

City Council Special Called Meeting Transcript – 06/28/2017

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 6/28/2017 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 6/28/2017

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[1:07:20 PM]

>> Mayor Adler:, it is June 28th, 2017. We have a special called meeting of the city council to go over codenext. Our continuing meetings just to air some of the issues or questions that we hear in the community. We have the consultant and staff with us today and we've posted on the message board the topics for today, that we want the staff and consultants to address. We have some specific questions that have been posted by a couple of the councilmembers. Including councilmember alter, who is not with us here physically today, but I understand monitoring what we're doing and having sent in questions. Real quickly, as we're getting into that there was discussion yesterday about the planning and zap about a change in nomenclature or something. Can you just address that real fast and then we'll get into our agenda? >> Mayor and council, Jerry rusthoven, sis sent director of the planning and zoning department. Since we released draft one in February we have heard a lot about the format and the layout of the code and the organization of it. So we are looking for draft two and making two major changes. One is a change to the actual format of the code to try to -- we've heard a lot about the transect and non-transect Zones are having different information presented in them in the code, the different layouts, graphics, versus non-graphics, tables versus non-tables. So we're looking at entirely changing that up and syncing those up. And I think more importantly we're also looking right now

[1:09:22 PM]

at not maintaining the transect and non-transect layout of the code. We've heard a lot about criticism that people feel that we have two codes because we have one set up transect Zones and one set of non-transect Zones. The T and the non-t. And so we're looking at combining them into a single spectrum of Zones that would still maintain some Zones having more form-based controls and others having less, but there would no longer be a distinction between transect and non-transect Zones. We would get rid of the nomenclature of T Zones and non-t Zones. And we are looking at going to a format of -- John can present a slide if you would like in a little bit showing this. Showing the different Zones being laid out. So

far we've tackled the residential Zones. We haven't had a chance to tackle the commercial Zones and really there's still a lot of work in this. This is an idea that's just come up in the past few days, but we're looking at a system something along the lines after system r-1, r-2 instead of lmdr, -- t-3, t4. And having the nobody following each zone being more specifics to to the number of units allowed in a zone up to a multi-family zone. And within each category having columns that would show an r-1, r-2 and r-3, and within r-1, you would have an three, and the idea is to be more transparent and clear to what actually each zone does. We have heard criticism that the existing nomenclature that we're using is too lengthy, the t3 and dot ss, that kind of thing. So this would simplify that. We also think it would be an improvement over today's code. Today's code uses terminology that we don't feel accurately reflects what is allowed in the zone. A good example is sf-1 and

[1:11:30 PM]

sf 2 only allowing a single property. Sf-5 allows 12, sf-6 allows a couple of hundred, condos, if you will. We don't really feel that a condo complex is a single-family use. So today's code I think is faulty in that. We've heard criticism that the draft one attempts to clarify that. Perhaps too much so in some pool's minds. So we're going to go back to something that we feel is better than what we have today, but it's not as complex with regard to the-- certainly the initials used and the names used as what was proposed in draft one. So we're going to head in that direction on draft two. We did present this to the joint meeting of the planning commission and the zoning and platting commission tomorrow night. We received very positive feedback from just about every commissioner who spoke saying that they feel that this is a step in the right direction. So it is something that we're going to be headed towards on draft 2. If y'all have any input, let us know, but that is the direction that we're headed. It does involve a lot of work on the consultant's part because of course the draft one is written using the nomenclature of draft one and so the maps would have to change because all the names of the Zones would change and there's just an awful lot of work that would need to be done, not starting over, but making a lot of changes. So -- >> Mayor Adler: This was received positively both at zap and planning commission? >> Yes. I'll let the consultants go. >> Pool: And real quick if we could. The meeting last night, was that the combined meeting with zap and the planning and development and the change was received positively from all who were assembled? >> Yes, it is. >> Pool: That's also important to note. >> This very room last night. >> Mayor Adler: Why don't you quickly take us through this. I want to go through the agenda that we have, so go

[1:13:30 PM]

through this quickly. >> Thank you, mayor. So in terms of the format of the zone, pages we're proposing to bring the formatting of what the transect Zones today and the non-transect Zones more in alignment. So each zone would have 'intent statement within the pages that are meant for that district. Any subzones would be listed as well. Currently in the non-transect Zones, in the introduction of the commercial set of zone districts, one would see all of the intents, but that's separate from the development standard so we bring those into alignment. In terms of the other regulations, every table that you would see in both the transect and non-transect, would start with the same letter and indicate the same information. So table C would consistently be about lot size and building stereotypes and/or intensity. And again, building placement just the setbacks would be presented in the same way, signage, encroachments, parking location, all of these things just bringing it more consistently so that when one is looking at a transect zone or one is looking at a non-transect zone it's seamless. There are graphics in both sets of zone districts. So that brings the non-transect Zones in terms of the way we present the development closer in line with the way that the current transect Zones are treated. One thing that we're carrying forward from the non-transect Zones is having consolidated land use tables so that instead of having a land use table in each district there would be a land use table that might have all of the land use that are land in the t3 neighborhood Zones or all the main street Zones. And the same thing done with the parking tables. So that's the methodology currently used in the draft that's out today in the non-transect Zones. So we are taking what we heard people found easiest and clearest from both sets

[1:15:30 PM]

and combined those into the way we're moving forward. This is something -- a conversation we've had with pz zap several times and as Jerry said, we didn't -- we only heard positives about the direction in terms of doing this with the formatting of the pages. Another item that had come up both in public with PC and zap and even council was the naming conventions and the organizations of the zoning districts themselves. So in the current code we have the transect Zones that go from the t3 all the way to t-6. And then we had the other Zones. So the proposal we had today. In the transect Zones you t3-e, lmdr. And we heard clearly that people were having how does t3-n relate to lm or lmdr because they were put into two spectrums. They weren't really shown next to each other. So the proposal we went to planning and zap last night is what if we kept rural residential referred to as rural residential, but what if we renamed those lower intensity residential districts r-1, 2, 3, four. And that number would mean how many units could you have by right? And in this case you would have r-1 zoning, just a single-family house, and sf 2, and those would go in the one by right column. We have additional versions of lmr and lmdr because you have Zones within the mcmansion. You also have sf 4 which as Jerry mentioned is really about a single-family house just on a smaller lot. And I'll get back to the by right in a second. In R 2 is zone districts that would allow two

[1:17:31 PM]

districts by right N this case we're proposing maybe there's a new zone district, an sf or ldr that just allows a corner duplex because we see on this in a community where just on the corner of blocks do you have duplexes so this would be an option provided. And -- people were saying in sf 2 you can do two units today and the way they would get to 2 and sf 2 today is through if you have a parcel that's 15,000 square foot or larger you can do a caretaker unit. We've renamed that an Adu in the new code. Or if you are providing a unit for a senior or someone with a disability, you can provide an actual unit so that's a way of getting another unit. We also renamed that an Adu. In R 3 we're proposing that the sf-3-lmdr would be in that zone and up to three units by right. So in the lmdr that is in the public review draft you can get up to three units by right. And again as well the t3 neighborhood added to the neighborhood would be recategorized under R 3. And R 4 would be the units zoned by right. This is the missing middle of the t4 neighborhood Zones. We say by right here because in the t4 neighborhoods in the affordable housing that we had a chance to present to you a couple of weeks ago what that says in the affordable housing are the kind of programs that by right you get four units, but to get five, six, seven or eight units in those multiunit buildings you need to take advantage of the affordable housing incentive so the only way to use it that by using that program. So by right you can get

[1:19:31 PM]

up to four and any more than that you need to use the affordable housing incentive program. We think this renaming of the Zones more clearly indicates how many units you can get by right in a district. So it clears up the whole sf 6 issue which it's not even single-family. And the six has no relationship to the number of units you can get. So we feel that this helps clarify all the house scale buildings that can be built and how many units one can get by right. Showing how the multi-family units might change over, we are proposing that here the numbers are just showing kind of scale. They're not indicative of number of units, but rm 1 would be those t4 neighborhood and t5 neighborhood Zones that were three and four story house scale multiunit buildings. But we straight those from the R 1 through R 4 because they are bigger than houses so they're at a different scale. They're more related to the other zoned districts listed here. So we have rm 2 that's really bringing forward your sf 5, sf 6 or the mdr that we've proposed. Rm 4, rm 5 and rm 6. I know it's showing urban setback Zones. These are Zones if one thinks of in U.N.O., the five and six stories buildings being built that don't have ground floor residential that's what this is really meant to implement. To note on both of these charts the blue rows are what today we're referred to as non-transect Zones and the yellow and Orange cells are what were referred to as transect Zones in the past. We still have work ahead of us in terms of renaming the organization. We've done this for the

[1:21:31 PM]

residential Zones. We've started work for what this would mean for the commercial Zones, what it would mean for the mixed use Zones, what it really would mean across the rest of the code, but really it was the residential ones that were the most complicated for us to figure out a new system for, organizing and presenting information. >> Mayor Adler: So did I understand correctly you're still going through this, though? This isn't what you're proposing. You're just saying this the kind of thing you're looking at now. That you're still working on this, is that right? >> Correct. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. So thanks for the head's up and thanks for presenting that to the commissions if there are no questions we'll go on to our agenda. >> Kitchen: Mr. Mayor, I think it might be helpful for them to have our initial reaction. I would just say it sounds like you had a good reaction last night. I would echo that. It seems to be more intuitive. >> Mayor Adler: For me too. It this seems to answer some of the questions I was hearing out in the community as well. Anything else before we go to the agenda? The manager says once they go to this they don't want to go back. Let's keep moving forward and always. Once they go to a different nomenclature they don't want it coming back. They're just moving forward. Won't retrench. Do you want to say that again? >> If they're going to move forward with this and produce the draft 2 with this new nomenclature, it would be very difficult to go back in draft three to the draft one nomenclature of the transect and non-transect. So I guess the point being is that we're abandoning the transect, non-transect and replacing it with this proposed new less

[1:23:31 PM]

complex nomenclature. I just want to make sure that was clear that we would -- as we move forward in the drafts, we will not continue to see the transect and the non-transect codes. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. >> Troxclair: So I want to make sure that the transect Zones would be completely replaced by just the three Orange boxes that are on this slide? >> So on the two slides there are yellow and Orange Zones. It's just showing where the transect Zones would end up residing. So under the column here under R 3 what that's really showing is the R 3 a is your sf 3 zoning. It really has the least amount of form controls and as one moves further down the list there are additional form controls added. So in R 3 B it's adding the form controls of the revised mcmansion. And in R 3 C and D it has controls more in what the transect Zones today in the public review draft are showing. >> Troxclair: So instead of having the categories as transects and non-transects they will be R or rm. >> For the residential Zones, correct. >> Troxclair: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: Thanks. You know, in concept I think this makes a lot of sense and I appreciate your responsiveness to the concerns from, you know, a broad away of community members. -- Array of community members. I would just comment that in glancing -- and I understand this is sort of a concept you're rolling out, not the specifics of it. I would just make a couple of quick comments. It's not clear to me what rm stands for.

