

Potential Option	Description of Current Status/Concern	Potential Improvements	Anticipated Impacts	
			Advantages	Disadvantages
1. <i>Lady Bird Lake Update</i> §25-7 Multiple	Town Lake has been renamed Lady Bird Lake.	"Replace All" instances of Town Lake with Lady Bird Lake	Updates code.	None.
2. <i>Department Director References</i> §25-7 Multiple	References to "director" need to be updated.	"Director" is defined for Chapter 25-7 as WPD unless otherwise noted.	Clarity.	None.
3. <i>Development Application: Global change</i> §25-7 Multiple	Uses of "site plan," "preliminary plan," "construction plan," "final plat," "subdivision construction plan," "construction plan," do not cover all applications.	Replace with "development application" defined in Definitions section to include applications required under this title for development. Also clarified to refer to Chapter 25: Land Development code.	Clarity; completeness.	None.
ARTICLE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS.				
4. <i>Definitions</i> §25-7-2	Several terms need clarification with definitions.	New definitions added for: Adverse Flooding Impact; DCM; Development Application; Director; Drainage; Erosion Hazard Zone; FEMA; FEMA Floodplain; Flood Insurance Rate Map; 100 & 25 Year Floodplains.	Adds clarity.	None.
5. <i>25-Year and 100-Year Floodplain Determination</i> §25-7-5 [Deleted]	Text in this section is a definition.	Move to definitions section.	Consistency.	None.
ARTICLE 2. DRAINAGE STUDIES; EROSION HAZARD ANALYSIS; FLOODPLAIN DELINEATION.				
6. <i>Title Article 2</i>	Term "floodway" is not necessary. Need provision for "Erosion Hazard Analysis."	Delete "Floodway." Add Erosion Hazard Analysis.	See benefits discussion below for Erosion Hazard Analysis.	None.
7. <i>Director Authorized to Require Drainage Studies</i> §25-7-31	Some references out of date. Other text needs rewording.	Delete reference to Administrative Manual which no longer exists; change language in (C) to better relate to (A); change "director" to "City" to allow for variable reviewers, as the application itself determines who will review.	Updates; clarity.	None.
8. <i>Director Authorized to Require Erosion Hazard Zone Analysis</i> §25-7-32	Need provision for "Erosion Hazard Analysis."	Add new section to require Erosion Hazard Analysis; only applies where development is within 100 feet of the centerline of a waterway with a drainage area of 64 acres or greater or where significant erosion is present.	Prevention of damage to structures, infrastructure and creeks and associated public & private costs.	Increased design and construction cost. But assessment of erosion hazards is an engineering obligation.

Potential Option	Description of Current Status/Concern	Potential Improvements	Anticipated Impacts	
			Advantages	Disadvantages
9. <i>Floodplain Maps, Delineation, and Depiction: Clean-up</i> §25-7-33	First portion of section consists of definitions. Other text needs rewording.	Move definitions to definitions section. Reword text.	Consistency. Clarity.	None.
10. <i>Floodplain Maps, Delineation, and Depiction: Required plats</i> §25-7-33 (D) (3&4)	Plat requirements in (D [former E]) need to be aligned with those required in Planning & Development Review submittal packet.	Add (D)(4) "on a residential building permit"; "site plan exemption or general permit" included in (D)(3)	May eliminate some confusion about requirements (code v. packet); would facilitate review of impacts on floodplains and drainage easements.	None.
ARTICLE 3. REQUIREMENTS FOR APPROVAL.				
11. <i>Criteria for Approval of Development Applications: Clean-up</i> §25-7-61	Some text needs rewording for clarify & consistency.	Reword text.	Consistency. Clarity.	None.
12. <i>Pool-Riffle Sequences v. Nuisance Pools</i> §25-7-61 (A)(3)	No distinction made between natural pools and nuisance pools of standing water.	Add clarifying language.	Allows for pool-riffle sequences that may be part of natural channel design projects.	None.
13. <i>No Additional Erosion Impacts</i> §25-7-61 (A)(5)(d)	Current code does not explicitly prohibit additional erosion impacts from new development.	Add requirement to ensure that downstream property is not impacted by erosion.	Prevention of damage to structures, infrastructure and creeks and associated public & private costs.	None. Usually already managed using standard water quality controls & energy dissipation provisions.
14. <i>Erosion Hazard Zone Considerations</i> §25-7-61	Current code does not explicitly ensure Erosion Hazard Zone protections are provided.	Add requirement to locate "proposed improvements" outside erosion hazard zone unless protective works are provided.	Prevention of damage to structures, infrastructure and creeks and associated public & private costs.	Increased design and construction cost. But assessment of erosion hazards is an engineering obligation.
15. <i>Review by Parks and Recreation Board of Certain Site Plans</i> §25-7-63 [Moved]	Requirements in this section fit in better with §25-8-652 (Environment chapter).	Move content to §25-8-652 .	Reduces confusion and overlooking of requirements by consolidating like requirements in one section.	None.
16. <i>Design and Construction of Drainage Facilities and Improvements</i> §25-7-64	Some items required for permit approval are scattered in other locations.	Move text from §25-7-121 to Article 3. No changes to text/substance.	Clarity. Organization.	None.
17. <i>Enclosed Storm Sewers, Bridges, and Culverts</i> §25-7-65	Some items required for permit approval are scattered in other locations.	Moved from §25-7-123 (B) & (C); deleted "sewer." No changes to substance.	Clarity. Organization.	None.

