Thank you for taking time with me this afternoon. I would like document my comments regarding the Year 10 Report for consideration by the Committee in my absence tomorrow:

Per the Imagine Austin Plan (Page 223), the goal for ongoing plan implementation monitoring is to "…inform the City Council, Planning Commission, City of Austin administration and departments, partner organizations, and the public about the plan's effectiveness; identify those aspects of implementation that are working well and those needing improvement; and keep the plan current as circumstances change and new information becomes available." This ten year plan is meant to serve in the capacity of "longer term performance monitoring" and should be "using indicators to measure whether the recommended actions are achieving desired results".

I do not believe that the story-telling approach to this 10 Year Report (as described in the report) meets the intent of the monitoring that is described in detail on Pages 223-226 of the Imagine Austin Plan (attached). While this report does a beautiful job showcasing some terrific work and progress the city is making, it omits key information that would allow the pubic to evaluate our progress toward key goals and actions identified in the IA Plan and consider needed adjustments in priorities.

It's not until Page 54 of the 10 Year Report that there is reference to the Imagine Austin Indicator Data (which are outlined in the IAP as the metrics to be monitored in these reports). The table found there indicates that only 37% of the indicators are trending in the positive direction, and yet there is little to no discussion of the non-improving indicators – outside of a single sentence (Page 55) that says "Worsening conditions were found in household affordability, investments in the arts, community health, physical activity, and transit ridership." (I would like to highlight a specific ongoing concern, which is the omission of discussion regarding development in the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone – which is not included in this list of worsening conditions, though it absolutely qualifies.) This paragraph is followed by a link to view the indicator data, but I found data to be missing or incomplete. For example, the last entry for square miles developed in the Recharge Zone was updated in 2016 (see attached Airtable).

As I am being asked to provide commentary as a member of a land use commission, I would like to recommend that future reports anchor more directly to the indicators outlined in the Imagine Austin Plan (Pages 223-226) and provide data and trends that can inform decision making, the reevaluation of priorities, and the everyday business of the City. These reports should serve as metrics-based tools, aiding us in our implementation.

Additionally, I continue to be disheartened by the repeated omission of discussion relation to the Land Use Indicators for sustainable development (e.g., LUT P21. Ensure that redevelopment in the Edwards Aquifer's recharge and contributing zones maintains the quantity and quality of recharge of the aquifer, LUT P22. Protect Austin's natural resources and environmental systems by limiting land use and transportation development in sensitive environmental areas and

preserving areas of open space) and hope that they will be included in future iterations of this reporting and in the City's evaluation of land use decisions.

Thank you for your hard work! I look forward to working more closely with you and your new team,
Carrie Thompson
Commissioner, Zoning and Platting