[1:25:33 PM]

>> Residential multiunit. Sorry. >> Tovo: And I'm sure you said that. I would have to think about whether that's -- whether -- I just wanted to understand that but also I'm not sure that that's -- that's the ideal name. And then in looking down R 3 I would just make the comment that this is not what we're talking about at this minute, but I continue to think as you hit R 3 B that we can -- and then those below it I still am struggling to understand why we would have certain mcmansion provisions apply in one area of the city and not in others. If we're talking about similar type neighborhoods that happen to be in different geographic areas I think they should follow the same mcmansion regulations. So that's a point on a slightly different subject, but since it's on the chart I thought I would just bring it up. Generally I think the concept of having one framework for the zoned names and categorization makes sense to me. >> Councilmember tovo, I think that's a great point and one of the things that I want to highlight here that we're doing Lynch than in the -- is that we're separating out Lmdr into two zones. Currently Lmdr is one zone and it says within the standard says go look at this other method. You have to check up here within the urban core or outside the urban core. And what that means is if there are other parts of the community outside the urban core who want to take advantage of the form controls that were in the mcmansion tent, one would actually have to go and modify the urban core map. By having two zone districts it would allow the community to be able to say, you know, we want even outside the urban core in this new

[1:27:34 PM]

development to have those additional controls apply even outside of the urban core. So it allows the flexibility for the planning department, for developers, for the planning commission to talk about using some of these tools outside an even urban core review where it would be appropriate. >> Tovo: And that makes sense to me when you were talking about ground-up developments allowing them to adopt tools that might not have been available there. But I think to me I would still contend that the mcmansion provision should be similar. I know you're talking about form controls. Some people regard the current mcmansion as form controls. The loss of yard in one area versus another is something we've had an opportunity to talk about in here and I've submitted a comment. I'm just underscoring that I stand by that comment that we ought to have the regulations on mcmansion be similar. >> And one of the advantages of organizing the zones this way, unlike today where the non-transect and the transect zones are different divisions, this allows us to lay out a similar zones -- lay out the similar zones so in that next discussion on calibration of what is the F.A.R., does it apply, it will be much easier for everybody to see it altogether and see the relative relationship between one zone and how it clicks up to the next zone. >> Tovo: I agree. That's a very good point. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, Ms. Pool? >> Pool:

Could you talk to us a little bit about how you define a unit, the one unit by right, two units by right? >> In the way that we worked on this, it owe a -- a unit is a unit. When we say two units by right, that could be the

[1:29:35 PM]

primary residential unit and an accessory dwelling unit. So in this sense we're using unit to mean any dwelling unit on that -- >> Pool: And they're detached. >> They could be. So up to three units, the way that one would get to three units of lmdr as proposed in draft one is that one could do a duplex where two of the units are attached and an accessory dwelling unit, which would be detached. >> Pool: Or three connected. Units, like a rowhouse. >> Right now we haven't thought about that necessarily because in our t3 neighborhood we allow three units on a lot either as an duplex with an Adu or whether you happen to be on a corner, the cottage corner which allowed three individual units that were separated. We had not -- we can explore what that means in terms of whether they're attached or detached. >> Pool: And also, they still have to respect whatever additional restraints are there like impervious cover, height. >> Yes, impervious cover, height restrictions would still fly apply to all units. >> Pool: And you've reintroduced F.A.R. into all of these as well. >> I think one of the discussion points we've had with you as the council and with pc/zap is thinking about the t3 neighborhood edge and neighborhood Zones whether or not F.A.R. Is a tool we want to reintroduce. So we are considering that as we move forward. >> Pool: Thank you. >> Mayor, if I could, we are committed to trying to find a zone called R 2 D 2. [Laughter]. >> It would be an R 2 and D 2. [Laughter].

[1:31:39 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: On this high note on codenext we should adjourn the meeting, I think. [Laughter]. All right. Let's go through the topics that we've identified. >> Mayor, I think the next thing we're going to discuss is small area plans. Specifically one thing that we have heard from the council is the desire at this stage as we're continuing to work on codenext to identify what we will be working on with regard to how we'll be applying imagine Austin to some of the corridors that are identified in imagine Austin, some of the corridors, some of the notes. One of the things that are discuss and I'm prepared to say that I'm committed to is on the draft 2.0 map, which will be a zoning map, but right now for illustrative purposes we are committed to identifying through two priorities, through two different colors, if you will, areas that we plan on proceeding with small area plans upon the adoption of codenext. We will place our first priorities on those areas that are identified in imagine Austin, but may be a little bit outside the urban core. One thing we've heard in this discussion about codenext is some people in the urban core feel that they are carrying the weight, is the term that I've heard, of the things that we've

identified that we need through the housing blueprint, et cetera. So we would be looking at areas that are outside the urban core, but are identified in imagine Austin as corridors, nodes and activity centers, and looking at them for the application of some of the more innovative ideas that are proposed in codenext in addition to just focusing on the area within the urban core. Another high priority would be the areas that are within places that

[1:33:40 PM]

will be affected by the bond package that passed last year, the transportation bond package that passed last year. A lot of those areas, some of them are outside the urban core and in doing the exercise of the map of the first go round of the map, allow those -- a lot of those areas have simply had their existing zoning taken from current zoning map and replied and translated into the new codenext zoning. There is a desire and we've heard from the community, some of the councilmembers as well as the staff to go ahead and look at those areas a little more closer. We're dedicated to doing smaller -- small area plans, if that makes any sense. What we've called small area plans, we've used the word neighborhood plan. They tend to be several miles large. We're looking at things now in the area of around 10 blocks or so for some of them to try and do a more focused look at some, again, these major nodes and centers. We would on also be identifying other areas that -- for other reasons which we're kind of working on to better define which we would also want to take a similar look. It would also be an area where for one reason or another maybe a major employer moves there or a shopping mall closes down, but an area that kind ever unexpectedly suddenly becomes a high priority for us with regard to planning. So I believe the consultants can probably provide a little more context in terms of the corridors and what we'll be looking at, but we will be identifying those areas when you see the draft 2.0 map that we do plan to follow up on with a small area plan. Do you want to pick it up from here? >> Mayor Adler: Do you intend on indicating that somehow on the map? >> Yes. We plan on indicating that on the 2.0 draft map. So I think that when the map is adopted by the

[1:35:41 PM]

council that may not be included on there, you know, because it would just be a zoning map that would be approved, but the council could approve and we could have a separate map that identifies that. We will for the purposes now while going through the codenext drafts is we will be putting those two maps - those two things on to a single map to make it easier for y'all to see. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Hang on a second. Mayor pro tem? >> Tovo: Just a quick question. I was listening to y'all on my earphones when I stepped but, but we 2.0 you just mean draft two? >> Yes. >> When we start using the decimal points I just want to be clear that we're talking about the same thing. Draft two. >> Sometimes the tech

thing creeps into our language. >> Only when I was mentioning we were at 2.5 instead of going on to 3 it was really confusing so I'm happy that we're doing -- >> Whole numbers. >> Yes, whole numbers. >> We'll roundup or round down. >> So we prepared some draft maps that just indicate the thinking behind what Jerry was talking about here. We have here shown the city limits, so the city of Austin. Here one can see the different imagine Austin centers that were identified in the comp plan and adding the corridor with the corridor buffer off of them. So that's where imagine Austin talked about trying to focus growth within the city. This is the land area so in purple that falls within that quarter mile or under the imagine Austin centers diagram. It's important to understand that there are existing puds or small area plans that exist today, so there is a vision set in specific zoning, so if we split between these two we can see in the northernmost activity center, Robinson ranch is

[1:37:42 PM]

approved by the map and also a good point of lakeline station that we've talked about in the past. Those are all under planned unit developments, so there are some large areas removed because they're planned unit developments. In addition, we removed any parcels that have transect Zones applied to them and I think one of the requirements we have to do is still also look at areas where some of the non-transect Zones are actually already implementing the vision of imagine Austin, so I think this map will continue to get refined. But it starts to indicate to the community where are the areas where a vision plan is still needed. And then apologies, but in Orange here, very light on the maps, easier to see on the printouts, are the transportation bond corridors. So again when we combines these two one can start to see [lapse in audio]. Other areas. Additional items that would be brought to bear to look at this would be cap metro's future expansion of bus service. So where cap metro is anticipating increasing service, either the time in between buses or adding new lines or high Katie lines. So -- high capacity lines. So this again begins to paint a picture of how to prioritize different parts of the city. With the long-term goal that everything in purple here at least everything in purple here would eventually have some additional planning done. So that's where we are today with the mapping. We will continue to refine this and we'd be happy to come back and present more information as we move further along on this. >> Kitchen: Mr. Mayor, I have some questions. Thank you very much. This is very helpful to see it like this. So I have a couple of

[1:39:47 PM]

questions Mr. Rusthoven when you started talking you talked about some of the imagine Austin areas and some of the corridors. So I think that what you were referring to is this map, right, that we're seeing, which follows along most of the corridors as I can see. I don't know how it relates to the imagine Austin

activity centers. But I guess my question is to the extent that we're not mapping or identifying in this way all of the corridors and all of the imagine Austin nodes and activity centers, I just want to understand what is the criteria for which are done and which are not? I'm not suggesting they all be done, but I just want to know what the criteria. For example, I think this is Brodie over here. It's not mapped. And maybe it shouldn't be. I just want to know what the criteria is. >> The criteria I believe is the charge that we have is before the draft 2 map comes out that we will be coming up with what our recommended priority areas are of the areas identified here and trying to identify which ones we feel are most important to do first. >> Kitchen: Based on what? Do you know yet what the criteria will be that you're going to use or maybe that's something you're developing. >> That's something we need to develop. >> Okay. So when you present it to us when it comes back in the map, you will be presenting your recommendations along with the criteria used and those rising to the top and also the data -- letting us know where data is behind the criteria. >> We plan on showing the two categories of priority, higher priority and lesser priority. >> Kitchen: Do you have anything you can share on this point about what your thinking is on what that criteria might be or are you not that far along. >> Mayor Adler: Isn't that what you said a second ago? >> We would be first looking at the places that have the mobility bond, places that of course were already identified in imagine Austin. >> Kitchen: But all those places are not included on here. >> Mayor Adler: That's what they're saying.

