CODE NEXT
SHAPING THE AUSTIN WE IMAGINE

Austin Voices and Community Conversations

Community Engagement Phase 2
January – March 2018
Final Report

Prepared By

GROUP SOLUTIONS RJW
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT • COMMUNICATIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The initiative to update the land development code in Austin has prompted the best hopes and worst fears for Austin's future. Many residents over the past several years have attended CodeNEXT meetings, filled out online surveys and participated in other forums to express opinions.

Others have been silent due to job and life stresses, or because of the complicated and confusing torrent of information coming at them, or because they do not trust that anyone is listening to feedback due to previous negative experiences.

The City recognized that some under-represented groups in Austin have been vocal during CodeNEXT discussions, but others needed an opportunity to provide feedback. Group Solutions RJW, a team of communication professionals with a 25-year history of reaching out to diverse populations, was hired to help identify representative individuals and/or groups in the African American, Asian American, Latino/Hispanic, low-income, and renter communities, as well as people with disabilities. Community representatives were to have some knowledge about CodeNEXT but may have not shared their viewpoints in public forums or discussions.

Ten questions were drafted to draw out opinions on the impacts of CodeNEXT on community, housing and mobility. The City requested that Group Solutions ask at least three of the questions during the hour-long session. A copy of the Interview Guide is provided in Attachment A.

Prior to beginning work, Austin City Council members were made aware of the initiative and their counsel was sought on organizations to include in the community engagement initiative. A letter was also sent to members of the African American Resource Advisory Commission, the Asian American Quality of Life Commission and the Hispanic/Latino Quality of Life Advisory Commission to make them aware of the community engagement efforts. Finally, the Communication and Public Information Office (CPIO) and Group Solutions met with the Equity Office to give staff the opportunity to review the contact list, offer revisions and initiate coordination as needed, as a similar public outreach project was underway there.

With that framework in place, Group Solutions RJW made calls and sent emails to approximately 32 organizations and individuals to explain the process and schedule discussions. The end goal was to discuss CodeNEXT, identify concerns, and document potential solutions that were recommended. City staff understood that some recommendations might not fit neatly under the CodeNEXT umbrella and might need to be addressed in another way by City leaders and staff.

Discussions with 17 organizations were held at offices, homes, and restaurants – wherever it was most convenient for the stakeholder. Some conversations were held with one to two people; other conversations included three to four participants responding to the questions.

Robena Jackson provided context for the discussion and explained how the input would be shared with the Planning Commission, the Zoning & Platting Commission and the City Council prior to the commissions' public hearings in late April. Stakeholders were told that there were no right or wrong answers and that the purpose was not to prioritize answers but to collect feedback. Conversations were scheduled to last an hour, but many went much longer as people spent the time to share detailed histories and opinions.

The original list of community contacts came from the City's CPIO. Team discussions and a conversation with the Equity Office resulted in additional contacts. Some groups on the list were not available for discussions until after the project deadline; others were contacted multiple times and elected not to participate.

OPENING CONVERSATIONS

Those visited were very generous with their time, discussing freely their knowledge of CodeNEXT, current feelings about the draft code and ideas for making Austin a better place for the communities of which they are apart.

On behalf of the organizations identified in Attachment B, we present the following information. Attachment C provides a brief profile of each participating organization and Attachment D provides demographic information about the participants.

KNOWLEDGE LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS

As mentioned earlier in this report the intent of the conversations was to engage groups who had an interest in CodeNEXT and had been following the process but may not have been vocal participants in the process. Participants were asked how much they knew about CodeNEXT and asked to rate themselves on a scale from 1 to 5 , with 1 being very little and 5 being significant knowledge.

Of the twenty-five individuals providing input:

> **Four** participants rated their knowledge level a **1,**
> **Eleven** rated their knowledge a **2 or 3,** and
> **Ten** rated their knowledge level between **4 and 5.**

Many of those in the 2 or 3 range noted they had been actively following the process but had not yet studied Draft 3 of CodeNEXT (released only a few days before our conversations began).

