of my colleagues talked about, I know

[10:58:34 AM]

environment Texas and others have been talking for a while about, hey, can we get these moving. I neglected to mention podair as another group that we worked with in developing this as well. It would be great if we could get this moving. Code amendments take a long time. I think then soar they sell out and we get staff working on that, the better. Especially since a good number of them passed on two readings with the majority of this council voting for it. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. I need to go back and take a look at considering those as a standalone. And I just haven't had a chance to be able to vet it with people that I would ordinarily vet. >> Tovo: I understand that. It's long and dense. As you're kind of thinking through that, just call your attention to the last be it further resolved, which council member Renteria added, and that

[10:59:35 AM]

is -- well, the first half, I think, was your language, council member, and we added additional language. But the manager would always do an affordability impact analysis on a code amendment. We just kind of articulated that that's going to happen as well as a fiscal impact analysis. So the things that are not a code amendment, but are processed changes, we're asking to calculate what any increased cost would

be for those. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anybody have anything else before we go into executive session? Looks like we might be able to take care some of of the executive session stuff this morning before we break for lunch at noon. Does that work for folks? Ann, we might be able to bring some people in. Would you be able to do that? >> It might take us just a couple minutes. >> Mayor Adler: The city council will go into executive session

[11:00:37 AM]

to take up three items. Pursuant to 551.071 of the government code, we're going to discuss legal issues related to -- let me stop for just one second. There's another item on our agenda that relates to a rotation list and hiring people on that. I think we went to number 11. I'm sorry? Item 13. I was looking at that list. I was looking at this scaling. It looks like if we went to 12 or 13, we would have more choices here locally. Might make sense for us to do. So I would like staff to take a look at that on Thursday and tell us if we want to do that, what's the best way for us to be able to do that. Kathie? >> Tovo: Yeah, we've gotten some feedback from the community about that, and I support that

[11:01:42 AM]

direction as well, if that can be achieved. And then I had a couple of other things, if we're going to kind of talk about things that we're eyeing on the agenda. I did want to ask a question of staff. Hopefully I'll have an opportunity to put this into the q&a. But there's an item on our council agenda to waive the distance requirements from a school. And maybe council member pool has something on this. I did reach out to the mayor's committee on individuals with disabilities. And I don't believe from her response, I don't believe that this is an issue that they've addressed, and I wondered if staff could tell us whether they have proactive reached out to Rosedale or to aid to get their feedback. Rosedale is the serve that is triggering the need for variance for the alcohol waiver. The other thing I wanted to just note, we have an item on here. 19. Authorizing to consider whether we should authorize a fee in lieu of on site affordable

[11:02:42 AM]

housing for an item, for a project. I asked a question in the q&a about what is the compelling reason that the developers are requesting this waiver, and frankly, I did not find -- the response was extremely helpful from staff, and from that response, I take away that there really is not a compelling reason, in my opinion, to waive the requirement for onsite housing. And so I am strongly leaning against supporting that and just wanted to highlight that so that my colleagues can think about it between here and Thursday as well. >> Mayor Adler: Which number was that? I'm sorry. >> Tovo: 19. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. >> Tovo: And then 17 as we discuss the escape game. I am going to review the new terms.

But I guess as I think about the way we're using our assets, especially those city assets that we have out there on the private market, you know, that

[11:03:42 AM]

we have private tenants in, it's not like the arrangement we have with urban roots where we have -- where we're giving them extremely low rent for our -- for our tract of land over by the berkstrom spur so they can farm. That to me is an enormous community benefit and it makes sense to give them a great deal on that land, so they can fulfill -- with the private sector. I think we should be operating it like a business, and we should be getting as much value, as many dollars in to our city coffers as possible. So I'm really eager to see whether the escape room hits that. I will say I continue to have questions about whether we are using that downtown asset at the highest level we should be. Because I just think, I look

[11:04:42 AM]

across, as we're approaching budget and I look across the programs, I think about the need for more park staff and more public health staff and so many areas, better wages for so many of our employees, I am really looking carefully at all places where we can maximize the revenue for the city, so that we can help pay for some of the services. I'd much rather charge a fair, but high rent for one of our city assets than I would have to cut services or not reward our employees. So, that's just my perspective on that one, and I'm going to continue to get more information. That's where I'm leaning on that. I think we may be scheduled today for a conversation about candlewood; is that correct? In executive session. >> We provided a memo -- >> I'm sorry, those of us virtual can't hear. >> The question is about candlewood. And we are not scheduled to do

[11:05:44 AM]

an executive session today, because there was a memo that went out. And if there are other legal issues or real estate issues, I'd be happy to figure those out between now and Thursday. >> Tovo: Sure. Thanks. I think my questions don't fall into either of those categories, so I'll just -- I'll continue to follow up with the staff on them. But I am -- and I know I am getting questions about -- I know I shouldn't talk about it if it's not on executive session. But I'll just say I'm beginning to get questions about the extent of the damage. I know council member Kelly had made some comments about the extent of the damage. We need to have more transparency around that issue, and more information in the public. So I appreciated the information that went out from the city of Austin, but I think we still need a higher level of detail there. >> Mayor Adler: Mackenzie. >> Kelly: I'm a little confused. Ann, I know we talked about -- I requested an executive session