[1:41:48 PM]

The next step is -- so this represents -- this represents an area not mapped or planned yet, but you have said in the version two maps you're going to further identify areas either with planning or with some resolution of those and you said you were going to indicate what the priority order was. While you're working on that, the preliminary indication you had, which I thought was the answer to the question that you were asking, was in terms of priority where are they going to go to first in order to move -- and it's going to be shown on the maps. So right now this is left off the maps, but these will now be included in the version 2 and what you said was there is covered by the mobility bond so some of these will come off this purple map as an area that's not planned or addressed. >> And areas of imagine Austin, nodes, corridors, activity centers outside the urban core and don't currently have a small area plan to go with it. >> Mayor Adler: Those would also come off the purple map and those you said would be two of the priority categories that would come off this purple map. >> Pool: Because the purple areas were things not being addressed. >> Kitchen: Let me just refine my question because this map doesn't include all of the mobility bond areas. It doesn't include all of the areas identified in imagine Austin. That's okay. I'm not saying that's wrong. I just want to know the why. So what Mr. Rusthoven said earlier is he listed criteria and one of the criteria was imagine Austin. Well, it's not all of imagine Austin and some will rise to the top and some of them won't. And we just need to understand when they come back what is the criteria that determines what rises to the top and what doesn't. So that's all I'm asking. I don't think that -- this doesn't do that. And he hasn't told us that yet. >> Mayor Adler: I agree. >> Might I offer that

[1:43:50 PM]

the simplest way to look at this map is the purple and that's on display now. Represents the areas in the draft 1 map where T Zones weren't applied. This is where this question is coming from significantly, right? >> Kitchen: Okay. >> And so all the areas that John went through that sort of went away are because in draft 1, that's sort of the T Zones that were applied or where the pd is or something like that. So what's remaining that was not that. So in determining which Zones to apply there, this -- the goal is to identify a prioritization system. So you're correct that some of the bond -- mobility bond corridors are not showing in purple here and again the idea here is to say, well, of these remaining purple areas which are the ones where infrastructure priority has already been identified, such as the mobility corridors. That's coincidental with areas that are defined as either a center or imagine Austin corridor. So that portion I think that you were pointing out where it's a mobility bond corridor is not identified as an imagine Austin corridor. So that's why it's displaying that way. Initially the thinking in figuring out priority is where did imagine Austin set the policy foundation that that's a growth opportunity? Where are the opportunity financial and infrastructure priorities pointing some attention to. Another factor that makes sense is where --

[1:45:52 PM]

this is where -- the pz work is important R is the market strength. Where is the next level high opportunity or the next potential areas. So if we were to, for example, take a map of that, there is the heat map wherever you get the coincidence of those layers that might introduce some ideas about, well, these seem to be the warmer spots, maybe those are priority one. And these are the next warmest spots and those are priority two. So that's the idea. >> Kitchen: I think you guys are saying yes. When it's presented back to us we'll just understand what the criteria went into priority 1 and priority 2. So for example, the mobility bond corridors are long corridors, there's not enough dollars to do everything along every corridor. So it's part of the mobility process that's part of the priority. So when we come back with codenext, the first priorities for land use planning, for small area planning, I would expect to see that align with the areas on those corridors that are the top priority unless there's a reason not to. So, for example,, councilmember Casar has been talking about a north area of burnet around rundberg and so if that rises to the top for that corridor, then we'll want to understand does it also rise to the top for this land use. So that's the level -- it's that kind of detail, that level of detail of coordination between the mobility bond planning process and codenext that I think I'm hearing you say you will be doing. Right? >> And I think we're very excited about the opportunity here because you can actually be talking about your mobility investments along with your land use

[1:47:53 PM]

aspirations along with an understanding of where there's likelihood of development activity in the near -
- in the midterm or in the future such that they're not separate decisions of mobility because we're
counting number of people moving land use. It's actually allowing you to really integrate your policy
foundations regarding land use and transportation and the opportunity of where development is likely
to go. >> Kitchen: The second question, which is a little different question, is a logistical area. With
regard to the small area planning, I think there's a section of the code right now that. >> Of proposed
codenext and the process of things. So I imagine Austin or I guess I'm asking when you come back -- you
will come back with the second version of the map, but you're also going to be coming back with the
second version of the code, if I'm understanding correctly. So with the second version of the code will
there be edits to that chapter or division, I forget what it is, on small area planning that will provide us
some detail about the process for small area planning? >> Yes. We're taking a look at of course
everything that was in draft 1 and still taking in the comments and everything like that. We will be
relooking at the process. I can't tell you just from a staffing perspective. We have thought about it
somewhat so far and right now we have one team of planners working on small area plans. Okay,
neighborhood plan, and working on the north shoal creek plan right now. Our thought would be once
we're done with codenext that we would basically reorganize our department, basically take people
who work on codenext and work on small neighborhood areas plans and probably spreading some of
the staff members who worked on the nitty-gritty details of codenext and spreading them among

[1:49:54 PM]

these two teams because they would be the most familiar with the new code and they could be the
ones immediately working on the small area plans once we're done. >> Kitchen: Okay. That sounds
good. I think there's two things here. There's the language we write into the code about how it should
work. And I would be interested in that being sort of the best practice because we have a real
opportunity here with our change to our land development code to write our section on small area
planning as a best practice. Now, I understand that that may mean that there are some resource issues.
That's a separate question. And so at the appropriate time you guys will need to tell us that in order to
implement what we're talking about you might need X. So that's fine. I just want to be sure that we're
not writing the small area plan section of the development code on existing resources. I want it on best
practices. Does that make sense? >> Yes, ma'am. >> Okay. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, Mr. Flannigan. Flan flan
what do small area plans do that small development doesn't do? Right now we have a requested zoning
map, requested changes to zoning, which is what you deal with every Thursday. And then we have once
every 30 year exercises like this when we look at the city all at once. When you do a small area plan you

take a much closer, like a magnifying glass. You look much closer and not looking at someone making a request for change, but looking at the status quo and saying is the zoning appropriate, are the land uses appropriate. You're having an awful lot of kind of proactive community outreach, stakeholder meetings, you know, meetings on Saturdays and school cafeterias to really get input from the community on what they want to see in their neck of the woods rather than just dealing with proposed changes from developers. And it allows us to look

[1:51:55 PM]

at multiple systems, that's what Peter was alluding to, look at mobility, look at education, look at connectivity, look at, you know, a wide variety of infrastructure, look at a wide variety of factors and take a holistic approach albeit in a small area, but take a holistic approach rather than just dealing with people's requests for change. >> Flannigan: But isn't that what we're doing with codenext as a whole? >> It is, but we're looking at the entire city. >> Flannigan: I don't see how you do holistic planning one small area at a time. >> I think it's difficult to look at all these multitude of factors when you're doing the whole city all at once as opposed to having the time to take the opportunity and time to do a small area one piece at a time. >> Flannigan: But this is precisely the charge that we have, is it not, that we're doing all this planning at the same time? I don't understand how you can plan one neighborhood and in a small area separate from understanding the system. >> Kitchen: What we're doing now is a zoning exercise, not a planning exercise, but I'll let our consultants answer that. They can probably give some examples. Planning gives you an opportunity to actually put together all the things that are going on in the city. It helps you direct where you put your investments. It helps you make sure that you're getting the kind of community that you want and that's possible in the area. I'll stop speaking. You guys can speak to it much better in terms of what small area planning is and the difference between small area planning and zoning. >> Yeah. They really are different. I do -- I think we know that in your practice of discussion of planning and zoning in your city they are often very much one and the same. So it's hard to parse out what the difference is, but as others have said, the planning, creating the plan is to engage and talk about a range of things beyond

[1:53:55 PM]

just the zoning and land use. To talk about transportation, to talk about parks and open space, to talk about economic development, to talk about a whole range of things. And that adoption of that plan is then your policy document from which there are, as I think about it, basically three realms of action. Regulatory, infrastructure and partnerships. And in the regulatory realm that's zoning, right? What in our current -- in this new plan did the plan set new policies that identify new regulatory changes to be

made in order to implement the plan? That's one tool. What did the plan identify with regard to mobility or infrastructure or flooding, flood mitigation. Other things that are not zoning, that then begin to inform your cip, that may begin to inform how you prioritize bond spending. So that's the infrastructure bucket. And the third piece on implementation of plans, we often think about it in terms of partnership. That the implementation of the vision of a neighborhood or for a city, is not all 100% on the shoulders of the government. That you rely greatly on other partners, whether non-profit, whether business, where there are other jurisdictions to implement your vision. So cap metro is -- you don't completely control cap metro, but there certainly is a lot potentially about what happens with regard to your transit system that will shape the future of your opportunity for zoning and all these other things? So the plan is really the time to engage with community, define the what is the aspiration and then identify what are the -- of those three buckets, what are the kind of tools that we need to have in place to implement.

