

Executive Summary/One Page: Plan CC 2035 Comments

If adopted, PlanCC2035 will become the law of Corpus Christi.

Unless we work together to change it, this IS currently in PlanCC2035:

- Develop a plan for facilities and programs so that every resident has the opportunity to learn how to swim
- Seek partnership options to create community boating programs and education
- Support a greenhouse-gas audit and use of renewable energy sources
- Promote lower vehicular speeds
- ... reduce single-occupancy vehicle use ...
- Seek provision of high-speed Internet and telecommunications access to all residents and businesses
- Work with electric service providers to upgrade the grid and put it underground

Do you want this to be the law? I don't.

In addition to the above, there are millions of dollars of new spending on new programs – frankly money that the City does not have.

Police, Fire, Emergency Preparedness, and Animal Control are missing from the plan even though these are critical City services that represent 60% of the current City budget.

Instead of PlanCC2035, the City should focus on streets, water, wastewater, public safety and other essential services.

For these reasons, I have prepared the following:

- This One Page Executive Summary
- Cover Letter
- Written Comments
- Motion of Direction to Staff

Thank you,
Chad Magill, At Large City Councilman
Corpus Christi

Dear Citizens of Corpus Christi:

First and foremost, I appreciate the enormous amount of work to develop the draft of PlanCC2035. Under the guidance of Goody Clancy, we have a document in front of the Council and the citizens of Corpus Christi for review. I know that many hours were invested in this document by citizens, city staff, planning commissioners, and paid consultants. What we have before us today is the culmination of that work, as a single document. It is that document itself that must be considered and not the process that got it here.



When considering the plan, there are practical issues, such as limited City budgets. There are also philosophical issues such as the appropriate scope and role of government. If adopted through the ordinance process, this document will achieve the force of law, and according to City Charter, "All city improvements, ordinances and regulations, shall be consistent with the comprehensive plan." Future City Councils will be guided by it, City staff will be bound by it, and the citizens will make choices in reliance upon it. Because this document will become law, every word must be considered and each word has the awesome potential to shape the future of our City.

There can be no question that this document will impact the activities of City staff, City budgets, provision of City services, land development, land value, and the environment, among other issues, each enormous in scope and important to all City stakeholders. As such, the policies of the plan, and the plan as a whole must be carefully weighed. There will be intentional, direct consequences and unintentional, indirect consequences.

Ultimately, it is the current and future citizens of Corpus Christi that will shape our City. While government can engage in a "Visioning" process, we must recognize that it is the hard work of each individual, private investment, and the sum of billions of choices by free people that will determine what the City becomes. A comprehensive plan should allow for the free market to thrive and communicate our future focus to do so - not constrict future growth.

I believe it was important to respect the process, without my interference. But now that the document comes before us on Council, it is the time that I must provide my feedback as a matter of conscience and also in my role as At-Large City Councilman being asked to deliberate on and adopt this plan.

In considering each of the plan elements, I applied a three-fold test:

- 1. Is it fiscally responsible, with respect to our city's current needs?**
- 2. Does it help or hurt citizens?**
- 3. Does it provide clear direction to City staff or future leadership?**

With these considerations in mind, here are my comments on PlanCC2035.

Faithfully submitted,

Chad Magill, At-Large City Council
Corpus Christi

All page references are with respect to Draft July 2015, PlanCC2035:

Page 9		<p>The Plan includes pages of musings of which page 9 is an example.</p> <p>There are parts that I agree with, such as, “Our skilled workforce results from a commitment to a strong culture of educational achievement, from pre-school to grad school.”</p> <p>There are parts that seem untrue, such as, “City services, infrastructure, and utility systems – have been modernized over the last 20 years to ensure that the city can support and maintain urban and industrial growth, employing best practices in a cost-efficient manner”</p> <p>Imprecise language diminishes the value of any plan, because it does not frame the issue to allow for the development of policy or the implementation of action.</p> <p><i>So rather than nit-pick particular wording, I recommend that the imprecise visioning parts be abstracted into a snapshot of current feelings and observations so that this element of work is captured in a single document, but not elevated into law. For purposes of discussion let’s call that collected document “VisionCC2035”.</i></p> <p>The Goals and Policies for Decision Makers seem to be the core plan elements so they will remain as the PlanCC2035 for consideration for adoption by ordinance into law.</p>
Page 10		Move to VisionCC2035
Page 11		Seems redundant of page 12. Page 12 probably has a better statement of the facts.
Page 13	G1	As a 20 year goal, I’m not sure it is reasonable to plan to exceed Federal and State water quality standards.
Page 13	G1, P1	“always safe to swim at ... bay, Padre, and Mustang Islands.” This seems like an impossibly high standard because the designated geography is enormous. Does this envision regular lifeguard patrols over this large area and facilities improvements? – because otherwise, I can’t imagine what meets this standard. I don’t think that there is existing budget capacity for this activity; I don’t think that there is existing City staff who has capacity to take on this responsibility.
Page 13	G1, P2	“... improve water quality so that shellfish beds are open throughout the city and thrive throughout the Bay.” Does this imply clean water standards higher than currently mandated? Will the City have to acquire and maintain shellfish expertise? Does the City have an obligation to engage in

