

Source	ID	Page	Edit or Correction	Comment	Staff suggested Edit	Category	Meeting
Gullahorn	196	88	1st paragraph: 5 of 7 key challenges relate to meeting the challenges associated with the contingencies related to growth in the ETJ in some manner. Need a realism statement that reflects that these contingencies constitute a major planning need and will require the intentional and coordinated use of infrastructure investments in order to prepare properly for the need.		Ok. Promote regional planning and increased coordination between local governments, especially Travis County, agencies, districts, and the State of Texas to address major land use and transportation challenges. TF: unsure this addresses the comment.	2-etj	January 17
Gullahorn	213	147	LUT Action 14: In first bullet add language saying that in collaboration with county use public transit centers as an incentive to drive development in the ETJ to preferred areas.		This is addressed by the first bullet, expanding service to compact centers and mixed use corridors.	2-etj	January 17
ET, October 25	1094		agricultural technology is changing, more dense farming area is the future, similar to housing			2-etj	January 17
Houston	276		Missing threads in the plan:	There should be a more equitable distribution of the cost of growth among tax payers.		2-regional expansion	January 17
Houston	285		Missing threads in the plan:	12 Media - How do we portray the City of Austin in the media? How do people in other cities see us? Austin will soon be majority Hispanic. When we market the city do others see "someone like me? The media has a lot to do with the image we portray. If we don't provide visibility for the communities of color, people of the creative classes won't want to be here/'come here. How 'non-traditional' media can be used to keep members of the community informed.	See CRE Action-4 (p. 176). Refer to TF.	2	January 24

Source	ID	Page	Edit or Correction	Comment	Staff suggested Edit	Category	Meeting
Sandy McMillan	5336			Who pays for growth? If Austin moves toward a future as a vertical city built on what is already an aging, insufficient infrastructure, who pays for replacing the infrastructure? We have been told that growth does indeed pay for itself through increased fees, expansion of the tax base and other means, but why are existing residents experiencing ever increasing property taxes and elections asking us to tax ourselves even more? In Dawson, the city is spending millions of dollars on storm drain improvements allegedly for flood control; yet, only a handful of homeowners self-reported flooding problems. Several residents pointed out to staff that the storm water runoff appeared to be the result of insufficient or non-existent storm water control on the properties on South Congress. Staff did not deny this observation and merely replied that those property owners could not be forced in hindsight to deal with their storm water, further adding that increased development in this VMU corridor will only make the problem worse.	Developments that require expanded infrastructure typically pay for some or all of the expansion. The benefit of focusing additional growth where there is existing infrastructure is that the infrastructure can be expanded as a part of its routine maintenance. Continuing to build at the city's edge adds the responsibility for new infrastructure while continuing to need to maintain what already exists.	2 - who pays for growth	January 24
David Venhuizen	5021	117		the cynicism fairly drips off WPD 3 -- "Continue to develop and evaluate decentralized wastewater processing site options, including package plants and satellite facilities, to complement centralized facilities." Uh, "Continue"?! When did they start? Indeed, I've been told Meszaros has said he doesn't WANT to consider any of this. WPD 3 also highlights how very, very unaware they are of what the opportunities are. Distributed reuse will have NOTHING to do with "package plants".	GC -- checking with AWU.	2 Water/Wastewater discussion	January 24

Source	ID	Page	Edit or Correction	Comment	Staff suggested Edit	Category	Meeting
Heather Way, FACTF	5489	9		<p>Our primary recommendation is to change the first principle in the draft Plan from “Grow as a compact, connected city” to “Grow as a compact, connected, family-friendly City.” The history of growth in cities across the U.S. has established that focusing on redevelopment into a compact city without also focusing on redevelopment that is friendly to children will result in a city that is more dense in the urban core but also more void of children. Families with children are pushed out to the suburbs defeating the city’s primary goal of sustainability. In contrast, cities like Vancouver, Portland, Stockholm, and Freiburg, Germany, and others have made it a goal to be more compact and sustainable while also including children. As these cities have shown, for compact development to be successful, it will need to be designed with children in mind, incorporate open space and access to play spaces, and be pedestrian-oriented. (See, e.g., “TODS for Tots,” Planning Magazine, Feb. 2011).</p> <p>Compactness is problematic unless it speaks to redevelopment that is inclusive for all residents. We</p>	<p>GC: include different types of people in this paragraph.</p> <p>See inclusiveness sidebar.</p>	2. need to add different demographic groups to principle?	January 24
Jeff Jack-TF meeting	5531	143		economics (land prices, taxes) of affordable housing component needs more attention	Flag for priority program revision.	2-affordability	January 24