They didn't feel they could rate themselves higher because:

> (a) they hadn't reviewed the latest draft of the code,
> (b) the code was very complex, and they couldn't claim they truly understood it, or
> (c) they still had unanswered questions.

COMMENTS ABOUT CodeNEXT

Respondents were asked if they currently support CodeNEXT with the information that they know now, and to share reasons for their answer, whatever that answer was.

> **Two** individuals **supported** CodeNEXT,
> **Ten** individuals **didn't support** CodeNEXT, and
> **Eleven** individuals **had not made a decision**.

Those who did support it said:

- I could support it as long as it helps the community.
- Yes, I could support it. Some of the concepts are different, but I buy into the concept that they want to build more housing on one lot.

In general, those who did not support CodeNEXT offered the following reasons:

- They've done a lot of studying and spent a lot of money, but they have not talked to Austin's most vulnerable populations.
- It is misleading to tell people that CodeNEXT will automatically bring about affordable housing.
- How can you unilaterally support a 1,000-page document?

COMMENTS ABOUT CodeNEXT

- The public can't understand CodeNEXT. The people drafting CodeNEXT are sending out mixed messages and are not making it easy for the community to participate.

- How will CodeNEXT protect our rights to stay in our neighborhood?

- The new code increases detriments to the neighborhoods. It's being touted as a fix of the current land code, but it will create gentrification on steroids.

- I don't think I could support CodeNEXT in isolation by itself (i.e., without addressing important related issues such as affordability and displacement of residents).

- I'm not sold on the push for density because the push for density has a negative impact on the current cultural environment.

- I am concerned about the lack of outreach and engagement with people of color.

- CodeNEXT talks about allowing people to build Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) on their lots, but our residents can't afford to do that.

Those who were undetermined shared the following insights:

- I don't know enough about it to support it or have an opinion.

- It's so complicated and overwhelming.

- It is moving in the right direction. However, the spirit of Imagine Austin has been lost due to all the self-interest.

- Which CodeNEXT? Which one will be recommended?

COMMON THEMES AND COMMENTS

Surprising to the interviewers was how similar the comments and concerns were across groups and organizations. In some cases, there was an obvious connection between groups. But, in most cases, the individuals represented very different stakeholders and had little known connection with other groups.

Because of these shared viewpoints, the common themes presented below represent the views of most, if not all, of the organizations that participated in conversations.

THEME: AFFORDABILITY

Austin's lack of affordability is one the most serious challenges facing long-time residents, particularly communities of color, low and moderate-income families, tenants and homeowners.

Comments:

1. New developments in East Austin are priced so high that residents who have been displaced can't afford them, only the upwardly mobile can. They are driving out even those residents and homeowners who want to stay because they push up the taxes for everyone and people can no longer afford to be in their neighborhood.

2. People are not able to stay in their homes because of rising taxes and costs. This is particularly problematic for the elderly and people who inherit family land in East Austin.

3. Eighty percent of Median Family Income (MFI) is not affordable housing. Austin has to have options for people and families that are 20%, 30% and 50% of MFI.

4. Current discussions of affordable housing do not address the needs of families currently living in Austin who want to stay.

5. The protection of existing homes and neighborhoods is the most affordable housing option of all. The most affordable housing option is making it affordable for people to stay in their existing homes.

6. Austin residents are moving to Buda, Pflugerville, Manor, Hutto, Bastrop and Travis County just to find affordable housing.

7. Some renters are moving yearly because rents keep going up.

8. The definition of affordable housing (qualifications) needs to be reconsidered and revised based on the family income in the area.

Recommendations:

1. Change the definition of affordable housing. Affordable housing is 60% or less of MFI; low-income housing is 30% to 40% of MFI.

2. Preserve existing homes and provide grants and low interest loans for maintenance and repairs. This is much more affordable than displacing people and building brand new homes that existing residents can't afford to buy.