		shellfish monitoring programs? Does the City become responsible for water quality in the Bay even though non-City entities impact it, such as shipping traffic or other cities? I don't think that there is existing budget capacity for this activity; I don't think that there is existing City staff who has capacity to take on this responsibility.
Page 13	G1, P3	"... balance fresh and salt water in estuary." Does the City become responsible for water quality in the Bay even though non-City entities impact it, such as other cities? Does the City become responsible for fresh water sources other than what it controls as water supply intake or wastewater effluent? I don't think that there is existing budget capacity for this activity; I don't think that there is existing City staff who has capacity to take on this responsibility.
Page 13	G2, P1,2	Wetlands and wetlands mitigation are very important. There are also numerous State and Federal agencies that are devoted to the identification and preservation of this precious resource. Unfortunately the issue is very complicated and often contentious. I am not sure that the City has the expertise or resources to engage this issue in a manner that would do anything other than duplicate governance or be ineffective. I don't think that there is existing budget capacity for this activity; I don't think that there is existing City staff who has capacity to take on this responsibility.
Page 13	G3, P1	"... preservation of bird rookeries and similar critical habitat sites." Birds and bird rookeries are very important. There are also numerous State and Federal agencies that are devoted to the identification and preservation of this precious resource. Unfortunately the issue is very complicated and often contentious. I am not sure that the City has the expertise or resources to engage this issue in a manner that would do anything other than duplicate governance or be ineffective. I don't think that there is existing budget capacity for this activity; I don't think that there is existing City staff who has capacity to take on this responsibility.
Page 13	G3, P2	OK, this seems consistent with current City practices and is sustainable into the future.
Page 13	G3, P3	"...promote ecotourism..." Ecotourism is an important category of tourism that has financial benefit and promotes awareness of environmental protection. Corpus Christi is blessed to have substantial advantage as a destination. I support it. However, I do not think that this is a policy matter that deserves special recognition apart from other tourism drivers. The City has numerous direct or indirect agencies which are responsible for stimulating or facilitating tourism. I think that it is up to them to prioritize ecotourism among the many tourism objectives without interference from City Council or City staff.
Page 13	G4, P1	"Give priority to natural, green drainage systems..." I don't have an

		expansive knowledge with respect to the range of drainage system options. It would therefore be unwise to recommend a prioritization without an understanding of cost, quality, or impact of green systems as compared with other choices.
Page 13	G4, P2	“Give priority to strengthening the green character of existing open spaces.” I don’t exactly know what this means. Do we (1) add more plants with irrigation to turn it green, or (2) do we remove non-native plants and irrigation to allow the land to revert to its natural state?
Page 13	G4, P3,4	OK, this seems consistent with current City practices and is sustainable into the future. Should also evaluate potential for utility easements.
Page 13	G5, P1	OK, this seems consistent with current City practices and is sustainable into the future.
Page 13	G6, P1-4	Trees are wonderful. They also have costs associated with watering, trimming, trimming disposal, irrigation systems, and management. There is also an inherent liability associated with the regional high-winds. Downed trees are a danger to life and property and may interfere with travel or provision of emergency services in a hurricane. I absolutely support private tree planting and acceptance of these costs. I also support volunteer efforts to increase greenery. However, I reserve my support for governmental trees without a complete understanding of the cost and assignment of roles necessary to properly maintain them – especially within existing budgets and staffing. I would be very receptive to trees located as a park amenity to provide shade and make existing parks more usable – unfortunately this was not the specific recommendation within PlanCC2035.
Page 14	G7	OK, this seems consistent with current City practices and is sustainable into the future.
Page 14	G8	Seems duplicative of Goal 7, immediately above. If these are good ideas then they should be part of the PRMP.
Page 14	G9, P1,2	“Develop a plan for facilities and programs so that every resident has the opportunity to learn how to swim.” “Seek partnership options to create community boating programs and education.” I cannot support this as a proper role of City government as a mandate that has budgets and staffing. It seems that in times past both of these goals were served by community groups like Boy/Girl Scouts or any of the numerous other organizations that are available to everyone at low or no cost and that build community from the grass roots, inside neighborhoods. Why should City government duplicate or undermine these types of organizations?