Source	ID	Page	Edit or Correction	Comment	Staff suggested Edit	Category	Meeting
Gullahorn	214	149	<p>149, et seq/ LUT Action 20, 23, 33,35, 37, 39: Increase costs of living in inner city. "regulation and Require" are not the words to use. "encourage" better if at all.</p> <p>This is a major area of conflict in the plan with regard to affordability and the desire to have a tightly regulated dense inner city</p> <p>Need a requirement that for any new regulation or requirement there is an "affordability impact statement" that would have to be performed and assess the impact on additional costs to existing homeowners as well as the home buyer/ renter or taxpayer.</p>	<p>LUT Action-23: Require that all new neighborhoods be connected to adjacent neighborhoods and commercial areas by streets, sidewalks, and bicycle lanes and/or paths.</p> <p>Recommendation: Revise to LUT Action-23: Develop standards to connect all new neighborhoods to adjacent neighborhoods and commercial areas by streets, sidewalks, and bicycle lanes and/or paths.</p>	<p>Revise LUT Action-23: Develop standards to connect all new neighborhoods to adjacent neighborhoods and commercial areas by streets, sidewalks, and bicycle lanes and/or paths.</p> <p>Revise LUT Action 19-Develop complete streets design standards for all new road construction and reconstruction.</p> <p>EGRSO states that conducting an economic impact analysis for each regulation or policy would be costly and time consuming. They don't generally support blanket requirements, but rather would look at the need for an economic impact analysis on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>NHCD conducts an Affordability Impact Statement for all proposed City regulations and plans.</p>	2-affordability	January 24
Collins	146	152	<p>HN Action 10 -- The City of Austin should incentivize the providers of affordable housing to provide workforce housing, instead of large employers because the private sector can provide that housing most efficiently.</p>		Suggest TF review.	2-affordability	January 24

Source	ID	Page	Edit or Correction	Comment	Staff suggested Edit	Category	Meeting
Gullahorn	177		<p>Recommends careful look at cost impact of new regulations to implement Plan, esp tough on small businesses. Used parking regulations as an example. Do new regulation costs counter-act improved/better development? How do people stay in their homes: how do we maintain affordability while creating a better place? Need to reconcile better development (regulations) vs affordability.</p> <p>JG: The need for a requirement that any new regulations and policies that come forth from this Plan or otherwise should have an economic impact analysis attached to them is the only thing that will keep this Plan from being self -contradictory.</p> <p>Develop an affordability impact index or something similar for every regulation or requirement.</p>		<p>EGRSO states that conducting an economic impact analysis for each regulation or policy would be costly and time consuming. They don't generally support blanket requirements, but rather would look at the need for an economic impact analysis on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>NHCD conducts an Affordability Impact Statement for all proposed City regulations and plans.</p>	2- affordabil y	January 24
Jack Gullahorn	341			How to deal w ETJ, esp farmland in eastern travis county. Steer growth to particular areas instead of sprawl thru strategic incentives, and specifically reference Travis County in Plan.		2- affordabil y	January 24
Jonathan Ogre	343			change in future economic analysis needs examination		2- affordabil y	January 24
Jack Gullahorn	1101		How do people stay in their homes: how do we maintain affordability while creating a better place? Need to reconcile better development (regulations) vs affordability			2- affordabil y	January 24
Regina Rogoff,	1120		Need economic impact of Comp Plan.			2- affordabil y	January 24
Francie Fergus	1129			How does city sustain itself, implementaion of measures to provide affordability		2- affordabil y	January 24
Jack Gullahorn	1162		Recommends careful look at cost impact of new regulations to implement Plan, esp tough on small businesses. Used parking regulations as an example. Do new regulation costs counter-act improved/better development?			2- affordabil y	January 24