3. Provide more funding for the East Austin Conservancy and programs like it that pay half of seniors' property taxes so that they can stay in their homes. Currently, 30 families are helped on a rotating basis. The Conservancy can help 30 families for $50,000 whereas to build 30 new homes would cost millions of dollars.

AFFORDABILITY

4. Look at the MFI in respective neighborhoods instead of using the MFI in the city as a whole. Tailor the price of affordable units to where you are building.

5. Create a special zoning category for the people who live in small homes, who are not adding to the size of their homes but whose property values are escalating based on surrounding development. These residents are currently being taxed as if they are in 3,000 to 5,000 square foot homes.

6. Hold property taxes steady for homeowners whose property valuations have increased not because of their improvements but because of other real estate activity in the area.

7. Require a higher percentage of units to be built that are affordable to people who make 30% to 40% of MFI.

THEME: HOUSING

Single-family homes provide neighborhoods their special identity and stability. Single-family homes are the preferred housing choice, although there is a need for every type of housing, particularly affordable options.

Comments:

1. Reasons cited for wanting single-family home options included maintaining existing neighborhood character, addressing the needs of families (e.g., yards, space, the number of bedrooms, etc.), providing ownership options and supporting the American dream of home ownership.

2. A mix of housing options is desired. Factors such as family size, age of inhabitant (s) and income impact what type of housing is needed and when it is needed.

3. More duplexes are needed because they are a happy medium. They would double the number of residents and you can still maintain a single-family home perspective and the neighborhood character that people are used to in Austin. I also like the idea of row homes because people still have home ownership.

4. Housing for seniors is needed. It must be low maintenance and accessible and close to neighbors and friends to avoid loneliness and isolation.

5. A significant amount of the available multi-family housing doesn't have enough bedrooms to meet the needs of families with children or living with extended family.

6. CodeNEXT is not incorporating all of Imagine Austin. Imagine Austin envisioned neighborhood centers throughout the city (not just in the central city) where infrastructure and affordable housing, as well as market-based housing, would be built. This option would provide housing in existing neighborhoods, and allow residents to return who have moved because of price pressures.

Recommendations:

1. Incorporate policies into CodeNEXT, or side by side with CodeNEXT, through the neighborhood housing or community development departments, that address the housing crisis.

2. Take 1% of the City's budget and build affordable housing.

Housing

Recommendations:

3. Make use of city, county, school district, state and University of Texas property to build affordable housing so land is used for public good rather than financial profit.

4. Be creative and find new uses for old spaces, like the old Brackenridge Hospital. Make it into affordable housing.

5. Require a fund for low income housing to be incorporated into CodeNEXT.

6. Adjust occupancy restrictions in appropriate areas. Some families are financially interdependent even though they are not related by blood or marriage. Rent and mortgages are more affordable when costs are shared.

7. Provide property for more manufactured home parks and encourage the construction of more manufactured homes.

8. Provide a mix of diverse housing opportunities in all parts of the city. Seniors do not necessarily want to live in single-family homes and families with children appreciate having the additional space afforded by single-family homes.

9. Enforce the building code to prevent slumlords from owning dilapidated houses that lower neighborhood values and create eyesores.

Theme: Density and Gentrification

The increased density allowed in CodeNEXT will not increase affordable housing but will harm and displace existing residents by increasing property taxes, changing the character of neighborhoods and driving up the cost of housing.

Comments:

1. Density does not increase affordable housing. Just look around. Look at the new dense housing units. The rents and mortgages are not affordable. People are displaced, then a few affordable units are set aside. The new residents don't look like the residents who were displaced.

2. Most folks in East Austin won't benefit from the ability to add more units on a lot. It will cost upwards of $300,000 to build a one-bedroom/one bath unit. The economics, credit history, etc. of current residents don't work. ADU's are good for only a small number of people (e.g., who can qualify for loans, those with only one to two people they want to house, those who choose to be landlords, etc.)

3. For persons who have paid off their homes, borrowing for ADU's creates the risk of losing an already paid for residence.