[1:55:55 PM]

So it's not -- planning and zoning are just not one thing. Hope that helps. >> Flannigan: No, it's completely unhelpful. [Laughter]. It's entirely unhelpful. And I understand, councilmember, where you're going, but this is not -- the community thinks this is what we're doing. The community is looking at a map that we put out and it's not just a toolbox. If we were just rewriting the text, tweaking the text, that would be one thing. But we will now have a map on top of a map, on top of a map. So no, but we've got a zoning map and we'll have a draft map and we'll see another revision. And then on top of that we'll say we're assigning all new Zones to your neighborhood, but don't worry we'll come back and do a small area plan later. What was point of the first map? >> Kitchen: Let me just say something. Let me take one little piece of what he spoke to. Let's talk about infrastructure. When you're looking at the map you're not seeing anything on the map about whether there's -- whether there's a street light, whether there's a stop sign, whether there is a high pedestrian hybrid pee can, whether there's -- bee can, whether there's a sidewalk, whether there's other things like that. So just drilling down on one little piece of what he talked about, that's not zoning. That's planning. >> Flannigan: But aren't we making great assumptions on that as we assign zoning? >> Kitchen: No, we are not. We are not assuming where -- we are not assuming where the -- where the lights might go, for example. I'm just trying to give you some concrete examples. So the other thing to remember is you don't small area plan the entire city. That's not what we're talking about here. So there are huge parts of the city that the zoning is it. You know, it's just -- you're talking about small area planning where you have this confluence of opportunity. Where you have a confluence of activity on your transportation investments, you know, on -- you know, on where the market might want to build affordable housing, for example. Where you have some other kinds of things that can come together,

[1:57:55 PM]

you know, and that's where do you a small area plan. Like this -- the waterfront plan. I'm forgoing the name of it. ' -- I'm forgetting the name of it. That's an example of one. We have these already in the city that we do. So it's different than zoning and small area planning is not appropriate, nor does it [lapse in audio] Everywhere in the city. >> Flannigan: So why do I see neighborhood plans in the city now? >> Names are different than small area plans. We're not talking about neighborhood plans now. We're talking about small area plans, which are two different things. >> Flannigan: Are they two different things? >> Well, we've typically referred to as neighborhood planning. We have a neighborhood planning that started here in the early 2000s. We've done multiple neighborhood plans. We currently have one underway. What we're looking at now is kind of a re-engineering of our neighborhood planning program. Neighborhood plans, small area plans have been used interchangeably in the past. But we're looking at doing is the existing neighborhood plans are for a larger area. As I said, several square miles. We're looking at kind of putting a mar laser like -- more laser like focus and looking a the smaller areas in the past to discuss specific issues that we've discussed. >> Just by example of our experience in Denver, right? Our experience in Denver. Codenext is about a new zoning map for the city. And so in some places as draft 1 is proposing, some areas are proposed to be rezoned to Zones that allow more development, right? Where imagine Austin has identified priorities for growth. In other -- so that's sort of an example of how rezoning of the city you can increase the entitlement changing from the existing to a new range of entitlement, right? But the whole city is not being proposed in draft 1 to be increasing entitlement

[1:59:57 PM]

everywhere. And primarily because and for reasons why these additional maps and requests for these other plans have -- have emerged is that there needs to be additional plan direction and policy direction to make a change from the status quo to something different. In Denver we did exactly the same thing. We rezoned the whole city. Some areas got up zoned, some areas just carried forward essentially what was comparable to the previous zoning because, in the latter case, because we didn't have enough -- on a citywide scale we didn't have enough local plan policy guidance, and so we followed up with new plans that updated old plans or completed plans that were underway while we were rezoning the whole city, and then they subsequently were rezoned using the new zoning code. And in some cases the entitlements increased, but there was more clear guidance in the plan in order to enact those. And as we said, while codenext is an ambitious project of rezoning the city, it's not the last time you're going to have rezonings in your city. And there are just some areas that right now are the highest priority attention to rezone and you have the most opportunity to yield a development that is in alignment with your imagine Austin goals of how do you accommodate growth in the best way. And then other places these areas that we're identifying for the next plan sets are the high -- become the priority for providing

you with more guidance for figuring out which Zones would be appropriate to apply. >> The only other thing I'll

[2:01:58 PM]

add is on the map I've seen this the presentation, it seems to be very specific based on the graphics that are in the imagine Austin, but as we've been told many, many times, the centers are not those clearly defined circles, they are not that clear. And I think it's also important to note not every pud is an active pud or represents the current desire. The pud that cuts into the lake line station area is not actively happening. It's an old pud. It's before it gets built is probably going to be redone completely. So I don't want the community to look at this and kind of zoom all the way in and say my house is just outside that little blue area so I'm not going to have to worry about anything. It's not that clear. >> Councilmember Flannigan, I think that's a real important point that both the quarter mile we're showing off the imagine Austin corridors and the literally someone drew a perfect circle are not intended to be completely indicative of all the parcels that would be looked at. It's just, again, a representation. And I think you bring up a good point about the puds. When one looks at prioritization, it could be that a major landowner comes and says you know, we're in this pud, we're open to relooking at this and that can change some of the prioritization. The map was trying to do a couple things at the same time. Say where in your city do you have very easy opportunities to think about changing the zoning, right? And it was removing some of those places where either planning had already happened, so the small area plans, east Riverside or north burnet gateway, and it included puds and even those other [inaudible] They are still opportunities to relook at them, right? So yes. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar. >> Casar: And I think that what's being discussed here is sort of a matter of degree in that I hear from the

[2:03:59 PM]

consultants and councilmember kitchen, I think I understand that -- from thinking about some of the neighborhood plans in my district there are some nonzoning things whereas the street punched through, whereas the light we're not scoped to get done during codenext and that there's future zoning that we will have to do. In so far as the small air plans hits those things that seems to make sense, but I think I do agree with could of councilmember Flannigan's concerns if we go back to the big rezoning of big areas it sends the message in codenext we're going to rezone your area, but don't worry about in a because we're coming back to do it really soon. So I think it's just important for us to get done now what is right to get done now and to take this opportunity, nor would I would to not do what's best in codenext in a particular area because we're kicking the can down the road to get it done in some future planning effort if right now we have a comprehensive citywide opportunity to achieve more of the

mobility goals and social goals of the plan. I think it's a matter of degree and I would just feel most comfortable with it existing the way that it's been described as there's going to be future planning that we have to do and we can't do a comprehensive rewrite every time there's future planning we have to do. And also though I do have concerns about making sure that the small area planning that we do set up for the future is different than the way we've done the neighborhood plans because as our audit laid out that our current process -- having grass roots planning is very important so there's people on the ground that can be making part of those decisions, but clearly we are cleaning up in codenext the way some of those older plans have inhibited as our staff have agreed to as are impediments to fair housing reports have agreed to have inhibited affordability and other

[2:05:59 PM]

citywide goals. I think it's really important if we are laying out time for future graphics planning that we get that done and have that local knowledge but address things from our audit that say things like of the 253 people they worked with on contact teams, only seven identified as renters and none were officers of any contact team. Or that from our fair housing report agreeing with the findings of that report that we need to change the way that in fill options can be blocked by a small group of folks at the cost of some citywide goals. And so I'm a supporter of that grass roots level of planning, but we just have to make sure that we don't wind up back in the same place where we're at where we need to make sure those citywide goals are mayor mount as we continue to do that work in the future. -- Paramount. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool. >> Pool: Okay, easy question on the handout where it says imagine Austin, are those all of them or only some of them? I got the sense from councilmember kitchen's comments that that was an incomplete map but I can't tell. >> The intent was to indicate all centers so we can verify that, but the intent as to show all centers. >> Pool: That was what was thinking too. And then the quarter mile buffer would be the same. I think the one map that maybe was a little confusing was when we get into the purple, that those are the areas that haven't been covered by the first iteration of the text and the mapping. >> Councilmember pool, are you referring to slide 7? >> Pool: I am. Thank you. >> And again, it's just where we removed [inaudible] Attempting to implement the neighborhood plans to imagine Austin, small area plans where

[2:08:00 PM]

you have customized zoning and puds. These are kind of those areas where we just don't have -- more fine grain plan direction to move forward with. >> Pool: That's exactly what the future land use maps and the neighborhood plans are providing you is the more granular information on how the zoning should be applied. And also represents a lot of hard work and diligent efforts on our staff's part over the

years and also the people who live in the vicinity and the people who own businesses who are also involved. And the people who live there are both renters and owners. So I think that on the alignment with the existing neighborhood plans and the flums and keeping the growth concept map in mind along with the neighborhood plans and the flums, we should have important context for each neighborhood and provide necessary guidance to achieve the goals and promote the priorities of imagine Austin, and then I just have the question can you talk a little bit more or clarify more about how the mapping decisions were made with regard to how you integrated the neighborhood plans and why they were important. >> Tovo: Mayor, can I interrupt for a minute? Councilmember pool, I wasn't clear what you were reading from. You probably introduced it but I missed it. >> Pool: What I was literally reading from is the council message board with the questions that I posted. So I wanted to make sure that I -- >> Tovo: Okay. Thank you. >> Pool: -- Talked from the points I had made and also we're trying to refer to the questions we had posted. >> Tovo: I get that. I wasn't clear what the introductory matter was coming from. Thanks. >> When we were considering the maps [inaudible] First attempt at the map, we did consider the neighborhood plans. We did consider, of course, the flums which are part of the neighborhood plans. Considered the text of the neighborhood plans as well.

