

ANC QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES: BETTY DUNKERLEY

1) No, although I will advocate for additional resources for neighborhood planning and I do remain committed to the timely development and implementation of neighborhood plans. By the end of 2005, 36 of the 57 planning areas will be complete. However, to complete the remaining 21 plans by 2006 would take about 28 additional full-time employees, and with a learning curve of about a year, it simply would not be feasible, even if we had the funding to do. It's important to recognize that city resources and staff have been dedicated and will continue to be dedicated to several unanticipated, large-scale planning efforts, most recently commercial design standards, rewrite of the zoning code, corridor planning and development of the TOD ordinance.

2) No. The formation of the Neighborhood Planning Teams occurred with the pilot project plans and was comprised of whomever attended the meetings. With the changes in the plan amendment process the Neighborhood Contact Teams were created so that they could review proposed plan changes in the amendment process following the approval of the plan. This duty requires a more stable group with a balanced representation. However, the neighborhood stakeholders determine who, from each interest group, will serve on the team, and the requirements for becoming a team member.

3) Yes. I believe that proposed land use or zoning changes in areas with approved neighborhood plans should be considered according to the established neighborhood plan amendment process, including TOD areas. Such changes should be considered a plan amendment and reviewed / approved in accordance with the neighborhood plan amendment process.

4) No. Deed restrictions are private agreements between buyers and sellers, and the City does not maintain such records. Within a neighborhood there may be countless number of subdivisions, each with different deed restrictions. The enforcement of the deed restrictions is

the responsibility of the property owners within the subdivision. The property owners are not required to notify the City of changes to these privately enforced agreements. Assembling a complete record of all deed restrictions would require an enormous commitment of taxpayer money and staff time, which I can't commit to at this time.

5) No, I can't commit to never vote against a valid petition. I do agree that valid petitions are very important, and accordingly, they require a supermajority vote of the City Council. My approach to these zoning cases is to meet with all interested parties, visit the site in question, and then support what I believe to be the best possible outcome for the property owners, the neighbors, and the neighborhood.

6) No, I can't commit to vote against "any" proposed change; such a commitment would have precluded, for example, the construction of our new City Hall. But I do believe that protecting the Town Lake Corridor is extremely important to the community, and that any proposed change should obviously meet a very high standard and deliver clear, broad community benefit.

7) No. I cannot commit to vote against all cases of so-called "up-zoning," because I believe there could be instances where such zoning changes could be beneficial to the neighborhood and community (and desired by both). My commitment on zoning cases is to always take into full consideration the views of the neighbors and neighborhood, as well as the owners.

8) Yes, I am committed to support our compatibility standards in general.

9) No. I supported the TOD ordinance because I believe it helps accomplish important, progressive planning goals for Austin. The boundaries were specifically drawn to exclude single family zoning and land use as much as possible. TODs are intended to be areas of mixed use and higher residential density. As the station planning is done,

compatibility standards may be addressed in new ways and perhaps would not apply to the Gateway or Midway zones, but may apply in the Transition zones which are nearer neighborhoods. This issue will be worked through as we get into the design phase.

10) No. It is too early to re-evaluate because the initiative is not yet complete. The primary purpose of establishing the “One Stop Shop” was to simplify Austin’s very complicated permitting process for applicants, and I believe it has accomplished this purpose. While there will always be some human error and some room for process improvement because of the complexity and volume, I believe that city management and development review staff have done a consistently good job in working to ensure that all projects permitted in Austin conform to our codes and ordinances. To my knowledge, there has been no specific increase in the number of reported code violations since the “One Stop Shop” was established. I feel the operation is working well enough not to necessitate a wholesale re-evaluation, but I am committed to delivering more resources to this department in the hopes of achieving more improvements.

11) No. There are many ways which a potential developer can contact the City for information which may or may not lead to a formal application filing. We do not track these informal contacts. No city that I am aware of does this kind of notification. I am committed to ensuring that this information is accessible to the public in a timely fashion via the Internet, as it currently is.

12) No, because the maximum fines that can be assessed under state law are already in place.

13) Partial Yes. I do intend to advocate for additional resources for code enforcement for the proposed 2005-2006 budget. But even with additional resources, code enforcement will remain a complaint-driven process because of the size of our City and the complexity of the codes.

14) No. The Regional Stormwater Management Program and Urban Watersheds Structural Control Fund Fee Study was completed in June 2002. For flood control purposes, the City has collected the recommended fees, which include construction cost indices and property valuations adjusted on an annual basis. For Water Quality, the analysis was completed in October 2002 and fees were increased at that time. In addition, last fall a required construction cost adjustment of 11% was assessed to “Fee in Lieu” participants. Because of these cost increases, many projects are opting to do on-site controls.