4. The increased density permitted in the proposed code will only benefit builders, allowing them to place more units on a designated piece of land and justify the high prices they are paying.

5. Density is the latest tactic to force Black and Hispanic people from their land.

6. East Austin is not the central business district. The density specifications will exacerbate gentrification. It will destroy the neighborhood character and make it look like downtown. This is totally unacceptable.

7. Density should not be the only option. I don't want to see every single-family house replaced by a fourplex that would then cost $350,000.

Density and Gentrification

Recommendations:

1. Do not zone East Austin like it is the Central Business District (CBD).
2. Push for density in areas other than East Austin.
3. The density program is already a City program. It shouldn't be addressed in CodeNEXT.

Theme: Mobility
Residents are adversely impacted by traffic congestion, limited transit options and current transportation policy. The low-income are disproportionally impacted.

Comments:

1. It takes too long to get anywhere (traffic, slow buses, undependable buses, not enough bus routes from inside neighborhoods connected to essential destinations)
2. Low-income residents without cars are isolated from jobs, bus routes and other vital services they need.
3. Insufficient parking is an issue (e.g., apartments are being built without sufficient parking, low-income people are being asked to pay for parking, employers downtown don't have parking, vendors have insufficient parking, etc.). Lack of parking is negatively impacting people and businesses.
4. Bike lanes are not the solution. Bike lanes don't work for most people (e.g., people with children, elderly, for most adults, very few people when it's hot). Bike lanes are only useful for a very small segment of the population.
5. Bike lanes are increasing congestion by taking traffic lanes.
6. Many people need cars to get to jobs, to get groceries, because of age and physical conditions, etc.
7. Bus routes are not convenient. Either they don't go where people need to go or it takes too long to get to a bus stop. Buses only go downtown. If you don't work downtown, the system doesn't get you to work.
8. To encourage transit ridership, more things are necessary:

    a. Connectivity – people have to get to the health clinics, grocery store, the post office, etc.

    b. Routes that go where people are going

    c. Bus stops that people can easily get to

    d. Dependability

    e. Covered bus stops with seating
9. There are no buses for people who have moved beyond Austin's city limits for affordability reasons. Neither are there park and rides in strategic areas where they can leave their cars and ride the bus.
10. The immigrant community depends heavily (or is accustomed to using) transit, but many live in areas not served by buses.
11. The bus system needs to serve individuals and families in existing communities. It's too far to get to bus stops, when they exist. Circulator buses would help. They can be smaller and faster.

MOBILITY

Recommendations:

1. Make sure neighborhoods have sidewalks and accessibility for people with disabilities.

2. Turn city easements into sidewalks and include benches with shade covers.

3. Provide adequate parking, which is crucial to those who have jobs requiring that they drive a car or truck.

4. Develop Affordable Equitable Transit Oriented Developments, which create transit hubs so that people have access to transit as well as affordable housing. Financial programs are available that encourage banks to increase available loans within the transit hub.

5. Capital Metro needs to offer more and better bus routes that connect to grocery stores, schools, doctors' offices, jobs, etc. People should be able to walk out their front door and get to their destination in a reasonable amount of time.

6. Implement fleets of small buses to circulate in neighborhoods to get seniors and others to the bus stops and back to their homes. Encourage developers and other private investors to pay for these and other unique transportation venues.

THEME: THE PROCESS

The most vulnerable have not been talked to and don't know what is happening; the proposed code weakens neighborhoods and encourages gentrification; a result of CodeNEXT will be to promote growth at the expense of current residents, community values and culture; and, too many questions and outstanding issues remain to adopt CodeNEXT without addressing these questions and issues first.

Comments:

1. CodeNEXT ignores neighborhood plans. Residents have spent years on those plans in an attempt to preserve and maintain their neighborhoods.

2. Moving from use-based code to form-based code in CodeNEXT offers fewer protections to neighborhoods. There are fewer notifications to neighbors and does away with neighborhood protections.