[2:10:00 PM]

We considered the existing zoning, including sometimes [inaudible]. We considered the existing land use because the existing land use and existing zoning don't always match. We considered -- boy, a wide variety of factors. I'm trying to get them all. We also considered imagine Austin. We have received some criticism about -- well, my future land use map, my neighborhood plan says this and this is the zone proposed in codenext and how do those two sync together. I think that is something that the answer to that is we had to consider a variety of factors and that's solely one factor when making that decision. So while the neighborhood plan Flum may have said [inaudible] And we may have allowed a transect zone that allows more than one unit, we are considering factors from imagine Austin, for example, to say that identify corridors and areas of opportunity for growth. We considered, of course, the housing blueprint, even though it just came out recently we kind of were aware of it when it was underway. So all these things were factors that went into making the proposed mapping decisions. We do not, of course, think just like the text that the map is ready to be adopted. We have, you know, spent the past -- since the end of April taking input on it. The mayor and I will be doing some more on it this evening. So we do understand that there is some people who identify one single component of city policy and say you're not complying with this, you have to change it. My response to that is we have multiple [inaudible] Sometimes conflicting city policies and plans that are all factored together at the same time. And we do not feel that we got it perfect the first time and we're hearing people and we're going to be making changes. Sometimes some major changes for some areas, but that would be my answer to what went into it.

[2:12:01 PM]

>> Pool: That's really helpful and also kind of gives a sense of just exactly how broad the waterfront is for the items that you're including and also the many years that you've worked on each of those areas. And we certainly don't want to lose any of that because a good portion of the city has a lot of investment in time and effort and intellectual rigger in sense of making sense of planning and zoning literally the streets where we live. >> And good will. People working on these things we're not saying the months or year working to put into that plan we're throwing that away, we got a new idea. People may disagree that we did take all these things into consideration. >> Pool: And I think that's really well taken and we're not usurping all the previous efforts with something that we may come up with around the dais. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Garza. >> Garza: I just want to make sure as we're calibrating the metrics on what's a small area or to the questions councilmember kitchen was asking, you know, if there are about priorities for growth, what has happened in the past, you know, imagine Austin a lot of the priorities for growth were in north centrallish, airport, and a lot of -- a lot of what was put into that plan this last mobility bond funded a lot of those plans that had been on the shelf. And so it left out a lot of south Austin. We were able to get some things in there, thankfully, but I just don't -- however we calibrate this, I want to make sure, you know, there's a plan and then there's what happens and we're seeing in my district and where the land is cheaper you're seeing a lot of growth, but they are not part of this conversation

[2:14:02 PM]

sometimes. They don't, you know, just being on cap metro, the infrastructure there, the bus service there is horrible, so however we're calibrating this, just keep that in mind that we're, you know, considering that whatever -- when we make these plans, they guide a lot. They guide mobility bonds, they guide infrastructure improvements and has left parts of the city out of those infrastructure improvements conversations. So however that's calibrated, please just keep that in mind. >> Mayor Adler: That's important to. >> Kitchen: May I speak to it? Yes, I think that -- and I think you all may have mentioned some of the other tools that are out there, but that component where growth is actually happening has got to be a key criteria in what y'all are looking at. I think you said that. I would be curious, we don't have to go into detail now, is this pleasant valley here or maybe something elsewhere there's just a break in it. Is that pleasant valley? Yeah, so there's not purple along pleasant valley, for example, and that's an area of growth. So just I guess one of the criteria that needs to be considered and perhaps the major driving criteria is where growth is actually happening. >> Yeah, councilmember, I think that's -- when I was speaking earlier, we did talk about identifying some priority areas right now, pre-identifying them, but I also like to keep available, but a tactical team ready for unexpected events. Sometimes an area of town becomes hot. Luckily we've done the south central plan, but highland mall

announces they are closing. Sometimes there's a need very quickly to be able to go out in an area and go, okay, this is an area that has not had a -- you know, a tight focus

[2:16:04 PM]

before and for us to go out and take a look at that. That's the kind of thing I was referring to. >> Mayor Adler: And you talk about the corridors in the mobility plan that we funded. We also had the next series of those and I think that's one of the ways we were looking at where the growth would occur and I would hope and expect that things would also rise to be a priority area because we've identified those and we've actually put the money together to begin planning for those as well too. Councilmember Garza, did you want to finish? >> Garza: I don't know if this is going to be part of the discussion on thousand these are formed, but the southeast contact team, for example, many of the original participants, they had a hard time getting actual homeowners and I don't know if that's why one of the criteria was homeowners or business owners. So thankfully many of them got together, landlords, but the majority of that was business owners and landowners who didn't live in that area. And so I think people as a result of 10-1 have become more engaged in the process and I would be happy to try to get those, but if we could make it so -- there's a percentage of actual residents that are part of that planning is really important. >> As councilmember Casar referred to, there were some things we need to pay closer attention to when we're looking at who participates in these plans. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: So I -- I just want to make a couple observations and comment about the neighborhood planning audit. It continues to be cited and I believe that it's probably time for us to have a full council discussion about it. In my opinion there were several real failings of that audit so if it's going to direct further policy action, I think we just need to have a conversation about it as a full council and really address them head on. And I would say there have been several allegations of

[2:18:04 PM]

them, -- analyses of them, but I'm uncomfortable with casting aspersions on the value of our neighborhood, that community members have spent hours and hours and hours of staff time, business owner time, resident time, and all of the taxpayer resources that have gone into and the valuable staff expertise from our watershed to our development staff to our planning and review to -- you know, those represent a very broad allocation of resources from our staff and our community and I believe they have value. And so if we're going to start really having discussions about that, I would like to do that in a full and thorough manner and not kind of use it as an assumption going forward. But while we're talking about neighborhood plans, I need to say a couple things. I'm looking back, and I haven't spent a lot of time doing this, but I've been spending time reading the proposed code and trying to

understand the differences and whatnot, but going back to our original understanding about what we were undertaking, it was certainly clear that we were undertaking a rewrite of the land development code. But there were a lot of conversations about how radical that was going to be and we settled on a middle -- the council directed a middle position. And while certainly it was clear that the land development code rewrite was not just to simplify matters and to bring it into -- and that it was to bring it into closer alignment with imagine Austin, but never do I recall, and I'm going to go back and see if I'm wrong, but I would say I don't believe the community understood and perhaps some of us on council that we were undertaking a rezoning of the entire city. And so I've heard some of that discussion here today about rezoning the entire city. That was really not -- I don't believe that that was really the community's understanding of what we were undertaking here. That being said, I would -- and I appreciate the

[2:20:05 PM]

conversation and your response, Mr. Rusthoven, about what guided those changes, and I think we need and you really have to some extent today acknowledged that in certain mapping suggestions you have veered from the neighborhood -- from the council adopted neighborhood plans and the associated zoning. And so, you know, I appreciate you acknowledging that because, you know, our community is really responding to that. I would say that if what we had before us with regard to the maps were really -- were not diverging so widely from the neighborhood plans that are -- that are currently adopted policy, I think we would have a lot less anxious in the community -- angst. I would encourage you as you undertake the revisions to bring the mapping closer in assignment with those neighborhood plans. If we want to incentivize increased number of units on those tracts, we've talked about some ways to do that, but I believe we should be and actually imagine Austin directs that the land development code not override, not dramatically veer from the neighborhood plan. And I just wanted to read a little bit of 207. It talks about the charter. That imagine Austin. This is the section that is subtitled revise Austin's development regulations and acknowledges that achieving these goals are going to require comprehensive review and revision of the land development code, efforts. Then it goes on to talk about the existing neighborhood and area plans were crafted within the context of this code, decisions were reached based upon assumptions of the continued utilization of the provisions. Any suggested rewrite of the city code while striving to achieve the broad of the -- must recognize these carefully compromised and system suns upon which is neighborhood plans were based.

[2:22:05 PM]

And continued protection and preservation of existing neighborhoods in a natural environment must be considered top priorities of comprehensive revisions to the city code. The consequences and impact of additional density and in fill in existing neighborhoods must be carefully identified and analyze to do avoid endangering the existing character of neighborhoods and ex and and -- and ex Sasser baiting issues. It really varies district by district as we've talked about in some of these work sessions and some areas where it's been pointed out this veers from the neighborhood plan, I've heard okay, we're planning on bringing that into assignment. The intent was to bring it into alignment. Those were in some of the more recent plans. But recognizing that in areas that I represent and in areas -- some areas councilmember Renteria rents and councilmember Houston and councilmember pool and some in councilmember alter's district, the recommendations veer rather widely from the neighborhood plan -- plans. And so when he with -- I think we are seeing an enormous and really in my opinion unnecessary amount of concern and anxiety and feelings of frustration and a lack of trust among a broad array of our community. I am hearing from probably hundreds of people and including lots and lots of people who have not been engaged in city issues, neighborhood issues, land use issues, because of that split. And I think we would build a lot more consensus around adopting a new land development code if we brought these into assignment. And then I would just close by saying -- so again, I would hope that you would take that into consideration as you are making the revisions. We all got a very good email just a few minutes [inaudible] Or a little while ago from Mary reed of the Clarksville community development corporation, which has been actively engaged in restoring

[2:24:10 PM]

and keeping houses affordable within the Clarksville neighborhood and I think they very well capture -- you know, some of these concerns and why it's important especially in an area where they are really striving to maintain some ain aabilitiability which has rapidly gentrified and become more expensive. On where I hope we'll go in achieving community consensus and a land development code I believe will still reflect the goals and envisions of imagine Austin but doing so in a way more consistent with the commitments we made. >> I received Ms. Reed's email as well as will make sure the consultants get a copy. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan. >> Flannigan: Mayor pro tem, can you tell me which of the neighborhood plans has succeed understand maintaining affordability for those neighborhoods? Within the work sessions is the right way to do it. I think it would be a great idea to sit and explore the adopted council -- the council adopted neighborhood plans. Almost I would say the ones I'm most familiar with identified affordable housing as a key priority. Have they -- have the neighborhood plans in and of themselves helped reveres the economic trends affecting our city, no, but I don't think there's a silver bullet on that. And, you know, I think Mr. Mr. Hockenyos would be the best to talk about that. >> Flannigan: I think if the neighborhood plans we have have done a great job at solving some problems, then I'd like to know which ones have and what problems they solved. As you know, my district does not have any neighborhood plans. So if there's some magic combination of uses and restrictions and whatever it