Page 17	G1, P1,2	<p>I don't know what "resilience planning" is.</p> <p>I'm for planning for flooding for which stormwater facilities seem to be the appropriate City responsibility.</p> <p>I for planning for hurricanes which require a knowledgeable citizenry to act appropriately and for an organized and sustained emergency response in the face of hazard and its aftermath.</p> <p>However, this seems to be something different.</p>
Page 17	G2, P1	<p>We already protected barrier-beaches in Page 13, Goal 5, so this seems redundant.</p>
Page 17	G2, P2	<p>I don't know what "flood-protection measures" are.</p> <p>Stormwater planning is imperative. Additional regulation on private people or entities depend on the details. Other City actions will require budgets and allocated staffing.</p>
Page 17	G3, P1	<p>"Support a greenhouse-gas audit". No. No potential cost savings. Not required. Expensive. No meaningful alternative to continued use of existing equipment and facilities.</p> <p>"Support use of renewable energy sources." This should be: use the most cost effective energy from any legal source; pick the renewable source in the event of a tie.</p>
Page 17	G3, P2	<p>"Give preference to energy-efficient designs, materials, and equipment..." This should be: consider the total cost of ownership including upfront cost, energy costs, and costs of maintenance.</p>
Page 17	G3, P3	<p>"Expanded use of renewable energy sources" This should be: use the most cost effective energy from any legal source; pick the renewable source in the event of a tie.</p>
Page 17	G4, P1	<p>Private industry, governmental resources at all levels, schools, and NGOs promote renewable-energy options. Any City activity would be redundant and therefore unnecessary.</p>
Page 17	G5, P1	<p>Private industry, governmental resources at all levels, schools, and NGOs promote green building initiatives. Any City activity would be redundant and therefore unnecessary.</p> <p>Green building has cost, design, and operational implications for the property owner such that the City must be very careful not to prejudice particular methods which are otherwise legal and acceptable under the numerous regulations that already exist.</p>

Page 17	G6, P1	<p>There are numerous Federal and State laws regarding brownfield identification, remediation, and use. Brownfield issues are complicated and expensive. The City cannot become involved in these projects without substantial investment in risk management and liability management. It would be absolutely improper to have involvement without consideration of these issues and on a casual basis.</p>
Page 17	G6, P2	<p>Urban blight resulting from abandoned or sub-standard structures is an important issue facing Corpus Christi. I think that the management objective should be 'urban blight' which is remedied by multiple types of redevelopment. I don't understand why the City should favor preservation or re-use over other choices for redevelopment.</p> <p>Often preservation or re-use is the proper choice because it is the most cost effective for the owner. As such, I support it. However this should be the choice of the private owner and not the City.</p>
Page 17	G6, P3	<p>OK for urban farming.</p>
Page 19		<p>In several places, PlanCC2035 discusses, "High-quality, safe, connected and diverse neighborhoods" as providing a variety of living choices. For those who want to live in those neighborhoods, I strongly support them and the developers who build them.</p> <p>In the free market, people who want these neighborhoods should make their desires known to developers. Developers will eagerly build these neighborhoods and people will purchase or rent these housing units. Satisfied tenants and developer unit sales will create the environment where more of these neighborhoods will be built.</p> <p>This process is underway and healthy in Corpus Christi. Downtown is a large live/work/walk/bike/public transit neighborhood. There are many existing loft/apartment choices. The Cosmopolitan is an exciting new development which greatly expands the downtown housing stock. There is also room for substantial re-development to expand and further the neighborhood success.</p> <p>However, in my opinion, PlanCC2035 does not adequately address other types of development. As a general matter, Corpus Christi has demand for housing across all types and neighborhood configurations. Each additional home, no matter the type, cost, or exact location increases the supply of housing and therefore indirectly lowers cost of rents or reduces sale price of existing home sales. Rising housing price increases taxes and increases everyone's housing cost.</p> <p>There are at least two housing types that seem to have been neglected (1)</p>