3. Someone needs to acknowledge the negative impact of previous policies and ensure that the new code doesn't do the same.

4. It would go a long way if the City came out and talked to neighborhoods and addressed concerns prior to trying to move forward. There is an opportunity to address the concerns of the people in neighborhoods. It hasn't been done. There are ways to improve on the integrity and transparency of the process.

Recommendations:

1. Slow down. Don't adopt CodeNEXT in April. Recalibrate and go to each neighborhood with the neighborhood plan and go parcel by parcel. Make it local instead of global.

2. Publicly acknowledge the impact of previous policies, especially the 1928 Master Plan that moved Black residents east of I-35. Make sure that new policies don't perpetuate the same discrimination as in the past.

3. Ensure that neighborhood plans are reflected in CodeNEXT. Neighborhoods spent many hours crafting these neighborhood plans only to see them ignored in CodeNEXT.

4. Instead of changing the entire land development code all over the city to make the permitting process more palatable, address the inefficiency of getting permits through the city department that is responsible for them.

5. Talk to neighborhood residents.

THEME: TRADE-OFFS

Some residents are willing to accept trade-offs in exchange for additional affordable housing providing neighborhood safety remains a priority and more affordable housing is guaranteed. The question posed suggested these potential trade-offs and asked respondents to make a choice on items they were willing to trade-off to get more affordable housing.

Comments:

1. We could give up parkland dedication fees in exchange for more affordable housing.

2. Requiring parking spaces, limiting impervious cover and restricting the height of buildings need to stay in place.

3. I would trade-off height restrictions and parking to get more affordable housing.

4. All of these factors that increase the cost of construction are negotiable if their elimination leads to more affordable housing.

5. In exchange for more affordable housing, our trade-offs would be limiting impervious cover, restricting building height and eliminating parkland dedication fees.

6. We would trade-off additional parking spaces, limiting impervious cover and height restrictions if it meant more affordable housing.

7. I would need to see a statute in place that requires developers to pass along the savings from the trade-offs to consumers, and see how affordable housing is defined and what type of housing it is, before agreeing to trade these things for affordable housing.

8. No, the options offered are not suitable trade-offs for more affordable housing. These don't have to be on the table. It's a matter of money and political will that the city must find.

SUMMARY

Representatives of 32 community organizations and groups were asked to participate in a CodeNEXT community engagement effort aimed at getting input from communities that were under-represented in earlier activities. Questions about the important document remained. And, some residents felt unheard and left behind while others believed that the new code was written in such a way as to obfuscate information. Hearing these frustrations, the City of Austin asked Group Solutions to restart the dialogue by engaging with the leadership of groups and organizations in the African American, Asian American, Latino/Hispanic, low-income, and renter communities, as well as people with disabilities.

Group Solutions talked with 25 people representing 17 groups and organizations. Residents openly shared their knowledge about CodeNEXT and discussed their concerns and fears.

Of concern to most respondents were affordability, housing, density and gentrification, mobility and the CodeNEXT process. Residents wanted to protect their neighborhoods and the vulnerable within the community. They communicated that they still had questions about CodeNEXT's long-term impacts and voiced fears that its policies would produce a city where current residents couldn't afford to live.

One conversation clarified the emotional toll of gentrification and displacement. "When you have a community, you have a support system whether its having relatives nearby to take care of your kids, schools that your great grandparents went to, or teachers in the neighborhood that are teaching your kids. When people are gentrified out of a neighborhood it's not like they say, 'Oh, let's ALL move to Manor now.' They go different places." Social structures, businesses and economic opportunities and, even, religious institutions are negatively impacted.

In closing, we spoke with leaders who are passionate about Austin. They appreciated the opportunity to share their concerns and ideas. They asked that the CodeNEXT timeline be extended so that unanswered questions were addressed before moving forward, and that the conversation be taken into the community so that those most impacted actually understand what is being proposed. Finally, they wanted to be included in the conversation to make sure the city they love not only grows responsibly, but also preserves the values, cultures and well-being of all residents.