[2:26:11 PM]

is those neighborhood plans are doing, then I think there may be lessons to be learned there. That I haven't heard communicated. >> Tovo: And I think probably they haven't been communicated because we haven't spent significant time as a new council talking about neighborhood plans or either broadly or in specifics -- in specific detail, nor have we really adopted any. I don't think our council has reviewed neighborhood plans, but the ones I'm familiar with, they up zoned properties, they identified areas where they wanted to see increased density. I would point you to Bouldin creek. The assumption is neighborhood plans place lots of restrictions, in many cases they identified areas of stability and areas of change, areas where they could accommodate the additional density that the city made clear was a priority, but also identified areas they wanted to see more preservation of the existing type of housing. You see neighborhood plans that adopted things like small lot amnesty which allowed for small tracts to be built on for the first time. There were neighborhoods plans that adopted accessory dwelling units long before council took up a revision to it. A lot of neighborhood plans you saw ability for increasing types that wouldn't have otherwise existed. I think there's a lot more complexity to neighborhood plans and frankly a tremendous amount of value that just talking about them here and then we have a difficult time I think -- it's not broadly known. But I would love to have a conversation and really look in detail at some of the neighborhood plans because, again, they represent tremendous amount of city staff time and community time and made some really careful and very thoughtful decisions about the direction that those -- that those neighborhoods were moving and how best to do that in a way that had city goals as well as local community priorities.

[2:28:12 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar. >> Casar: And I don't think that folks here are trying to talk about whether neighborhood plans and the intentions and work are all good or all bad. I recognize the amount of staff time and community time is built on people doing their best given what they know at the time and what priorities are at the time. I'm pretty sure from flipping through neighborhood plans important work was done to protect the environment in a city that was growing at a rapid pace and doing what it was we could based on information folks had then across a long period of time. I don't think it's unfair to take a look back and see what things were done well and what places we need improvement at this time. And I think what we know and what's laid out I think really well in the code diagnosis on housing is that zoning districts that encourage high quality, small footprint, medium to high density housing types like those that exist through walkable neighborhoods are almost completely missing from the land development code and these are the types that can provide diverse and more affordable housing housing choices. While there is no simple way to take advantage of these tools now and unfortunately few of those

neighborhood plans chose to apply those tools to date. Under our current code we cannot easily provide a range of housing choices of different affordable options even in locations where it would be appropriate. That's not to say that that everything that we've done in the past is wrong and that we all would have known better and done it better then. It's just to say that today, given the opportunity we have, we can recognize the things that make sense and work for us as a representative body working really closely with the community over of course of many months and years and do our best to keep what the things that we think work best and tweak and change the dials on things based on the needs of our growing city.

[2:30:13 PM]

I think that that level of us admitting what things we think worked and disagreeing about things we think we want to change is fine and I would not want to imply that the whole thing was bad or the whole thing was perfect. I think we need to focus what things we want to keep in them. Have honest disagreements about things need to change but as far as I can tell and the consultants and staff and folks that review this agree there are things that need improvements especially relates to the type of housing types we allow to be produced and that means we have to go back and change some things folks worked on really hard in the past, that's okay. That's part of what we've been elected and tasked to do because my constituents -- the large, large, large majority of them don't ever think that they or unfortunately their kids will ever be able to buy a house in Clarksville. They just want the chance to stay where it is they are or be able to live for a while longer wherever it is they are at \$600 a month for their apartment. And if we want to be able to produce that, that means creating more income restricted units and smaller and missing stick built units that we need. If I was to see somewhere where I think a the look of those income restricted units have been built in one particular area, it has been in uno and west campus where we've seen a huge -- being built because of a smaller area that got planned out to do that work. And so I do see the value in doing that work to address a need and right now we have lots of needs. So we need to change from where we're at and that's not to cast aspersions on the past, it's just to learn from it. >> Mayor, I believe unless you feel otherwise, we covered all the items on the agenda with the exception of parking and flooding. We are about to lose the consultants in 15 minutes. They have planes to catch. So we also have Jose Guerra

[2:32:15 PM]

from the watershed protection department to answer any questions you have regarding flooding, but -- >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Why don't you guys start. >> With regard to parking we do not have any sort of presentation prepared. But we have heard a lot about parking. We have heard a lot of concern about

the reductions codenext proposals with regard to parking. We do understand that folks have issues with on-street parking and the amount of on-street parking that includes in some neighborhoods. Codenext does not contemplate or have any changes to the residential parking program. That's a separate matter in the a priority of codenext. We do feel there's a balance to be made. Parking costs money and, you know, we are spending a lot of time talking about affordability so the cost of providing parking is built into the cost of rent or a mortgage. And to the ability [inaudible] Does not have to provide parking that helps contribute to affordability. It also makes a space available for -- what some consider [inaudible] Or a space sitting empty waiting for a car to be in it. We are taking a look at those as we work on the draft 2. So I think that that's where we're at and we're available for any questions about parking. >> Kitchen: I have questions. >> Mayor Adler: Let's go back. Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: I wonder if you could very quickly summarize exactly what the parking changes are. And I've not been submitting the same question over and over again, but I think it would serve as a good model for all of these. Like what is currently allowed the changes being proposed for lmdr, for 3, what are the changes for t4 and changes for

[2:34:15 PM]

ads. I have heard 50% reductions thrown about. I think it would be helpful perhaps in the next draft to have an information sheet about those. I could ask questions all the time about reductions in parking and I couldn't summarize how those move from -- if you could just tell us sf-3 requirements for the main requirements and Adu, lmdr, 3, -- t3 and t4. >> I don't have that off the top of my head. Typically parking space is based on use not necessarily the zoning category. Generally speaking there's some things I can repeat and I can put together a fact sheet and post that up on the message board. >> Tovo: That would be -- let's do it to the Q and a. >> Generally speaking I've heard concerns about the fact for a retail establishment under 2500 square feet there is no proposed parking in codenext. Today's code requires two parking spaces per dwelling unit. Codenext cuts that in half. I believe for the Adu's it goes to possibly half a space. But I actually do not have on the top of my head the parking rights for all the things you mentioned. It's all in the draft, but I can provide a summary. >> Tovo: That would be great. Seems to me it's in different places so it's just a little hard to get the full picture. If you have the ability to do a summary sheet that would be valuable. How do you create a half space and what value is it. >> A car to go. A half a space is just that -- we already have in existing code half space requirements untimed there are situations where you have multiples of something. Might be one and a half space per hotel room. When you have 50 hotel rooms, you can go ahead and do that math. >> Tovo: What happens if you

[2:36:16 PM]

have one Adu but not two. Two you are required one space, one, does that round up or round down? Does it round down to zero or up to one? >> The way in the current code, I would have to see if this is proposed to change, we would round that up. >> Tovo: Okay. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: So when you talk about parking spaces, eventually we're going to be balancing a lot of competing interests, as you talked about earlier, because you had conflicting policy direction. It will be real important I think to be able to identify and to understand what the tradeoffs are with respect to those kinds of choices, parking is an example. There's a tradeoff with impervious cover, there's a tradeoff with cost, there's a tradeoff with safety, there's off with lots of things. I don't know if there's a way to quantify that in modeling or otherwise, but just put that thought in the being bazitski of your mind. >> There's a gentleman who wrote a into on it called the high cost of park and addressing just that. >> Kitchen: I have a similar comment. The question really is for consideration, in deciding on the number of parking spaces, for example, is there a way to account for where we're talking about? So, for example, some of our streets can handle parking along the streets than others having to do with their width. In some places there aren't sidewalks so people are walking in the street. So if you have a lot of parking that creates a difficulty. Instead of just tying the criteria to the size of the unit or the zoning category, is there a way to -- I would like to suggest or ask if there's a way to also consider how it relates to the street.

[2:38:16 PM]

>> Councilmember, I think that is certainly something we can consider. I don't think it has been considered up to this point, but I understand your point. It would be such that -- >> Mayor Adler: Hang on one second. Guys, thanks a lot for staying over a Wednesday to be able to talk to us. Thank you. Do good work in July. [Laughter] >> I do think that's something worth considering. If you have a certain unit on the street that's 30 feet wide different from a street 20 feet wide that is something to consider. It would add a layer of complexity, but that's something we could take into consideration. >> Kitchen: It might be easier to add that complexity now or consider it as opposed to just having all these blanket requirements that apply everywhere and then having to come back later and talk about, well, is it really safe, you know, as we talk about tract by tract. >> Not every street is the same. Ask you guys to think about that. >> Sure. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar. >> Casar: I've already sent this comment to the consultants, but it keys off your comments on parking and how we balance it on other things. But I think it best fits into our prior topic which is just imagine Austin. In that imagine Austin is more than the growth concept map. There are goals we're trying to hit and instead of talking about just parking spaces and isolation, I want to talk about it in the context as much as possible of the really big goals that we put in the plan. For example, we are trying to break the trend of vehicle miles traveled going to 36 million miles and bring that down. Land area -- we want it to be 120 square miles. We want a mowed shift out of single occupancy cars into transit. We obviously want a shift from big, single-family homes and really big apartment complexes