Source	ID	Page	Edit or Correction	Comment	Staff suggested Edit	Category	Meeting
Houston	277		Missing threads in the plan:	4) Water - Concerned about the city's ability to provide water for the 800K people moving to Austin. Water conservation has been in place for years and now water rates are going up because citizens did a great job of conserving. Or is it to fund the cost of expansion/growth? What is the real situation relating to Austin's water supply and its future?	Refer to TF.	2-affordability; conservation	January 24
Collins	162	175	CRE Action 1 -- This should not be a function of the City of Austin. Pattern this after the Fort Worth Council on the Arts , should not be a City Dept.		Not recommended.	2-City's role	January 24
Collins	164	176	CRE Action 4 -- This should not be a City of Austin function.		Not recommended.	2-City's role	January 24
Sustainable Food Policy Board	5594		NEW Conservation and Environmental Resources Recognize and publicize the significant contribution that the food system makes to carbon emissions and encourage consumption of climate-friendly foods and the enactment of policies and programs that support a strong and sustainable local food system.			2-climate	January 24
Mark Yznaga, (1122			Need more emphasis on climate change.			2-climate change	January 24
Collins	140	131	I strongly object to the singling out of the need to provide affordable housing for artists over teachers, policemen, the handicapped, the aged, or any other group in our city.		Recommend to TF,	2-creative community	January 24
Raul Garza	5545			It is wonderful to acknowledge the wealth of creativity in Austin. However, I do not find in this plan real or tangible recommendations to improve the quality of life of artists and those who feed into the Creative Economy (A 15). I don't see near the specificity or accountability in the Creativity Section as I do in the Conservation and Environment Policies, and that concerns me. It seems like the status quo of "collaborate...enhance...explore..." that really leaves the responsibility in the hands of those already involved in the creative community.	See revised priority program on creative economy, which will connect Imagine Austin to CreateAustin	2-creativity	January 24

Source	ID	Page	Edit or Correction	Comment	Staff suggested Edit	Category	Meeting
Ogren	300		5) Other elements Once we get back public comments I want to look at: how local agricultural is treated in the plan, the concept of natural capitalism/ ecosystem services, and a thorough explanation of the economic benefits and issues with natural resource degradation and conservation.			2- development & environment	January 24
Houston	287	42	Missing threads in the plan:	While Austin may demonstrate better than average data in many targareted areas of the plan, this is not true for all Austinites	Revise pg. 42 4th bullet by adding: Unemployment was also related to levels of educational attainment, with those with less than a high school degree or G.E.D. experiencing greater unemployment (13.9 percent) than those completing college (4.6 percent).	2- gentrification	January 24
Houston	278		Missing threads in the plan:	5) Electricity - Rates continue to rise.The more people that move here the more citizens are charged for their arrival. The new arrivals should pay more. Long-term residents should not pay the bills for growth with no benefit. No rates or taxes are decreasing.	TF: Review Priority Programs in light of this; connect to gentrification discussion.	2- gentrification	January 24
Houston	291		Missing threads in the plan:	People in parts of the city don't trust City staff to know or to represent their best interests. Example: 11th/12th Street Revitalization resulted in the displacement of this part of the neighborhood as a result of higher property taxes.	Refer to TF.	2- gentrification	January 24
Perla Cavazos,318			neighborhood character- wants more language associated w/ "protection" than just historical preservation, such as multi-ethnic culture		Working with Perla C.	2- gentrification	January 24
Cavazos	1008		housing/neighborhoods- reference gentrification, no mention		Covered by HN Action 9	2- gentrification	January 24
Cavazos	1009		housing/neighborhoods- "balancing..." needs to mention gentrification		Covered by HN Action 9	2- gentrification	January 24
Collins	134	118	SW 2. Incentivize MF, retail, restaurants and manufacturers to recycle.	The existing language does not take into account that the City of Austin incentivizes residential customers to recycle by making that service free. Most of the commercial uses cited pay for their trash and recycling separately and they pay for recycling.	Not recommended. The ordinance enacting this policy was approved since the plan framework was first written.	2-require	January 24
Mark Lind, Oct	1095		City process does not seem to be understanding of small business			2-small business	January 24