ATTACHMENT A: INTERVIEW GUIDE

CodeNEXT gives property owners guidelines and choices with regards to how they use or build on their property. The City can offer some incentives to provide benefits to the community. While these are options, it is the property owner who chooses to exercise the options or incentives proposed in CodeNEXT.

The challenge: A property owner's choice sometimes impacts surrounding property owners and the community.

OPENING DISCUSSION
How much do you currently know about CodeNEXT (on a 1 to 5 scale, with 1 being "very little" and 5 being "a whole lot")?

Could you currently support CodeNEXT as you know it? Could you give me 2-3 reasons why or why not?

COMMUNITY
Imagine Austin and CodeNEXT refer to the term community frequently.

Q1. How do you define community?
- Give some examples of community
- What are the boundaries

Q2. What is the most important priority to you in terms of strengthening your community?

Q3. How do you perceive the future of your community?

Q4. How do you see businesses working in your community?

MOBILITY
Regarding mobility, there are some things within the City's direct control; but most issues are outside of the City's direct control. For example:
- The City can create bike lanes, but cannot require people to ride bikes.
- The City can require construction projects to provide a minimum amount of parking, but cannot force building projects to provide more than the minimum.
- The City could encourage building environments that support increased transit ridership, but the City cannot implement and design bus routes or make individuals ride the bus.

Q5. What are the primary concerns about mobility in your community?

Q6. What are some examples of important transportation improvements you would like to see alongside construction projects that would improve your quality of life?

Q7. What are some creative ways in which you feel construction projects can assist in reducing traffic generated by their site? (Example of current option: provide parking reductions to allow for ridesharing options like car2go, etc.)

ATTACHMENT A: INTERVIEW GUIDE

HOUSING

The Strategic Housing Blueprint noted that we need 60,000 income restricted affordable housing units over the next 10 years. To help the city meet this goal, we need make it easier to build more housing units. One way to do this is by updating the land development code (i.e. CodeNEXT). While making it easier to build housing can increase the potential number of homes that can be built, it is important to remember that it is up to individual property owners (or builders)to choose to build more housing. Affordable housing is a very complex topic, with all kind of challenges and trade-offs. As the City weighs all these trade-offs, it would be helpful to understand the type of housing that you feel could benefit your community.

Q8. What type of housing is needed in your community? Examples include single family, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, rowhouses, mobile/manufactured homes, large apartment buildings, etc.

NOTE: *Mobile home and manufactured are basically the same thing. Mobile home is the name used prior to 1976 when HUD developed new regulations; manufactured home is the name given to this housing created after 1976.*

Q9. What is important about that type of housing?

There are tradeoffs to increasing our supply of housing, especially affordable housing options. Here is a list of factors that can increase the cost of construction, which in turn increases the cost of housing.

Q10. Which of the following are you willing to trade to get more affordable housing?
- Providing or requiring parking space(s)
- Limited impervious cover (concrete, hard surfaces that prevent water flow)
- Restricting height of buildings
- Requiring parkland dedication fee
- Requiring infrastructure improvement fees
- Requiring engineering certification to determine flooding impact to surrounding areas
- Anything else?

CONCLUSION

Thank you very much for your time. In closing is there any information that you would like to share with us that we have not already discussed?

ATTACHMENT B: WORKING OUTREACH LIST

A representative of each of the following community organizations was asked to participate in conversations about CodeNEXT. Those who participated in conversations and provided input into this report are noted below with an asterisk.