[11:06:44 AM]

on security at candlewood. You had not followed up with me about that request and the memo did go out, so I'm a little surprised to hear that that's not going to happen. I think we all need to be on the same page when it comes to security at our city-owned buildings. And I'm not entirely convinced that the public needs to know exactly what that security situation is. But again, I can follow up with you during our break to find out more information about why this is happening that way. Thanks. >> You bet. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: If after that conversation, Mackenzie, you think we need to set it on Thursday for executive session, let me know. >> Kelly: Thank you. And if I can just say real quick, I would love for all of us to be on the same page, and I think that that executive session is really the only way that we can have that happen. So, I'm just going to say that right now. But I will follow up with you after. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. So unless Mackenzie decides no,

[11:07:45 AM]

let's put it on the executive session on Thursday. Pulling 85 for executive session. Leslie. >> Pool: Yeah, I wanted to respond to council member tovo's question about the alcohol waiver. That's at a property on Burnett road. >> Mayor Adler: Which number? >> Pool: I think it was back in January or February, I was pleased to go to the ribbon cutting for the new Lucy reed school for the population that had been at the old one. As you all know, that property was part of the bond election that aid floated a few years ago, and those students who have multiple challenges are in a much -- in a new and beautiful location. So rosedale school no longer exists at this site where it

[11:08:46 AM]

used to in the old fallen down building. It's no longer the rosedale school. It's now the allendale rosedale school, and it's attached to Lucy reed elementary, which is up in allendale, around rich creek. And so there's not now a school. Aisd still owns that property, and I don't think the district has quite decided what they want to do with that property. It's right off of Burnett road and it's in rosedale, which is also just up the street from me, in rosedale neighborhood. So there is no longer a school there. That is why, frankly, I am not opposing that particular request, and I will be voting in support of the amendment to the alcohol provision on that item. >> Tovo: That's very helpful. So there are not students currently -- I mean, I know

[11:09:46 AM]

about the new rosedale campus, but there are not students at this point at the old rosedale campus? >> Pool: They've moved them all. >> Tovo: But aid has not used -- >> Pool: From what I understand, and we've been asking, rosedale neighborhood association is really interested in knowing what's going to happen to that property. I actually wondered if maybe the city could acquire it, but my understanding is aid wants to hold onto it and keep it in its inventory to do something to maybe monetize it in a different way. But there are no longer any students there. And frankly, I'm really grateful for that, because that structure really was beyond aged and falling down, and I would urge everybody, if you have a chance, to go up and see the new allendale rosedale school that's in the allendale neighborhood. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: I would need to be corrected as well, but mincing is that aid has no objection to the waiver and rosedale has no objection to the waiver. >> Tovo: It's very helpful to know that there are no more students there. Thank you for that info.

[11:10:50 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Pio. >> Renteria: Kathie has a lot of concerns about item 19. And so do I. I have the same concerns. My understanding is that there's a possibility that if we don't provide that, that they might just decide to go back to whatever their base entitlement is, and just built that. That's the only reason why I'm kind of hesitant also, just like you. And can't go any higher because they're in capitol overview. So that's some restriction that's going on there also. So I'd like to just get with you and maybe see if we can figure something out. But I do have that concern. And we need more housing. A lot of office buildings in

[11:11:50 AM]

saltio, so I'm really looking for more housing there. >> Tovo: Thanks, council member. I look forward to that conformation I think we're aligned on that. >> Mayor Adler: Ann. >> Kitchen: Yes. I just wanted to share that I was concerned about that also, council member Renteria and council member tovo. So, I know the importance of the housing onsite at plaza saltio, so look forward to hearing what you all arrive at. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Mayor, staff has put a memo in backup, and a kind of quirk of how we have to post this, but we are posting this as authorizing the fee of in lieu, but the staff is recommending to have council not authorize that fee in lieu. So please refer to that memo if you want additional information from staff on that item. >> Tovo: Just to resummarize that, staff are recommending against it. >> Correct. >> Tovo: Thanks.

[11:12:50 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: All right. Anything else before we go into executive session? All right, city council will now go into closed session to take up three items pursuant to 551.071 of the government code. Legal

discussions relative to e1, discussions of the police department. E2, the may 2022 election. And we will also discuss real estate matters related to e4, which is the health south property. Without objection, colleagues, it's 11:13. Five minute. We'll be back. >> Virtual. >> Mayor Adler: We'll go back virtual so everybody can participate the same way. We have people that are remote today. So let's go virtual, we'll start it in five minutes. [Closed session].

[11:13:55 AM]

>>

[1:11:02 PM]

>>> >> >>> [Music].

[3:52:33 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: All right, we're out of closed session. In closed session, we discussed legal issues related to items e1 and e2. We discussed real estate issues related to item e4. The time is 3:53. Those were all the items on our agenda. So today's work session on may 17th, 2022, is adjourned. Thank you.