



SPECIAL CALLED MEETING

Wednesday, November 16, 2016

The Austin City Council will convene at 4:00 PM on
Wednesday, November 16, 2016 at Austin City Hall
301 W. Second Street, Austin, TX



Mayor Steve Adler
Mayor Pro Tem Kathie Tovo, District 9
Council Member Ora Houston, District 1
Council Member Delia Garza, District 2
Council Member Sabino “Pio” Renteria, District 3
Council Member Gregorio Casar, District 4
Council Member Ann Kitchen, District 5
Council Member Don Zimmerman, District 6
Council Member Leslie Pool, District 7
Council Member Ellen Troxclair, District 8
Council Member Sheri Gallo, District 10

For meeting information, contact the City Clerk, (512) 974-2210

The City Council may go into a closed session as permitted by the Texas Open Meetings Act, (Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code) regarding any item on this agenda.

Present: CM Tovo, CM Pool, Sue Edwards, Mayor Adler, CM Kitchen, CM Casar, CM Gallo, Greg Guernsey, Peter Park, John Miki, Dave Sullivan, Cesar Acosta, Melissa Beeler, Susan Moffat, Eleanor McKinney, Jim Duncan, Jose Valera, Pat King, Roger Borgelt, Colby Wallis, Nuria Zaragoza, Lauren Ice, Guy Dudley

Absent: CM Renteria, CM Troxclair, CM Houston, Liz Mueller, Rich Heyman, CM Garza, CM Zimmerman, Terry Mitchell, Mandy De Mayo

CALL TO ORDER BY MAYOR ADLER 4:10PM

1. Welcome and Introductions (Mayor Adler)

The mayor thanked everyone for attending and for all of their hard work. He discussed the handoff process and that we are finally at a point of clarity for the rest of this process. The mayor stressed that he is not sure if there is anything else that is more important than this project next year. It involves so many different factors and explained that it is the expression of the strategic plan. The goal for today is to go through the timeline and discuss it.

The Mayor wants to make sure that this process ends before the election. He realizes it will be incredibly difficult for the Council to be involved in the process during the next election.

2. Discussion and Understanding of Project Timeline/ Outreach Efforts
a) Phase I: Public Release – January 2017

Greg Guernsey thanked everyone for being here. He pointed out the public release draft will actually be occurring in January and not November. The pre draft speaks to the meetings that will occur prior to the code release. He walked Council, CAG, Staff, and the audience through the timeline. Mr. Guernsey clarified that there will be three drafts prepared throughout this entire process.

The Mayor mentioned that the goal of this meeting is to take suggestions and then incorporate them into the schedule and discuss another version of the schedule again one final time in January. Prior to January the Mayor asked that staff meet with the CAG to discuss what the specific topics areas of interest would be. He wants to have as much level of detail to deal with expectations as possible. He would also like staff to orient the Council Members with that information as well as begin working with sovereign boards during Phase I.

Ann Kitchen wanted a clarification if Planning Commission (PC) and ZAP would be invited to the next Joint CAG Council meeting. Greg Guernsey clarified that they would not, but the chairs of these boards will be invited. Steve Oliver chimed in asking whether the CAG and PC will be meeting separately; Greg stated that that could be an option and that this schedule is not finalized.

Eleanor McKinney requested that a meeting between CAG and PC would take place and more than a report be provided from the CAG to the PC.

b) Phase II: Public Review Draft - January – June 2017

During Phase II there will be presentations to all the districts and multiple ways for the public to provide comments on the public review draft. The CAG will be involved in this process, as they would be present at these meetings as well as handoff a report to the PC. They will be reporting what concerns have been raised by the public and make sure that all stakeholder groups have been represented.

CAG member Guy Dudley asked whether a document would be available to show what has changed in the code. Pool asked if mapping would be schematic or a crosswalk with which would map the old code to the new code. Greg said the map would consist of the rezoning of the City to show where the tools in the new code would apply. Pool requests to see a crosswalk to show the disposition chart of where the old is now appearing in the new code. She wants to ensure that things are not left behind.

Consultant John Miki said a document of this nature would not get down to the fine-grained section numbers and sub-sections, but would be at a higher level such as a chapter level and division level. We will explain what happened and how it is incorporated throughout the code. We will not show that this section moved here, as it is a level of fine-grained level detail that is not quite possible. Pool parked the request and is not willing to take it as a final answer. She wants a more granular level of detail to ensure that we haven't lost certain bits of the code.