Source	ID	Page	Edit or Correction	Comment	Staff suggested Edit	Category	Meeting
Mark Yznaga, (1123		Need more emphasis on water use plan, future energy vision			2-water	January 24
Office of Sustainability	9092	68	Use of term "sustainability" throughout document	Use of the word SUSTAINABILITY is still somewhat confusing because it appears inconsistently in the document. I suggest we change the Vision category Natural and Sustainable, to instead read Natural and Resource Efficient. I think the latter still captures what is trying to be said but eliminates overlap with how the word is used more broadly. We need to be careful to make sure we are consistently referring to the entire triple bottom line when we use the word. Here I think it is just referring to the Environmental part.	Flag for TF. PDR recommends "Austin is green" as an alternative.	2-vision	January 31
McIntyre	217	9	FACTF: "Experts agree: Families with children are critical to the growth, diversity, vibrancy, and economic vitality of a city." Could be included in "Core Principles for Action" or elsewhere.		Wait for TF.	2 - a) families w/ children, b) can/should vision / core principles be tinkered with at this point (MY/ET/LR/PC/PD 12/13)	January 31
Lind	1016	78	No criteria for dense nodes	GC note: could generally describe factors that were weighed in identifying centers.	Addressed in revision to GCM definitions revision TF: explain in greater detail. Provide rationale for all features, possibly in an appendix.	2-map	January 23 w/ PC
Melancon	105	Map	I am very concerned about the map from its creation to its completion. I witnessed people slapping sticky notes on any neighborhood but their own. There weren't enough instructions, etc. I don't really know how to fix this. Staff says it corresponds to the neighborhood plans but the neighborhoods say it doesn't.		Addressed through PC & TF review process.	2-map	January 23 w/ PC

Source	ID	Page	Edit or Correction	Comment	Staff suggested Edit	Category	Meeting
Walt & Raine Hornaday	5377	139		Remove our district from the Downtown Regional Center on the Growth Concept Map as it does not fit your definition (" . . . the major urban hubs of the region. They have the highest employment and residential densities . . . support high-capacity transit, and provide a full range of employment, shopping, cultural, recreational, and entertainment opportunities . . . regional centers are entirely urban, like Downtown . . ."). To inaccurately label our historic, largely single-family Judges Hill District as such would place an irresistible developer bounty on it and destroy its role as a shaded, heritage-laden counterpoint to the dense portions of Downtown nearby. It would also be counter to the goals of our district as laid out in the new Downtown Austin Plan and thereby mock the public process that has led to that document. To layout incentives on top of this residential neighborhood would erode the investment owners like myself have made in this historic neighborhood.	See #5204 regarding Judges Hill, the downtown regional center, and the Downtown Plan.	2-map	January 23 w/ PC
Ferguson	261	143		Judge's Hill is valuable to the City as a largely single family historic neighborhood. There is a stron	Define the data needed on housing, households and jobs by geography to support complete community planning.	See the revised Priority Programs and indicators.	2-map January 23 w/ PC
Francie Fergus	1124	Map	Somehow indicate affordability on Growth Concept map.			2-map	January 23 w/ PC