[2:40:16 PM]

to different kinds of house goes types of a certain percentage some of which is put out in the plan. So it's really hard for me to explain why it is we're doing the big things we're doing what we're trying to get done citywide. We put some of those goals down into our strategic plans and sometimes I'm hearing through envision tomorrow that some of those outputs are getting spit out but I don't see them put in one place. It was useful to hear at the last presentation that it's predicted that under the staff and the consultant's plan that's being presented a small but significant decrease in projected impervious cover. Unfortunately there's also a small but significant increase in demolition of below market rate units. I want to figure out what dials it is we change if we want to turn that tide back. I also want to know how many income restricted units we're generating and figure how we generate the maximum possible while meeting our other goals. To do that I think we need a dashboard that best indicates what we think is going to happen under the current trend and then how it is that codenext helps. Not that it's going to solve all of our problems, but how it is we project it could given certain market conditions that we have to plug in, how we think it could help. Sounds like some of those things are in pieces, but in the comp plan we have it in one place, how we want to improve affordability, reduce damage to Edwards aquifer and that's all here and show the community this is a citywide process with citywide goals is helpful. If there's certain streets that have to be different, let's get some of the big stuff done so we can complain it and know whether it's good or -- explain it and know where it's good or not. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool. >> Pool: I've got a question for Matt hall Holland, I think

[2:42:18 PM]

we're going to talk about flooding now. >> Yes. Matt Holland -- >> Mayor Adler: Hang on a second. >> Tovo: Before we hit flooding, councilmember Casar, you mentioned have submitted a question. I was look ago to the Q and a. I don't know if it hasn't been updated. >> Casar: Probably hasn't been updated. We sent it in but I imagine it hasn't popped up yet. It's similar to what I laid out which is can you put in one place, generate in one place the metrics we anticipate that we could hit with the new code compared to the status quo knowing they may not have measured all but some like the loss in below 60% market rate units, the increase in income restricted units, impervious cover, potential vehicle miles traveled, those type of things. >> Tovo: Did you email it to the consultants or submit it through the Q and a? >> Casar: I hope we've done both. >> Tovo: I'm hoping our questions are all getting submitted. >> Casar: That's my hope is for everybody to know the questions and I'm airing it off the cuff but it probably will read better than I said it. >> The short answer to your question is yes. >> Tovo: And I just -- I know that you're working extremely hard on these sessions and other sessions and probably the reason that we haven't gotten some answers to the questions that we submitted through the Q and a is because of that, but I wanted to say one of the pieces of information we asked for back on April 18th when we first [inaudible] Was the number of -- as you are projecting the number of housing units generated by t4, 3,

several of us, councilmember Houston and kitchen and others asked for that broken down by districts. The consultants indicated they had that information. My question number 2 added additional questions but did ask that question again, but we still current gotten an

[2:44:19 PM]

answer. I understand that part of this is a time constraint, but I hope you all understand a lot of that was information constituents asked me for and I was looking for to help inform our mapping comments which are due next week. Again, we're -- as we're talking about time line, I just need for people to understand the kind of accelerated time line we're on has made it difficult to get the information we need to respond to the deadlines in appropriate fashion. That's just one avenue we need to understand where these units are projected so we can understand what the impact is and the value is in particular areas. If there's any way to get a partial answer to 2, that would be helpful. But the additional level of -- in northern Arkansas historic districts, the units projected -- the nuns projected near under utilized -- not under utilized, the numbers projected in areas adjacent to schools that have been identified for potential closure. You know, those are really considerations we need to have as we move forward. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool. Flooding. >> Pool: I've got a two-part question for Matt Holland if he wants to make some kind of a presentation. I'll give him that chance, but before we get further, I just want to say it was two or three weeks ago when we were looking at our schedule for the rest of July -- of June, not July, it was clear to me that we would get to today, which was going to be Monday, and have flood mitigation and environmental concerns as the last two topics on the list and we wouldn't have nearly enough time to delve into them and that has borne out. We have about ten minutes before 3:00 at this point, maybe 15. And I'm using up some of them. But the reason I bring it up that way, I want to make sure that when we reconvene for these meetings in August that these two topics be one of the first one or two meetings

[2:46:21 PM]

coming back in. >> [Inaudible] >> Pool: That's great. I think that will also help everybody in their planning. Okay. Matt, did you have a presentation you wanted to make and then I'll ask you a couple of questions. >> No, councilmember, we're just making ourselves available for questions and responses. >> Pool: We know that the new code has some increased benefits for flood mitigation and I would like you to explore those so we can get that out in the public and talk about it. Because I have talked a little about it with my constituents, but I know you guys will be able to explain it way better than me. Would you also talk about the balance between increased [inaudible] With the increased ability to pay a fee in lieu to the regional storm water management program. Rms and P. Just talk generally about the green

infrastructure and the storm water and flood mitigation pieces are and the new rewrite of the code and then talk about the balance between increased regulations and increased ability to pay a fee in lieu. >> And you also wanted the green storm water piece as well? >> Pool: Yes. Thank you. >> Okay. So I'll just give a brief overview of the -- we have two main proposals from a watershed protection standpoint. The first deals with flood mitigation. We have what we believe is a pretty exemplary flood mitigation framework in our code for brand new developments. Few have a green fields development, something that's coming in with law land and you would -- you would compare that project with what you want to put in -- I mean compare the law land with what you want to put in and show what the flood water response is going to be and to forth and so on with a series of design storms and you would put in flood detention if you needed it, provide for proper conveyance and that works

[2:48:21 PM]

really well. What doesn't work well if you have an existing site with impervious cover, maybe an old k-mart, let's take an example, somebody comes in on that site now, they can show that they are probably not going to inies the impervious cover, they might decrease it by 1% and come in and show there's no additional negative impacts. So right now our code basically gives you a free pass and says you don't have to do any flood mitigation on that tract. Many of those properties are in areas that have existing flooding and drainage concerns and so we are asking the community in this ordinance as we know codenext and just the city development in general is bringing a lot of pressure into some of these areas with existing flooding. We're trying to figure out a way to take pressure off of those areas. So we're asking new projects to come in and basically design in a similar way as would a green fields development. It doesn't mean you got a field with one little building. It means you can have a very large project, but you are going to have to integrate in flood conveyance or flood detention or some other flood mitigation measure on your project as you move forward with your development. So that's a big -- that's a big change. And we've had a the look of community discussion about it. We've held some public meetings about these topics in the near past and several years ago when we were trying to develop our codenext proposal. >> Pool: What kind of response are are you getting from residents when you talk about these changes? >> Overwhelmingly positive response from the neighbors and from the community in general, from the environmental community as well. We've had some concerns raised by the development community about cost and ability to integrate that in and so forth. So we will continue to work with folks and talk with how to bet integrate this in and draw up the criteria in our criteria manuals as this potentially moves forward. >> Pool: I think it sort of

[2:50:23 PM]

fits into the development paying for itself which is a piece we have struggled with really actually standing up and continuing to enforce. Based on the green fields policy that you are talking about here, should we adopt it, do you plan to go back and redo some of the modeling for the flood areas because of some of those like the big parking lots, if they have to be mitigated in the future at some point whenever that is, that would definitely have some positive effect on some of the down water storm water. >> That's a good question. Basically our flood models assume a maximum impervious cover. It is possible -- >> Pool: Whether it's built or not. >> Right. And they also -- we definitely depend on the smaller detention ponds and so forth that are put in by developments, but we only put the largest regional storm -- regional storm water controls into our models, so these new ones aren't going to actually be modeled to show to reduce the flood plain in the future. Actually that's a nice segue about how our hard working flood staff is going to be modeling the impact of this -- of this proposal to show what we -- to show the degree of benefit that this would offer if fully implemented. That will be something we will be offering to you all, the council and, of course, the whole community. It will probably take until the end of summer to do that kind of crunching. >> Pool: Did you think any of that will have an impact on the FEMA flood maps? >> I'll defer to my engineering colleagues. >> I think only to the extent based on the -- the actual projects that were designed and permitted that could also be incorporated into the rs and P program that would help with the regional ponds. Flood plain maps are -- only

[2:52:24 PM]

incorporate the regional type of facilities. To the extent it helps funds some of the downstream conveyances, that could also be incorporated so yes, it could have an influence long-term. To the extent it helps facilitate those type of regional facilities. >> Pool: We may not see it but some generation in the future may. >> I wouldn't say how many generations, but certainly when you implement best management practices, it's not a single best management practice implemented in one year that makes the impact. It is kind of a long-term trend. >> Pool: Right. >> By the way, Joe Pantera, watershed protection. >> Gallo: To go back to the balancing between the fee in lieu. >> Yes, so we're going to be offering as we do with water quality controls and urban watershed, offering some form of fee in lieu process. I'm going to refer to Jose in a second, but he want to make this a citywide program that will help -- we don't immediately jump to payment in look on a given project. It is something you work down through a chain of decision-making when you are doing the design. But we do want to mix this, something that is -- that a designer would be able to incorporate into the plan or provide some sort of alternative method to make sure that the benefits are achieved, but some flexibility is also granted. Jose, did you want to add a few? >> Jose Guerra, watershed protection. In addition to what Matt stated, the city of Austin has had a regional storm water management program since 1988, drainage criteria manual. It's part of the guidelines for the program. It wasn't just a payment in lieu of, we also had construction projects in lieu of. In the urban core we've had success over the last few years of developing providing construction improvements and one developer even did a

[2:54:25 PM]

channel in the montopolis neighborhood. So that brings in the urban type of environments that we're having to address, the flood mitigation of urban in fill. The changes. We also need to consider the form of the development. Whereas drainage hydrology used to be impervious cover based only, we need to consider the form of the development as buildings get closer to the curb line, 12-foot behind the curb, storefronts are there. So the need for infrastructure then becomes critical in those corridor areas to that form of development. Then we're stacking more houses on on top of that. There could be flood risk and now is the time to upgrade the drainage alongside the waterlines, sewer lines and what else is needed for that development. >> And I just want to say one of the basic tenets of participating in the rs and P is there not be an adverse impact downstream. A lot of times the down stream con veins improvement is a way of showing there's no adverse impact. >> Pool: The flood mitigation task force can a really good roars and you worked long hours with that group. Did you forward that by any chance to our consultants? Do they have benefit of reading that report? >> I'm not sure -- I'm not certain we have so we will make sure that getting this their hands. >> Pool: Great. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Further? >> Garza: I asked that question yesterday and we were told they did get it. So maybe if you would double-check. Since our flood mitigation folks, but this is more a question for Jerry more on the single-family side, not commercial. As we talk about possibly allowing more units on parcels, for example what is