Potential Option	Description of Current Status/Concern	Potential Improvements	Anticipated Impacts	
			Advantages	Disadvantages
18. <i>Fiscal Security Required</i> §25-7-65	Current content on erosion & sedimentation controls more appropriate to §25-8 Environment.	Moved to §25-8-186	Reduces confusion and overlooking of requirements by consolidating like requirements in one section.	None.
ARTICLE 4. SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS IN ZONING JURISDICTION.				
19. <i>Encroachment on Floodplain Prohibited</i> §25-7-92	Current wording does not allow for variances in City's limited purpose jurisdiction; includes incorrect references; may not take into account erosion impacts of variances.	Revise (C) to remove limitation of application to full purpose limits; provide correct references for (C)(1) & (3); in (D) replace "subsection" with correct term, "Section." This wording replicated in other sections as well for consistency.	Consistency. Clarity.	None.
20. <i>General Exceptions</i> §25-7-93	Wording needs to be consistent with "additional adverse flooding" language; includes incorrect reference.	Change "adverse effect on 100-year floodplain or surrounding properties" to "additional adverse flooding impact on other properties"; provide correct reference for Building Code.	Consistency. Clarity. Accuracy.	None.
21. <i>Exceptions in Central Business Area</i> §25-7-94	Includes incorrect reference.	Provide correct reference for Building Code.	Accuracy.	None.
22. <i>Exceptions in the 25-Year Floodplain</i> §25-7-96	Current wording does not allow a building on non-recreational land; current wording is unclear as to what types of structures may be allowed in the 25-year floodplain; includes incorrect reference.	Revise (A)(1) to include "public" land; revise (A)(2) to include a tool shed; provide correct reference for (B).	Provides clarity, updates code to accommodate common, appropriate uses.	None.
ARTICLE 5. [DELETED] DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS.				
23. <i>Design and Construction Standards</i> <i>Article 5 [Deleted]</i>	Need to relocate some sections. Details in others should be addressed in the Drainage & Environmental Criteria Manuals.	Move §25-7-121 to §25-7-64; move §25-7-123 (B) & (C) to §25-7-65. Delete sections §25-7-122, §25-7-124, and §25-7-125.	Clarity. Organization. Address high level of detail in criteria manuals where appropriate.	None.
ARTICLE 5. RESPONSIBILITIES OF OWNER OR DEVELOPER				
24. <i>Dedication of Easements and Rights-of-Way; Easement Width on Waterways</i> §25-7-152	Current code requires a 25-foot easement for open waterways; this width might not be adequate for some waterways for sufficient Erosion Hazard Zone coverage and/or maintenance access; includes incorrect reference.	Require easement follow Drainage Criteria Manual (DCM); require easement provide maintenance access; provide correct reference for (E)(2)(d).	Avoid unsustainable environmental & economic costs to correct erosion hazards; ensure ability to maintain waterway (else not large enough for equipment, etc.). More appropriate to handle this level of detail in DCM than in Code.	Potential reduction in development footprint (note: must be counter-balanced by cost to repair if not properly designed).