



Growth Management Policy Study

Working Group Meeting #2 Summary

June 4, 2019, 8:30 AM – 10:30 AM

115 Plaza de Armas, Plaza de Armas Gallery, San Antonio, TX 78205

ATTENDEES:

Alex Lopez, Economic Development
Department

Ana Villarreal, Planning

Bridgett White, Planning

Carl Wedige, San Antonio Fire Department

Clinton Eliason, Planning

David Brewer, Bexar County Fire Marshall's
Office

David McDaniel, Solid Waste Management

Eric Friedland, Office of the City Attorney

Gerald Herrera, Bexar County Fire Marshall's
Office

Jameene Williams, Office of the City Attorney

Ivone De La Rosa, TXDoT

James Geyenheimer, SAWS

Jana Punelli, Planning

Josh Chronley, Office of Management & Budget

Kara Hill, CPS Energy

Kayla Leal, Planning

Linda Vela, Alamo Area MPO

Lynda Rodriguez, CPS Energy

Manuel Leal, Bexar County

Margarita Hernandez, Transportation and
Capital Improvements

Megan Dodge, Government and Public Affairs

Michael Mullins, San Antonio Fire Department

Patrick Middleton, San Antonio Water Systems

Priscilla Rosales-Piña, Planning

Robert Brach, Bexar County

Rudy Nino, Planning

Susan Guinn, Office of the City Attorney

Thomas Filopoulos, Office of the City Attorney

Tim Woliver, Military and Veteran Affairs

Tony Felts, Development Services Department

CONSULTANTS:

Matt Prosser, Economic & Planning Systems

Brian Duffany, Economic & Planning Systems

Gretchen Roufs, Auxiliary Marketing Service

MEETING PURPOSE

The purpose of the Annexation and Growth Policy – Working Group meeting was to meet with representatives from City departments and outside agencies whom are impacted by annexation and/or municipal growth policies, as well as to gain their input in developing technical White Papers and the Policy Update.

PRESENTATION

The meeting format included a PowerPoint presentation which focused on agreements and partnerships with other public entities and stakeholders. Matt Prosser provided an overview on growth management in conjunction with the City's annexation policy. He discussed growth patterns and demographic trends in regard to the geographic areas of utilities and service providers.

Brian re-emphasized some of the objectives, issues, and constraints of Bexar County and the City of San Antonio from the previous April 9 meeting.

Issues – Various attendees agreed that there is gap between City and the County standards, in regards to street and road infrastructure. After the annexation, cities are required to undertake

major projects to repair or improve annexed county roads and/or streets. TCI staff added that this is a similar situation with drainage and storm water infrastructure and facilities. Current conditions may cause flooding in various areas of the city and county. SAFD staff mentioned that the lack of fire hydrants, as well as inadequate water flows for hydrants is expensive to bring up to city standards.

Objectives – Brian mentioned that those two entities desire responsible growth. He requested audience members to expand on the meaning of responsible growth. Responses included: consistency with the adopted plans and the City’s SA Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan, which has guidelines on growth and development; limit urban sprawl, equitable growth, encourage compliance with development and building standards and the ability to provide a minimal level of community services.

Mutual Benefits or Common Interests – Bexar County staff mentioned Tax Increment Reinvestment Zones (TIRZ), special districts, and voluntary annexations were the only tools spurring growth and development in southern parts of the city and the county.

Constraints – The group agreed that the County needs additional powers in the extraterritorial jurisdiction (ETJ). In addition, State legislation limits counties on the sources of revenue or financing. For instance, counties are not allowed to access impact fees on projects. The group added that the timing of a project can be a constraint for the completion of those projects. For instance, many development projects require a Traffic Improvement Assessment (TIA), which is based on rough proportionality policy and may require only a half of a street or an intersection to be built. If another development does not occur in a timely manner, then counties often will step in to complete the project.

EXERCISE: FRAMEWORK FOR SOLUTION

The group was broken into smaller groups for a brainstorming exercise to focus on the organization framework of various stakeholders instead of their geographical areas. Brian Duffany provided a handout for individual groups to identify and agree on the following: Objectives, Issues, and Mutual Benefits or Common Interests and Constraints of various stakeholders.