CAG member Pat King wants us to provide something to the CAG that they can take back to the neighborhoods and HOA groups. She mentioned that many neighborhoods are too busy to actually attend meetings or look up the information online.

Mr. Guernsey mentioned that in August by ordinance, PC & ZAP will need to make a formal recommendation to City Council. Text reading will be occurring at this point of Phase II.

CAG member Eleanor McKinney wanted to know where Sound Check II takes place. Greg responded that an event like that would happen in April. Eleanor thinks the map testing sections should receive public input prior to a map being produced.

Mr. Guernsey responded that mapping will be discussed on January 9th at the CAG meeting. Yes staff had originally mentioned that a sample set of mapping will be produced but staff is now hearing from the community that they are more interested in finding out where it could apply. So these discussions are not made in abstract but can actually demonstrate where one could expect them to apply.

The Mayor asked how City Council could apply during Phase II. Greg mentioned that staff will be holding briefings and working sessions with Council. The Mayor suggests that the CAG should suggest these topic areas of concern and Mr. Guernsey agreed that the CAG is and will continue to be a conduit for public feedback.

CM Greg Casar is glad that the mapping is occurring earlier than originally planned. He believes that it improves City Council's process as it puts the text into context. He appreciates that staff has shown where the outreach and feedback portions go, as well as where there will be a transfer from the CAG to the land use boards. He also appreciates that it allows the community to know when to organize around what.

CM Leslie Pool brought forth a suggestion from a constituent that a tactical urbanism event would occur in each district.

Mr. Guernsey mentioned that staff in fact would be visiting each district but that the details are still be worked out. Peter Park emphasized that the 1st set of district meetings are really about the text, while the second set are about the mapping as it relates to the text. The intention of the rollout in the February and March period when staff is discussing the text, staff will have some illustrative examples of how the code could work in that situation, not specifically that location. It will not be the actual map, but only discussion pieces. The actual map will come out in April and it will not happen overnight as there are many factors that will go into producing a good map.

CM Kitchen believes that it would be helpful for the January meeting to have some more specifics such as dates for all of these meetings so that the public knows how many, where, and what dates. She appreciated the graphic but suggests a list of details that explains each event and the dates, as well as what it encompasses.

CAG member Cesar Costa would like milestones of how many meetings to have and in what areas we want to reach out to throughout the City.

CAG member Eleanor McKinney wants to know how the CAG fits into the testing of the maps. Peter explained that it would be part of the rollout of the public review draft. Peter questioned whether there was much clarity in what testing means. He explained that its important that as the text that as the text is coming together it has some sort of context that can help explain what it means in regards to context. The January 9th CAG meeting will introduce the methodology and what goes into making the recommendation of creating a new zone based on policy recommendations and other existing plans.

PC Chair Steven Oliver requested for training with the ideas before they are kicking off the work sessions with mapping.

c) Phase III: PC Draft - July – October 2017

In Phase III the CAG's role shifts to ambassadors and the focus goes to PC & ZAP. The public is able then to participate like with any code amendment or zoning change to work with the planning commission. Notices will be sent to all households and PC & ZAP will be holding public hearings. Hopefully most of this process will be complete by October and work sessions with Council will continue to occur based off these discussions.

d) Phase IV: Adoption - November 2017- June 2018

In Phase IV Commission recommendations are in and now this discussion moves to the Council level in December. The map and text would be at consideration and staff and consultants would prepare the third draft of the code and the map to be finalized and presented March 2018.

Susan did not like the idea of ambassadors and would rather it be listed as “community resource as available.”

CAG member Jim Duncan thinks for that the seven months that the CAG will meeting with the citizenry and need jargon free, community friendly presentations. Jim believes that the text needs to be very simple to get feedback from the community. He believes those months will be critical for everyone to understand the code.

CAG member Nuria Zaragoza hopes that there is flexibility built into this schedule.

CAG member Jose Valera reiterated that the CAG needs collateral that they can put in everyone’s hands.

PC Chair Steven Oliver needs to see why we are making these changes next to each translation. He wants to see the dots connected from the code diagnosis to the prescriptions to the new code, so that people will not be so focused on the old text but on the benefits from the new code.

Peter Park said we are working on making collateral that explains what we have now and how the new code moves the needle. Narratives will be provided that point to why staff will propose something different than what exists today.

Chair Steven Oliver suggests that it may be helpful if specific areas were recommended by commissions or whomever to know where and if these specific issues were addressed.

CAG member Dave Sullivan wanted to reiterate that the code document is Imagine Austin and that’s what he’ll be looking at when he looks at the new code.