Source	ID	Page	Edit or Correction	Comment	Staff suggested Edit	Category	Meeting
Ogren	298		<p>3) Testing the Preferred Growth Scenario. Break down the density of jobs and population by the following:</p> <p>Watershed-- understand the impervious cover implications per watershed Transportation capacity-- over and under capacity transportation networks Recharge Zone and Contributing Zone of Edwards Aquifer-- Both Barton Springs Segment and Northern Edwards Water Quality Buffers-- Proposed Headwaters for east and general Water Quality Transition Zones and Critical Water Quality Zones Floodplain Prime Farmland Soils TPWD Ecological Systems Classification SH 130 Corridor Existing Business Centers Impaired Waterways Wastewater and Water Supply infrastructure Slope Classifications in Ordinance (15 to 25%, 25 to 35%, over 35%) Note: There are many more to use but this is a good starting list.</p>		TF.	2-map	January 23 w/ PC
SC, November	1127			concurs w/ rethinking the map. Brought up Heather Way's presentation....walking distance green space		2-map	January 23 w/ PC
Carol Torgrims	1135		Expressed concern that some in the community fear that the final Growth Concept Map (p. 76-84) could be used to rewrite the land development codes. Indicated a need to know this and to address it with the community.			2-map	January 23 w/ PC
Jonathan Ogri	1137		ET asked JO for map comments- poor graphics, maybe relook at maps, legitimize map looking at other different components led to separate discussion of improving map w/ more detailed data layers.			2-map	January 23 w/ PC
Mark Yznaga, (1138		Improve the quality of the maps . Sometimes the maps seem to be o ut of place.			2-map	January 23 w/ PC
group, October	1141		maps are mainly conceptual and that needs to be clearly undeerstood			2-map	January 23 w/ PC

Source	ID	Page	Edit or Correction	Comment	Staff suggested Edit	Category	Meeting
Carol Torgrims	1148		Expressed concern with the vagueness of the Growth Scenario Map. Suggested that it needs more detail.			2-map	January 23 w/ PC
Heather Hunziker	5380	Map		It has come to my attention that city staff has designated 38th Street between MOPAC and I-35 as a mixed use area. This violates the neighborhood FLUM (Future Land Use Map), and I strongly oppose this change. Please stick to the FLUM, and keep the area designated residential only. This is one of the few historic areas of Austin that maintains its character as a residential neighborhood. Don't ruin a good thing!		2 - map	January 23 w/ PC
Kathleen Strong	5384	Map		As a resident of E. 40th Street in the Hancock neighborhood, I am opposed to the designation of 38th Street from IH-35 to Mo-Pac as a mixed use area. This violates the neighborhood FLUM. From IH-35 west to Guadalupe, 38th Street is primarily residential. We want to preserve the residential character of our neighborhood. We oppose any designation that encourages non-residential uses in our neighborhood. We want to preserve the central city residential areas.		2 - map	January 23 w/ PC

Source	ID	Page	Edit or Correction	Comment	Staff suggested Edit	Category	Meeting
Michael Curry	5387	Map		<p>[See letter for full background]</p> <p>The community needs the Task Force's assistance in resolving this problem created by the Draft Growth Concept Map. There are at least two ways this problem could be resolved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Growth Concept Map could be corrected to remove West 35th Street from the Mixed Use Corridor. End the corridor at the West 35th/38th street cut-off. Eliminating this two to three block area would have absolutely no city-wide implications and is the simplest solution. 2. A more comprehensive and perhaps better solution, which would also address problems caused by the Mixed Use designation on other roads such as Lake Austin Blvd, would be to rename the corridor. The Mixed Use Corridor is the only development category on the Growth Concept Map which mirrors the name of a specific land use district recognized by the Land Development Code. Using a specific land use district as a description for a corridor is misleading since it is not the only land use envisioned along the corridor and, as shown above, can be harmful to the community when it promotes an incompatible use. Changing the corrido 		2 - map	January 23 w/ PC
SpeakUp	5341		Add Anderson Ln rapid transit to Growth Concept Map	<p>On Growth Concept Map, add rapid transit to Anderson Ln, with connections NW to Arboretum/Jollyville and SE to Crestview Station and down Airport. This supports planned density on Anderson and provides more E-W connectivity.</p>	ATD/CapMetro	2 - map	January 23 w/ PC