16) No. As you know, there are still some tracts of land within the Barton Springs segment of the Edwards Aquifer that have grandfathered development rights under state law. I am committed to take whatever actions are feasible to help protect the quality of water in Barton Creek and the Edwards Aquifer, but I cannot commit to oppose existing development rights, grandfathered under state law. I am working with our lobby team to prevent further extension of grandfathering and the erosion of the City’s right to regulate water quality in our jurisdiction.

17) Partial Yes. I have been a strong advocate for every possible strategy to avoid nonattainment status. I strongly support every alternative transit option – including improved bus service, commuter rail, better bike lanes, more pedestrian infrastructure, and a dramatically expanded use of hybrid vehicles – that could potentially help us slow the rate of VMT growth, and emissions, as our population continues to grow in the years ahead. I cannot commit to “less infrastructure” for cars since they will continue to be a part of our transit options for many years to come.

18) Yes.

19) Partial Yes. I am fully committed to returning funding for Austin’s health and human services contracts back to the level of the 2002-2003 budget cycle, in the 2006 budget. Obviously, Austin doesn’t have funding equality between its public safety and health and human

services functions on a dollar for dollar basis, nor does any other city. Our annual citizen survey consistently ranks public safety as the number one priority in the City. Personally I consider health and human services to be very important, as I hope is evidenced by the time and effort I have invested in improving the delivery of those services over my twelve years of public service with the City.

20) No. I can't commit to lowering the effective tax rate and decreasing city revenues at a time when I believe we need to be working instead to rebuild vital basic services – like code enforcement, branch libraries, and social services – after three years of cutbacks. I am, like many people, very concerned about gentrification issues and the property tax burden on Austin's lower and middle-income residents. My commitment is to continue to work hard to keep our city tax rate as low as possible (it is currently the lowest of any major city in Texas).

21) No. The City performs an exhaustive financial analysis each time it considers an incentive package of any kind (which is very rare). I simply don't know what kind of analysis methodology could be used to define the specific impact of a single new employer on gentrification issues in general, so I can't commit to direct the City Manger to do so.

22) Partial Yes. I am committed to finding every bit of funding we possibly can to devote to the continued expansion of affordable housing stock in Austin.

23) No. This should be regional effort, not done by the City alone. In developing a comprehensive strategy our partners must be included. The studies should determine the limits to impervious cover, identify where and how land will be protected or purchased, and the benefits of a long-term acquisition strategy for the aquifer. Much of this work has been completed and was to be presented to the Barton Springs Zone Executive Committee this month. I will ask qualified members of the new ECT citizen bond committee to review all of the available scientific data regarding the state of the Edwards Aquifer and to make

recommendations for bond-funded land acquisitions that offer the very best opportunity for improving the overall health of the aquifer. The City has purchased over \$100,000,000 of water quality land and I support continued acquisition of open space. With the bulk of the aquifer and undeveloped land outside the city, I believe it is also time for other entities to step up and help preserve water quality through land acquisition as well.

24) No. This is simply not feasible because it would require a site-by-site analysis to determine the build-out density of the existing multi-family zoned properties with the City.

25) Yes. The City's current Economic Development Policy formula calculates the impact of new business or expanded business on infrastructure and services. The amount of the incentive takes into account the cost of new infrastructure and services.

26) No. The issue of how to curb urban sprawl is a complex one requiring the culmination of a number of factors to resolve. At this time, this is not feasible to do.

27) Unknown. One of the purposes of the Commercial Design Standards(CDS) is to create a more sustainable development pattern while recognizing the realities of the market. The CDS are being structured to provide standards as well as alternatives for projects who cannot comply. Since the standards have not been adopted, I do not know the impact on small business and cannot make a commitment at this time. In general, I am very supportive of small business.

28) Unknown. I oppose placing tolls on roads already funded by gas tax. I would support a revised toll plan that removed all such roads, and was consistent with the AMATP. I am awaiting the independent study results to further clarify my position.

29) No, but I am committed to supporting the ongoing development of our multi-modal transportation infrastructure with the objective of reducing traffic congestion and air pollution. Please see answer 17.

30) Yes. While I don't anticipate being appointed to serve on the Board of Directors of Capital Metro, if I were, I would certainly consider creating such a Community Advisory Committee with neighborhood representation.

31) Yes. The City recently has received a small grant to provide for citizen input on the survey instrument. After the next survey, a citizen group will be called upon to evaluate the survey instrument and make recommendations for change.

32) No. Although the City Council serves as the ultimate consumer advocate, I support contracting with a consumer advocate to advise the City Council on rate decisions on a case-by-case basis, rather than having a full-time position on staff.

33) Yes. The City Manager already conducts an exhaustive research effort every year to identify all possible sources of revenue during the budget process. Each year City staff reviews all current fees and new and current State and Federal laws that regulate and allow the City to generate revenue. In the last three years, the City has performed 2 revenue initiatives and one revenue innovation study to determine new sources of revenue. Fees and fee changes are recommended each year in the proposed budget.