		<p>large scale tract development, typically on the outer areas of town, and (2) low-cost, low-quality infill development. Each of these segments are important to the total housing stock in the region, the improvement of the tax base, and economic impact simply by this housing stock being built.</p> <p>Certainly there are issues that the City must address to continue these types of construction, extension of city utilities being primarily important to tract development. The first step is understanding the incremental cost to the City and the life-cycle value returned to the City from this new construction. There may need to be negotiations to settle any imbalances. However, to deny the incredible historical growth trends and the likely demand for continuation of this type of development is bad public policy.</p> <p>It is the role of government to be an honest participant to facilitate each of these development types in an unbiased manner. Failure to do so raises everyone’s cost of housing, it denies economic development through growth, it is incompatible with raw land property rights, it unfairly interferes with established developer businesses, and it limits choices of free people to live where they choose.</p> <p>The City currently regulates these activities though an established and well understood system of zoning and other land use practices. To change, augment, or otherwise impact this established system will have enormous intentional and unintentional consequences.</p> <p>If this is explicitly or implicitly part of PlanCC2035, then the City should not underestimate the dislocation and problems associated with this plan.</p> <p>To be very clear, I cannot support anything that does not explicitly address the consequences described above to make sure that they do not occur.</p>
Page 20	G1, P1	<p>“Support a community-based system to develop and implement a citywide housing policy that includes stakeholders from government, the nonprofit sector, and the private sector.”</p> <p>I think that where this policy is headed is local, neighborhood planning boards. In Cities where these boards exist, neighborhood groups convene to pass judgement on every aspect of a new building or permitted improvement. It is like every neighborhood gets its own government-sponsored home owners association.</p> <p>The tools that City government has are zoning, building code, and construction of government-sponsored buildings. Each of these has room for citizen input to make sure that the resulting policy is correct. I support the current system as being fair and time-tested.</p> <p>I cannot support anything that changes, augments, or undermines the current system without a specific proposal that is well considered.</p>

Page 20	G2, P2	<p>“Support of the planning, regulatory and funding initiatives needed to provide a diversity of housing types...”</p> <p>The free market does an exceptional job of this. All forms of the increase of supply of housing stock improve the current situation. We should facilitate growth that results from willing makers and purchasers of these diverse housing types.</p> <p>Government involvement, especially in the form of central planning, generally leads to crony capitalism and waste.</p> <p>As a general statement, all levels of government are so broke, that they cannot ever construct enough housing to provide community-wide assistance to those in true need on a scale that matters. Moreover, there is a wide array of governmental, charity, or religious organizations that focus on this aspect of community.</p>
Page 20	G3, P1	OK, this seems consistent with current City practices and is sustainable into the future.
Page 20	G4, P1	OK, this seems consistent with current City practices and is sustainable into the future. However, for the poorest citizens, either owners or tenants, code enforcement can lead to homelessness, because there are few choices for affordable housing. Thus, this objective needs to be balanced with homeless and housing access issues. As such it may be more of a theoretical than a practical policy.
Page 20	G5, P1	City-assisted housing needs to be safe. It should also be low cost with low operating costs. This is the appropriate standard.
Page 20	G5, P2	City permitting should be streamlined to reduce the City and the developer costs. The standards should be the applicable City code. The issue of “resource-efficiency” is superfluous.
Page 20	G6, P1	OK, this seems consistent with current City practices and is sustainable into the future. These programs should be approved by City Council to make sure that they meet policy and budgetary rules.
Page 20	G7, P1	Each public investment should be considered on its own merits. To limit it to walkable or mixed use is not good public policy.
Page 20	G7, P2,3	OK, this seems consistent with current City practices and is sustainable into