African American Resource Advisory Commission *
AFTV5 TV Network *
Asian American Cultural Center *
Asian American Resource Center (non-profit) *
Asian Pacific Islander American Public Affairs Association
Asian Real Estate Association of America Austin
Austin Taiwanese Association
Austin Justice Coalition
Austin Revitalization Authority *
Austin Tenants' Council *
Black Sovereign Nation
Chamber of Commerce for People with Disabilities
Colony Park Neighborhood Association *
Communities of Color United (CCU) Coalition for Racial Justice
Community Action Network *
Community First Village
El Concilio
Fo Guang Shan Xiang Yun Temple
Go!Austin/VAMOSi Austin (GAVA) *
Grassroots Leadership
Huston-Tillotson University
Hispanic Advocates Business Leaders of Austin (HABLA)
Interfaith Action of Central Texas *
Knowbility
Las Comadres
NAACP *
Network of Asian American Organizations *
Raza Roundtable *
Restore Rundberg *
Six Square *
Teatro Vivo *
The People's Forum *

Attachment C: Organizational Profiles

African American Resource Advisory Commission

The Commission advises the City Council on issues relating to the quality of life for the City's African American community and recommends programs designed to alleviate any inequities that may confront African Americans in social, economic and vocational pursuits, including health care; housing, including affordable housing; home ownership and homelessness; entertainment opportunities for professionals and students; employment; and cultural venues, including museums, theaters, art galleries and music venues.

AFTV5 TV Network

AFTV5 is a non-profit and non-partisan video production organization with a social focus. AFTV5 is committed to the value of community television, delivering alternatives to commercial broadcast television. The Network aims to provoke thought, create positive impact in our communities, foster change and provide a voice for diversity and expression. AFTV5 seeks to report and to expose the African and African American community experiences and their interaction with the greater community. Through the exposure of the culture, AFTV5 provides a window into its customs.

Asian American Cultural Center

The Asian American Cultural Center facilitates the sharing of culture between the Asian American community and the Austin community at large. Asian Americans are a diverse people with a rich cultural heritage from the many countries of Asia. The organization celebrates the Asian American experience in Austin by offering, sponsoring and organizing a variety of events and functions including the annual Lunar New Year Festival, the Austin Dragon Festival and Boat Race and Harvest Moon Festival. Space is offered at the Center for Tai chi classes, and Japanese and Hawaii Dance classes as well as free ESL and citizenship classes for new immigrants.

Asian American Resource Center (AARC)

AARC is a nonprofit organization whose mission is to enhance and promote the quality of life of Asian Americans in the Central Texas area through social services, education and cultural arts. This mission is accomplished by:

- Providing community focused programs.
- Giving a voice to underserved Asian American families in-need struggling with poverty and limited English skills.
- Advocating for better policies, funding, and access to services at the city and state level.

Austin Revitalization Authority (ARA)

The ARA is a community and economic development corporation celebrating more than 20 years of service facilitating residential, commercial, and cultural development as well as historical preservation within the 11th and 12th Street redevelopment area. ARA has also facilitated, sponsored, and co-sponsored many cultural development projects throughout the East Austin Community.

Austin Tenants' Council

The Austin Tenants' Council protects tenants' rights and educates the community on fair housing. Our vision is to make Texas communities open to all without discrimination and free of landlord-tenant disputes.

Attachment C: Organizational Profiles

Colony Park Neighborhood Association

Colony Park was annexed in 1973, by the city of Austin. There are 988 homes that make up the Colony Park neighborhood (including Lakeside, Colony Meadows, Meadows of Walnut Creek, and Park Place neighborhoods). Colony Park is fortunate to have an active neighborhood association filled with many long-term residents that range in different backgrounds and ages. The American Planning Association Texas Chapter awarded a Project Planning Award to the neighborhood's Colony Park Sustainable Communities Initiative at their annual conference in San Antonio, Texas on November 4, 2016.

Community Action Network (CAN)

CAN is a partnership of governmental, non-profit, private and faith-based organizations which leverage mutual resources to collectively improve social, health, educational and economic opportunities in our community.

Go!Austin/VAMOS Austin (GAVA)

GAVA is a coalition of residents, community leaders, and nonprofits working to improve the health of communities in 78744 and 78745 by increasing access to and participation in physical activity and improved nutrition. GAVA uses community organizing and institutional alignment in five sectors – physical activity, healthy food access, coordinated school health, early childhood and community safety – to improve the health of the built environment and build community power for health equity.