ZAP Chair Thomas Weber encourages staff to work with communication experts on how the notifications of the new code will roll out. He suggests including a Frequently Asked Questions document or section that translates what this is all about.

CAG member McKinney wants to know where other major boards and commissions will be included in this timeline. She suggested that the CAG meet jointly with key boards and commissions to become the funnel for everyone’s recommendations. Mr. Guernsey mentioned that he has discussed this with the CAG and that the CAG Executive Working Group had proposed that 3 types of meetings that the CAG wanted to have one meeting with each group: Stakeholders, Boards and Commissions, and PC.

Mayor wants that type of detail in the January joint meeting. Potentially this discussion on those details could take place between CAG and Staff at the December CAG meeting.

CAG member Susan Moffat asks that we plan to do some outreach to renters. Greg said by our ordinance we would contact anyone who pays for water or electric bills.

CAG member Lauren Ice suggests that meetings will occur with neighborhoods and smaller groups. She wants to host meetings based on issues, such as the environment that would attract specific groups that want to drill down on those specific issues. Mr. Guernsey mentioned that staff is currently discussing the possibility of those interest group meetings.

CAG member Melissa Beeler wants to make sure that the feedback from prescription papers is incorporated in the draft code. She wants to ensure that the trade offs were addressed to frame the scenarios that the CAG can use to go out in the community.

The Mayor wants us to be able to demonstrate to the public that we have heard them, especially in regards to the prescription papers.

CM Ann Kitchen wants to include on the one pager what the feedback loop looks like. Not only what the public has already provided through the prescription papers but also moving forward with the release code and future drafts.

CAG member Roger Borgelt commented that the timeline seems aggressive but he does not want to let the timeline slide. He mentioned that outreach piece that explains the new code in fairly simple language would be helpful to have close to the time that the code comes out.

CAG member Nuria Zaragoza spoke about the year between the draft release and when it is first read to Council. She wanted more detail on the feedback loop. There was a lack of understanding amongst council members on whether the feedback and changes to the code would happen concurrently or if feedback would be halted and would at that point be incorporated into a new draft code.

Consultant John Miki said in late June- mid July, we would take as many comments as we can and incorporate them into the new draft.

CM Greg Casar mentioned that this is now the end of a very extensive public comment period. He also suggested that we should consolidate where the public should go to do their advocacy work and where the levers of power are so that people are not frustrated or disappointed to go to a meeting that they didn't need to go to. The public needs to communicate with the CAG between February to May, and then PC and ZAP afterward. If possible we should get all of the commission meetings together so that people know where to go and when.

CAG member Jim Duncan said we need to discuss the trade offs. Sue Edwards suggests having a Q&A session and having a public video.

There was a discussion between CM Kitchen, CAG member Eleanor McKinney, and the Mayor on an interim step to produce samples of what mapping might look like which could be easily graphically read by the public. The Mayor thinks that an illustration of the application of how that written code applies to mapping of the text during rollout would be

helpful. CM Pool suggests this sample model piece of code would be helpful if provided in each district.

PC Chair Steven Oliver thinks that we need to continue to help people set a common level of expectations of what the code can achieve. We must assume that everyone knows nothing. He thinks these conversations need to occur before the draft is out.

3. Next Steps

a. Next combined meeting in January (before public review draft)

Potentially January 11th will be the next Joint CAG Council meeting. It will occur in Council Chambers but the time needs to be confirmed.

The Mayor asks that a list of those expectation-type questions introduced by the PC Chair be addressed to manage the expectations of the public.

CAG member Lauren Ice thought it would be too fast for the CAG to have a report ready by the June proposed date, but to extend it into August and help attend some PC/ ZAP work sessions.

Mr. Guernsey expressed concern over whether the CAG would expect staff support to draft their report to PC. Staff will be hustling to make sure that we are making all the revisions to the code and mapping deliverables. Peter Park stated that its important that the CAG's report comes before the discussions occurring between Staff and PC.

CAG Member McKinney stated that the CAG is capable of producing its own report and does not need staff support. Assistant City Manager Sue Edwards stated that staff resources outside of PAZ could be found to support the production of the report.

The Mayor asks if there would be ways for the CAG to provide temporal ways for the CAG to provide their findings on feedback to staff overtime. He also wants the CAG to define what would be in that report so we would know what to expect.

Consultant Peter Park reiterated that the CAG report was to present the CAG point of view to inform the document for PC & ZAP.

CAG member Dave Sullivan mentioned that members of the CAG will be meeting to discuss hosting an internal poll on all the prescription papers.

Meeting Adjourned 5:56pm