		the future.
Page 20	G8	Expansion of the current City role in development. Unnecessary and likely to raise cost for both developers and owners/tenants. Will add a very high barrier to redevelopment of poorer neighborhoods.
Page 23	G1	I'm skeptical that there is a role for City government to become involved in technology transfer or start-up, new products, or new industries. I support the occurrence of these activities and the many public, private, and non-profit organizations that support this. However, I do not see a role for City staff or budget to support this. The potential for cronyism or mal-investment is very high.
Page 23	G2	OK, this seems consistent with current City practices and is sustainable into the future.
Page 23	G3	OK, this seems consistent with current City practices and is sustainable into the future.
Page 23	G4, P1-3	OK, this seems consistent with current City practices and is sustainable into the future.
Page 23	G4, P4	"Provide positive incentives for highly skilled individuals who have other locational choices to settle in Corpus Christi to pursue their careers." I can't imagine what this means, and if it means anything why it shouldn't apply to retention of talent already here.
Page 23	G5, P1	OK, this seems consistent with current City practices and is sustainable into the future.
Page 23	G5, P2	"Support an easily accessible and seamless service delivery system for jobseekers." They already did this. It's called "Craig's List".
Page 23	G5, P3	"Promote provision of essential support services that enable workers to seek and maintain employment." I have no idea what that means; sounds expensive. My mother provided these essential support services for me.
Page 23	G5, P4	Sounds like a good idea. Especially if the alternative is to whipsaw your program between immediate and long term needs.
Page 23	G6, P1	OK, this seems consistent with current City practices and is sustainable into

		the future.
Page 23	G6, P2	<p>It seems to me that there are already a large number of public, private, charitable, and non-profit initiatives to provide early childhood education (and many other services including nutrition). Many of these are at low to no cost for those in need. The largest is the Head Start program.</p> <p>I don't understand how the City can become involved in a manner that does not duplicate the efforts of other groups who exist especially with that purpose.</p>
Page 23	G6, P3	<p>"age appropriate career exploration ... beginning at elementary level."</p> <p>When I was growing up, children mowed lawns, raked leaves, moved trashcans, or did chores for money. These certainly were not careers, but a value-system that rewarded hard work, customer service. These building blocks of character later turned in to careers.</p> <p>Many of these opportunities have gone away, in part, due to governmental regulation or risk of liability. Perhaps it is a lack of work ethic caused, in part, caused by participation trophies that tend to reward participation as opposed to results.</p> <p>Perhaps instead of focusing on careers as the endpoint, we should focus on the fundamentals that bring accomplishment and a strong character. These are the factors that lead to a success, which often includes a career.</p>
Page 23	G6, P4	OK, this seems practical and is sustainable into the future.
Page 27	G1	OK in principle. The detailed planning initiative and authorization for expenditure should be explicitly authorized by the City Council.
Page 27	G2	OK, this seems practical and is sustainable into the future.
Page 27	G3, P1	Ask the citizens if they want lower vehicle speeds. My guess is that it would be unpopular.
Page 27	G3, P2	OK, this seems consistent with current City practices. Easy to talk about, hard to do. This is clearly a priority of the citizens, Council, and City staff.
Page 27	G4, P1,2	The RTA is a separately funded and operating entity apart from the City.
Page 27	G4, P3	Transit oriented development is good and a worthy. Perhaps the Planning Commission should consider a special designation of land use. I don't consider this rising to the level of a City plan policy objective.
Page 27	G5	OK, this seems consistent with current City practices and is sustainable into the future.

Page 27	G6	<p>OK, in concept. It seems to me that the rail system and at-grade crossings are the responsibility of the Port and/or private companies.</p> <p>I don't support a role for the City which would duplicate or interfere with these entities unless there was a material problem with their current performance. Perhaps there is an opportunity for shared easements or rights of way with respect to replacement or expansion of City utilities.</p>
Page 30	G1, P1	Policy leaves out "groundwater" as a future source of water for the City.
Page 30	G1, P2	Unclear as to why 2060 is the right planning horizon. The master plan needs a strategic plan which is focused on the near-term, five years as an example.
Page 30	G1, P3	OK. However, the financial impact of water conservation should be a consideration in these policies.
Page 30	G1, P4	Policy is specific for "in targeted areas" and as such is too narrow. Planning should be for the entire system.
Page 30	G2, P1	The goal states that water security exceeds State water quality requirements. The standard for water provision should be: the City will provide water in accordance with applicable standards and law, except where the City is appealing in good faith.
Page 30	G2, P2	New technologies should have the additional standard of being cost effective.
Page 30	G3, P1	The standard for wastewater treatment should be: the City will provide wastewater treatment in accordance with applicable standards and law, except where the City is appealing in good faith.
Page 30	G3, P2	OK, this seems consistent with current City practices and is sustainable into the future.
Page 30	G4, P1	Unclear if natural approaches are sufficient or cost effective.
Page 30	G4, P2	Seems difficult to reduce storm water discharge into the Bay without extensive earthworks and retention methods. All of this sounds expensive.
Page 30	G4, P3	Flood control is a necessary and proper role of government for health, safety, property which is the appropriate standard, not necessarily economic loss. For example is the City somehow responsible for economic flood loss for construction in a floodplain?
Page 30	G4, P4	Discussion of a storm water fee is fair discussion, however it is not part of a 20 year planning document in my view. What is missing from the document

