

Question/ Comment:

Is there discussion about non-public site plan review utilizing Bluebeam to provide comments as well?

Response:

At this time, Land Use Review (LUR) is not planning to exclusively use Bluebeam to issue comments. However, we continue to evaluate process improvements.

Question/ Comment:

Regarding 3rd party review for Drainage and Water Quality (WQ), how are consultants being selected?

Response:

The firm that the division is using currently was previously contracted to do residential erosion hazard zone reviews for the same team as drainage and water quality review. That's the firm we're using to perform the third-party reviews for the drainage water quality team.

Question/ Comment:

With heritage trees only being dealt with during subdivision review, will that mean only heritage trees will need to be shown on a tree survey at that time?

Response:

Subdivision review will only occur for heritage tree compliance with multi-lot subdivisions. Heritage trees on single-lot subdivisions will no longer be reviewed.

Question/ Comment:

Will subdivision changes impact the new House-proposed zoning changes for Single Family Residential (SFR) lots (e.g., SF-2)? In other words, is it best to delay applications for the subdivision of single residential lots until the new zoning changes go into effect?

Response:

We don't know what the council will ultimately approve. There is so much to be determined at the council level that it would be difficult for us to give good, reliable guidance in that regard until we have formal direction from council.

Question/ Comment:

Have any regulations or requirements changed because of the recent legislature or the review by McKinsey?

Response:

In terms of regulations, there was a council-approved code change that was implemented at the end of August in preparation for the 88th Legislative Session. The regulations haven't changed, rather the review process has. For example, site plans. There is a completeness check process that is now separated from a formal site plan application to meet the requirements of House Bill 14. The

completeness check guidelines are also being updated to comply with the provisions of House Bill 3699 for subdivisions.

Question/ Comment:

Will the standard inspection procedures being prepared for inspectors also be publicly available for applicant review? Because of inconsistent implementation of procedures and precedent on previous projects, the standard inspection/ closeout procedure hasn't been clear.

Response:

Yes. As the department reviews and updates internal processes, we will contact our partners within the development community to clearly convey the processes. Our focus as we update the processes will be to clarify the procedures and remove inconsistency throughout.

Question/ Comment:

On the pilot program using Bluebeam for final sign-off, will there be formal instructions regarding how to provide the plans to the City and what we can expect in the process? We were involved in a plan sign-off using Bluebeam Studio and had issues getting the plans to the Case Manager because they were not familiar with the Studio. Will this pilot program include obtaining signatures from Austin Water, Industrial Waste, and Austin Fire Department (AFD) – not just the Case Manager at permit issuance?

Response:

The new program is still being piloted and not yet finalized. Once the process is finalized, we will have instructions available for applicants. Applicants can expect a more streamlined process. The new process will require only one signature from the City of Austin (COA). Once that improvement is instituted, there will no longer be separate signatures from Austin Water, Industrial Waste, and AFD.

Question/ Comment:

It was stated that McKinsey and company goals are streamlining, and customer satisfaction is entirely devoted to timing. Is this entirely devoted to timing, or are there any attributes being considered like staff familiarity with land constraints?

Response:

While a large majority of the goals are dedicated to customer satisfaction and timing, improving the process and making sure that the department is using the latest and best in industry standards in terms of how we apply development regulations is equally important. Some of the critical enablers look at reinforcing training standards and creating a gold standard training ground. The McKinsey recommendations do include broader stroke recommendations that reinforce the need for strong training mechanisms.

Question/ Comment:

Is the city council expected to initiate any changes to the subdivision code for residential lots, prior to year-end? I understand a December 14 meeting may attempt to pass changes to either residential zoning or subdivision. Can anyone elaborate?

Response:

There are three public hearings that have been set to hear a wide range of Land Development Code amendments. Council will take a broad look at how those amendments are structured.

Question/Comment:

What might happen to items not completed at the end of the 6-month contract with McKinsey? Will the City continue to make improvements recommended in the report, even after the contract end date?

Response:

We don't anticipate that all recommendations would be fully implemented over a six-month period. As such, we remain fully committed to seeing those recommendations through and improving the process in the short and long term.

Question/Comment:

Are there plans for LUR to also have a similar Ticket tracking system as Building Permits? Sometimes the automated ticket email notification doesn't make it through our email provider so we're sometimes unsure if a submittal was submitted.

Response:

The LUR team is using the same system that the commercial and residential intake team use. It has been in use for a little over a year.