Interfaith Action of Central Texas

Interfaith Action cultivates peace and respect through interfaith dialogue, service and celebration.

NAACP

Founded on February 12, 1909, the NAACP is the nation's oldest, largest, and most widely recognized grassroots-based civil rights organization. Its more than a half-million members and supporters throughout the United States and the world are the premier advocates for civil rights in their communities, campaigning for equal opportunity and conducting voter mobilization.

Network of Asian American Organizations

Established in 1996 and officially incorporated as a 501(c)(4) non-profit organization, the Network of Asian American Organizations (NAAO) is the leading service and information network that unites and promotes the Asian American community through educational, cultural, social, and business.

Raza Roundtable

Raza Roundtable developed out of the 40th anniversary of La Raza Unida Party of Texas, held in 2010 in Austin. Raza Roundtable is a coalition of individuals and groups dedicated to helping each other deal with issues affecting Latinos in Austin. The coalition has sponsored activities ranging from candidates forums to presentations to inform members of plans, projects and policies of interest to our community. We represent our constituents to local and state elected officials, and ask members to provide updates at our twice monthly meetings.

Attachment C: Organizational Profiles

Restore Rundberg

Restore Rundberg's mission is to improve the quality of life, health, safety, education, and well-being of individuals living and working in the Rundberg community. This community-driven initiative is a partnership between neighborhoods, the community, government, higher education, public safety, researchers, and stakeholder groups. The goal is to develop innovative crime solution and complementary social services. Rather than short-term fixes, it's important that these crime solutions are sustainable over time. Much research is under way in partnership with The University of Texas at Austin School of Social Work.

Six Square

Six Square is the nexus of thriving Black arts and culture in Central East Austin. The District is six square miles of historic geographic sites that the organization is preserving for future generations. Leaders are creating an incubation space where art and culture can be celebrated and enjoyed and brought to the limelight, not just for the community who lives here, but for all of Austin and Austin's visitors.

Teatro Vivo

Teatro Vivo is dedicated to producing quality bilingual theater accessible to all theater audiences and artists. Teatro Vivo reflects the heart and soul of the Latino reality by opening a unique window for all to share in this experience.

The People's Forum

The People's Forum was formed in 1996 by representatives of about 25 Central East Austin neighborhoods. The group meets six months out of the year with the Austin Police Department as needed to discuss and monitor issues that affect the neighborhoods, like the Republic of Texas Rally which annually causes traffic to back up on MLK Boulevard, the primary thoroughfare in the neighborhood.

Attachment D: Demographic Totals

	Stakeholder Groups Name	Total Participants	a. African American	b. Asian American	c. Latino/Hispanic	d. Anglo-White-Non-Hispanic	e. Native American	f. Other	a. 18 or under	b. 18-24	c. 25-34	d. 35-44	e. 45-54	f. 55 or older	Male	Female
1.	Interfaith Action of Central Texas	1	1										1			1
2.	Austin Tenants' Council	3			2	1					2	1				3
3.	Community Action Network	1			1								1		1	
4.	Go!Austin/¡VAMOS¡ Austin (GAVA)	4			4						1	2	1			4
5.	Raza Roundtable	2			2									2	1	1
6.	Restore Rundberg	1			1								1			1
7.	Teatro Vivo	1			1							1				1
8.	AFTV5 TV Network	3	3										3		3	
9.	African American Resource Advisory Commission	1	1								1					1
10.	Austin Revitalization Authority	1	1											1	1	
11.	Colony Park Neighborhood Association	1	1											1		1
12.	NAACP	1	1											1	1	
13.	Six Square	1	1									1				1
14.	The People's Forum	1	1											1		1
15.	Asian American Cultural Center	1		1										1		1
16.	Asian American Resource Center (Non Profit)	1		1								1				1
17.	Network of Asian American Org.	1		1										1	1	
		25	10	3	11	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	8	8	17