		is a clear commitment to have a specific plan related to stormwater facilities or operations. Funding discussion should follow that clear understanding of the actions and the costs.
Page 30	G5, P1	The city may benefit from outsourcing all or some of solid waste functions. The plan seems to prevent this consideration.
Page 30	G5, P2	The City should not look to State and regional goals to determine its recycling plan. The proper standard is: the City should support recycling to meet responsible environmental and financial responsibilities of the City. Of course the City should consider the goals of other entities, but other than legal standards, the path the City takes should be chosen by the City.
Page 30	G6, P1	Does the asset management system need to be a policy, can't we just get this done.
Page 30	G6, P2	The standard for environmental investment should be: invest in environmental and efficiency improvements that make financial sense including lifecycle cost and upfront cost of investment.
Page 30	G7	OK
Page 30	G8	“Seek provision of high-speed internet and telecommunications access to all residents and businesses.” No. This is a private industry offering to any willing buyer. Services include access from cable companies, telephone companies, satellite, and mobile phones. It is heavily regulated at the Federal level to accommodate public policy issues. There is assistance for those in need or otherwise access to public computer facilities. There is absolutely no role for City government in this activity.
Page 30	G9	Undergrounded utilities may complicate existing issues with respect to City services including water, sewer, stormwater, gas, and streets. It is also likely to be an additional expense on electricity bills. This added cost and complexity works against other City goals which include reconstructed streets, stormwater improvements, etc. Choices and priorities have to be made, it is unlikely that undergrounding electrical would be higher than other needs. Undergrounding may add to the complexity of new development and the extension of services as well as other electric utility unintended consequences.

Page 32		Move to VisionCC2035
Page 33	G1, P1	OK, this seems consistent with current City practices and is sustainable into the future.
Page 33	G1, P2	OK, this seems consistent with current City practices and is sustainable into the future.
Page 33	G1, P3	The case has not been made for a City redevelopment authority. Does it have powers of condemnation? Does this duplicate the efforts of code enforcement and property maintenance code. Sounds expensive. High possibility of cronyism.
Page 33	G2	Private developers provide a wide variety of housing types and densities according to market demand. The City should not be prejudicial between property types, because all types bring new housing and tax base. The City should cooperate with private developers to provide infrastructure improvements that are consistent with improved development and will be repaid through higher tax base associated therewith. (Continued) It is not the purview of government to tell people how and where to live. It results in a diminution of property rights and is bad public policy. Anyone today can build an urban and neighborhood village. Development services will be happy to support them. The City welcomes their new development.
Page 33	G3	High-quality built environments are often expensive. The City defines standards in the building code; if you meet them it is acceptable quality which is a good standard. Perhaps the recommendation is exactly backwards, the City should pursue low-quality, low-cost development as a way to stimulate infill development, especially in poorer neighborhoods.
Page 33	G4	Use of the word “adopt” may indicate indicate a change from Joint Land Study that has been already accepted by ordinance. What is being suggested as the change, and what in the current policies are insufficient?
Page 33	G5	Any City involvement in a “fair transition process” exposes the City to liability and real or imagined allegations of picking sides. This is the responsibility of landowners and tenants with the intervention of the court system as necessary. In the limited case where City involvement is required it is imperative that it be handled on a case by case basis and not as a matter of standing policy.

Page 33	G6, P1	<p>Use of the word “adopt” may indicate a change from current policies. What is being suggested as the change, and what in the current policies are insufficient?</p> <p>There also may be a problem with the word “orderly”. Does that necessarily restrict the development opportunity for a willing participant that may not be contiguous to existing City limits.</p>
Page 33	Box area	Move to VisionCC2035
Maps	Maps	<p>Review in different session. Want clear explanation of existing zoning/restrictions versus new recommended zoning/restrictions so that it is easy to see what changed.</p> <p>If there are any changes in land use, are we not morally or legally obligated to specifically notice land owners that their property may be encumbered or restricted as a result of this process?</p>
Page 36, 37		Move to VisionCC2035. Certain neighborhoods clearly, consistently, and forcefully object to their inclusion into particular categories. This may need further revision.