Results from Exercise

Individual working groups reported comments and asked questions during the exercise. Below are the discussion results pertaining to different stakeholders and their partnerships:

1) Bexar County

Objectives – County and City staff want to ensure public infrastructure and facilities in outlying areas are built to consistent standards in case the City or the County, utilities or public entities need to take over infrastructure.

Issues – There were several issues identified. Bexar County staff mentioned that there may be situations where more regulations may result in illegal development. SAWS staff indicated that water utilities and service providers are obligated to build facilities and/or infrastructure for dense residential areas surrounded by rural areas at a distance from densely populated areas. Another attendee mentioned that housing developments located within unincorporated areas of the county often promote “No City Taxes” as a major benefit. However, property owners may not be aware of

all the taxing entities and their assessment rates. Property owners tend to believe that the tax rates of cities and counties are the highest when it is actually the school districts' tax rates that are the highest. Even more so, buyers and property owners expect a certain level of public services that are not available in the county. CPS Energy indicated that they receive numerous requests for installation of street lights in county areas. Residents frequently indicate that this is a public safety issue. Residents generally may not realize that they are responsible for their own garbage collection services. Currently, the lack of these services is a public health and safety issue in eastern Bexar County.

Mutual Benefits or Common Interests – County staff mentioned that it would be advantageous for residents if the City were to annex areas, provide services and take over infrastructure.

Constraints – County Staff mentioned one of their constraints is the limited powers granted by State legislation. Counties do not have the regulatory authority to mandate or enforce any type of waste collection or clean up services. In addition, municipal annexation powers have been curtailed even more since passage of the 2017 Senate Bill 6. Even so, when annexation was more plausible, it had been cost prohibitive for cities to annex areas with subpar infrastructure and facilities. In addition, it had been more expensive to annex only residential areas without commercial or industrial uses.

2) Real Estate Developers/ Land Owners

Objectives – The groups reported that the primary goal of the development community is to make a profit.

Issues – Once a development is completed, the developer and builder walk away. The local entities are called on resolve services and infrastructure issues with the development.

Mutual Benefits or Common Interests – There should be more incentives and tools to draw development into cities.

Constraints – Cities cannot promote or advocate annexation, including the benefits of taxes, to pay for an adequate level of services to urbanizing areas in the county.

3) Military Facilities

Objectives – Development surrounding Joint Base San Antonio (JBSA) should support existing military missions but also allow for opportunities to expand their missions in the future.

Issues –The City and County are required to notify JBSA representatives about development projects located within the 5 mile buffer of a JBSA installation. However, the notification is only a courtesy and cannot be acted on by the military. JBSA staff generally attempt to work with property owners or developers.

Mutual Benefits or Common Interests – JBSA support development and growth as long as it is compatible to their current or future military missions. A representative from AAMPO suggested a land acquisition program for farming or agricultural purposes near military installations. Funding could be similar to the Proposition 1 for the Edwards Aquifer Protection Program.

Constraints – Military staff indicated that State legislation tends to be pro-development. The existing Joint Land Use Studies (JLUS) for Camp Bullis and Lackland Air Force Base are already dated. The JLUS language regarding land use, development and zoning powers is not specific enough. Cities and counties have limited land use tools in extraterritorial jurisdiction (ETJ) areas near military installations. JBSA staff and military representatives cannot advocate on city related issues, including annexation.

4) Neighboring Jurisdictions

Objectives – Each city desires to control and/or expand their existing boundaries.

Issues – There are different political wills, as well as distrust among different cities and jurisdictions.

Mutual Benefits or Common Interests – There are opportunities for regional cooperation.

Constraints – There are different levels of infrastructure, services and regulations among different jurisdictions that may hinder regional cooperation or partnership.

Another comment was to add school districts to the conversation. School districts often have to catch up with population growth in their areas. For instance, the school district will complete building a new school when it is already over capacity and portable classrooms will have to supplement the newly built school.

At the end of the exercise, an attendee inquired about the SA Tomorrow Plan. Matt explained that it is the City's comprehensive plan which provides goals and policies regarding, land use, growth, physical form, transportation, sustainability and other major issues for policy makers. A primer on the SA Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan will be provided at the next Working Group Meeting.

NEXT STEPS:

The next Working Team Meeting (#3) is scheduled for July 23, 2019.

Meeting summaries and presentations will be available on the following website:

<https://www.sanantonio.gov/Planning/PlanningUrbanDesign/Annexation#233953492-annexation-policy-updates>