[2:56:25 PM]

formerly known as sf-3, 2 is the maximum, now it could be 3, I think there's a lot of concern about allowing more units means more impervious cover and that's not the case. Can you talk about that a little bit? >> Sure. As currently proposed, codenext does not increase the impervious cover in the single-family Zones that you are referring and generally across the board maintains impervious cover at today's code levels. When we talk about allowing possibly two units where there were one or three units where there were two allowed, impervious cover would stay the same. So if you have an existing house, today's impervious cover is 45, it would stay the same. Let's say you were allowed to add a second unit and you were already at 45%, you could not have that second unit. If you are at 30%, still have 15 to go, you could have that unit. But the density doesn't translate into impervious cover. A lot of people think it does and it may in the case that I just brought up where you go from 30 to 45, but if you can do 45 today. You can take that same unit, do an addition still one unit, go from 30 to 45 and still be 45. Or under codenext go from one unit to two but still at 45% impervious cover. The way it's contemplated right now in codenext is to not increase the impervious cover at all and in some cases we would allow increased density, but we don't think they are directly tied together as long as the cap stays the same. >> Pool: Is there any movement? >> No, keep in mind we have a draft. >> Garza: Okay. >> Mayor Adler:

Density could be increasing or decreasing the scale of the house, impervious cover, and increasing the number of

[2:58:26 PM]

units. >> Or multi-family going up instead of sideways. >> Mayor Adler: We're going to draw for new places on the council. >> Kitchen: I have a question. >> Mayor Adler: We're going to draw before we leave and I just wanted to let people know that in case people don't want to leave in the way Ellen just did. We're going to draw spots so the council can close off together. >> Kitchen: Just a couple of quick questions. To follow up some, on the modeling that you all are working on, I heard you -- I understand that you are working towards the end of the summer, rough target, I guess. So can you tell us a little bit more about the scope of the modeling? In other words, I assume -- am I correct in assuming that's broken down by watershed, for example? >> That's correct. We're actually just going to be looking at four -- two full watersheds and two pretty large tributaries or sections of watersheds. So we're looking at four study areas around town. The impervious cover analysis that we did, we did citywide, straightforward and were able to crunch through a lot of data in a short period of time. The flood modeling is 'more laborious. We selected core, watershed areas, benefits from this flood mitigation proposal. If you are in an area that's already served by detention, this new regulation is going to have very little impact. There are certain amounts of town that won't have a big delta so we chose country club west watershed which is in district 3. We chose Tannehill branch upper part that has highland mall and so forth in it. We chose the Hancock branch of shoal creek. And also the west Bouldin creek neighborhood which is. >> Kitchen: So will that tell us -- in doing it that way, will that tell us the

[3:00:28 PM]

impact of the changes to the land development code in terms of the zoning? , As opposed to just the changes that you all are proposing on -- on -- you know, going back to the green field? Is the idea behind this to show -- to look at all the changes in the land development code with regard to what can be built on property and what the impact might be on the -- on the watershed? >> Okay. So the -- yes, we're looking at the full picture. >> Okay. >> So it would model what's going on today, with today's code, today's impervious cover, today's conditions. >> Kitchen: Right. >> And then we would layer on to that the new proposed codenext zoning changes and the impervious cover changes that implies, and then layer on to that what would happen if you not only had whatever regional controls, there are not that many in these particular watersheds, but what would happen if you had retrofitted flood controls on to what could be newly developed in those areas and what would be subject to the code. >> Kitchen: Okay. So I understand the time factor, but do you feel confident in -- I mean, we're not choosing -- we're not

looking at all the watersheds, so help me understand if we're missing something by not modeling all the watersheds and if that's a later activity or not or perhaps we aren't missing something, but help me understand because I know we have a lot of watersheds in the city. >> Sure. We have many over, you know -- over 40 to 50, depending on how you count it, in our jurisdiction, but these are -- we believe are representative of the types of watersheds that would be most affected by this particular ordinance. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> We think that -- I mean, we think we're going to get an order of magnitude of how much impact we're going to get from this study. If it shows -- lets -- if it shows hypothetically, wow, there's very little benefit of this proposed change that

[3:02:28 PM]

will be an interesting thing to find out. Well, what if there are very significant positive help, we want to know that. And so I guess at that point maybe we could decide whether we wanted to push that further and to do more analysis. Again, it is a pretty time consuming process, so for four subareas -- >> Kitchen: Sure, I know. >> It's going to take two or three months to do (audio gap) Flood models it would be a pretty overwhelming prospect. I think we'll get good information from these four areas. >> Let me make sure I'm understanding. You mentioned the proposed change. By that do you mean the change -- the code change that makes you measure back to green field or do you mean all the other changes? Because I'm wondering about -- you know, some people might wonder that, okay, so now you can build two units versus one unit or you can build, you know, four units versus one unit. Is the modeling going to tell us what the impact of that aspect of the code changes will have? >> Yes. I don't think it's going to be a very dramatic impact because what they're finding is the impervious cover is virtually identical in both -- with current entitlements and future entitlements with codenext. But we would be using -- so the answer is yes and yes, or whatever is -- all of the above. We're going to be looking at, again, what we got now, what's current conditions, and then what we could expect with codenext, and we don't -- we don't have to turn on the detention initially. We can just say this hasn't been implemented. It's just here comes the codenext zoning and then here comes the codenext zoning with this flood mitigation for redevelopment proposal. >> Kitchen: Okay. Okay. Then last question, then, on the rs&p, are there -- what's different in the code or is there anything different in the proposed code about the -- how the rs&p is being done, from what we do now? >> There essentially is not anything different. We -- like I said, our rs&p

[3:04:30 PM]

program, I stated, it has been around since 1988. The guidelines to the program would bring in more sites to the proposed development, and if they did not want to provide that detention on-site, then we

have the other guidelines of the rs&p program, either a conveyance improvement or a he does tension -
- detention, may be off-site, alternative detention is the last -- but the last option is payment in lieu. >>
But have the guidelines changed? I'm trying to isolate are we doing anything different? >> The
guidelines have not changed. >> I think the major change you'll see is the fact that with the flood
mitigation for redevelopment you will have more potential applicants, but -- >> Kitchen: Okay, okay. >>
But as they go through the process, the guidelines, the criteria are all still the same. There's no
fundamental changes to the rs&p program. >> Okay, all right. Let's see. Okay. That answers my
questions. Thank you. Let me just say -- let me back up. I would think that it would be helpful -- I think
council member pool alluded to this, but when you were all at a point where you were done with the
modeling, I think it would be very helpful to have that presented to us in a work session so we can
actually get -- so we can actually make sure that we're understanding the what tells us and what it
doesn't tell us so we can tell the (audio gap) Because I know that I would not expect you to do all
watersheds but I do know that folks that are living or some folks that are living in watersheds that are
not being modeled are going to want to ask why and what can they (audio gap). >> Right. I think we're
going to be able to -- the different watersheds we've chosen have different characteristics so you can
see here's a watershed that's sort of similar, has essentially the same types of characteristics and
therefore could expect a similar response. >> Kitchen: I guess I'll be more specific. I think the
neighborhoods around onion creek, and you already have done a whole

[3:06:30 PM]

lot about onion creek, but I want to be able to help that neighborhood understand that the modeling
you're doing will also provide information for them because one of the things that they are concerned
about is all the development that's occurring around them. I think that they're very pleased with the
proposed change in terms of -- I never know how to talk about it directly, but the proposed change
taking back to the green field, I think that there's a recognition that that's -- that that's very helpful. So
they're just going to want to understand what the modeling can tell -- if there's anything else the
modeling can tell them, so -- >> And I think what we're going to do too is attempt to map out where
some of the impervious cover changes are, but again, as Jerry said, the changes are minor and from a
citywide perspective it's plus or minus a half percent, so that's why, you know, just from a need
standpoint running 45 watershed models with that is not a good value -- or a good commitment of time.
>> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: That was helpful. Thank you very much. Can you help us
draw (indiscernible)? Jimmy, you paid a lot of attention to the council last year, I'm sure you paid
attention to we're just drawing new seats up. Sit down next to new people. So before people -- are you
picking numbers one through 10? >> 1 through 10, and 1 is on the west side of the dais closest to --
(indiscernible). >> Closest to you. 10 is far -- >> (Indiscernible) On the dais where 1 is the right side. >>
Mayor Adler: Correct. >> If our city clerk could tell us, I believe council member troxclair and council
member Garza already drew, if you could tell us what their numbers were. >> Yes. Council member
Garza drew space 8, and council member

[3:08:32 PM]

troxclair had 10. >> She goes all the way to the other side. >> And council member pool, you're in 3. >> Mayor Adler: She's all the way to the right. >> Casar: I got 7. >> Mayor Adler: No switching. [Laughter] >> Tovo: So Leslie, are you in the same seat? >> Mayor Adler: 1 is next to the clerk. 1 is next to the clerk. What did you get? >> 6. [Laughter] [Indistinct chattering] >> Mayor Adler: Which one did you get? Peel is 5? >> Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: So now we have three that match up with their council district. >> Mayor Adler: You are almost to the left. Council member troxclair is to your left. >> (Indiscernible). >> Mayor Adler: Kitchen is 4. Council member alter is 1. So Houston is 2. Houston is 2. >> (Indiscernible). >> Mayor Adler: Renteria. All right. 1 is alter, 2 is Houston,

[3:10:33 PM]

starting next to the clerk. It is alter, Houston, pool, kitchen, Renteria, then skipping past us, Flannigan, Casar, Garza, mayor pro tem, and troxclair. And at 3:10 this meeting stands adjourned.