I recommend reading the City’s existing Comprehensive Plan from 1987. It is interesting to compare the issues of today with those of 28 years ago.

MISSING ELEMENTS OF PLANCC2035

PlanCC2035 is missing the comprehensive plan for Public Safety & Animal Control!

Public safety is a core element of City government. Public Safety represents 60% of the City's budget. The health and safety of the citizens depend on the City's Public Safety departments. Public Safety is responsible for a large amount of city assets including buildings, transportation, and service infrastructure.

Police, Fire, and Animal Control were all left out of the comprehensive plan for the next 20 years.

Here are some examples of planning issues that relate to Public Safety where policy needs to happen:

- The incorporation of new technology for Police such as body cameras, communications upgrades, crime tracking systems.
- Use and limitations of medical transport by EMS.
- Policies and goals for Animal Control
- Areas of coverage
- Scope of responsibilities and inter-governmental dependencies.
- Officer retention / training / satisfaction
- Emergency response planning for a hurricane event including setting citizen expectations for issues of communication, evacuation, emergency shelters, etc.

It is important to address for the public safety as well as the safety and satisfaction of the City employees. We can never get a handle on cost if we ignore such a large percentage of budget spending and City personnel.

This omission is even more strange when one considers that the City Charter requires a section of the comprehensive plan to include, "A public services and facilities element, which shall include a capital improvements program."

PlanCC2035 is missing mission critical departments

Finance, and its many related City groups, play a key role within the City. Areas of responsibility include accounting, cash management, accountability, receivables/payables, performance evaluation, recordkeeping, and many other mission critical activities.

Information Technology, and its many related City groups, play a key role within the City. Areas of responsibility include computer systems, file management, critical databases, communications, records retention, remote collaboration, and many other mission critical activities.

Best practices, training, coordination with other City departments, and systems are all areas that need a comprehensive plan.

Each of these items above are included in our current comprehensive plan and could be modernized, instead of

ignored as they are in Plan CC 2035.

PlanCC2035 is missing the plan for ETJ expansion

A City Charter element of the Comprehensive Plan is “Annexation”. While I am unfamiliar with all of the detailed minutia of annexation and the ETJ, it seems clear to me that as the City annexes property to the South, that there is the possibility for expansion of the ETJ.

Even though the current horizon is a twenty year plan, it must contemplate what future Councils will need as 2035 approaches. Thus it is relevant to consider expansion of the ETJ to reflect recently completed or pending annexations.

Future Land Use maps and expansion/annexation discussions should be separated out of the Plan CC 2035 discussion. They should be considered as an update to the existing comprehensive plan.

Conclusions about PlanCC2035

For the reasons contained herein, I cannot support PlanCC2035. Among them:

- PlanCC2035 fails to address important areas of City spending and mission critical City services. Our core mission, to me is: Fix & Maintain our Streets, Public Water Supply, Wastewater improvements, and Public Safety.
- Plan CC 2035 makes recommendations that are unlikely to be funded given that the City is struggling to fund streets, stormwater, wastewater, public safety, and other capital budget items.
- It prioritizes environmental concerns over most other aspects of public policy.
- It envisions a much wider role for City government in ordinary processes such as land development.
- It promotes the urban neighborhood concept and demotes free-standing housing.
- It envisions an extensive incentive, dis-incentive regime to coerce compliance with central planning. As such, it rejects willing providers and customers determining many outcomes. I believe the unintended consequences will be detrimental.
- The plan language is imprecise and general which can lead to confusion, multiple interpretations within the City staff and among the citizens' expectations.
- With all of the shortcomings described herein, I think that it would be imprudent to adopt the plan by ordinance. Doing so would give it the force of law and according to City Charter, "All city improvements, ordinances and regulations, shall be consistent with the comprehensive plan."

The path forward is simple and relatively low cost. I have attached a Motion of Direction to City staff to accomplish an alternative to PlanCC2035. PlanCC2035 becomes VisionCC2035.

I appreciate the hard work that many have put in to PlanCC2035, but the result does not justify adoption of this plan as an ordinance. Continuation with current plan development represents throwing good money after bad. I don't believe that most of the current workproduct is salvageable through refinement or negotiation.

I lay the blame on the paid consultants, Goody Clancy, for their failure to incorporate the funding situation of the City and omission of Public Safety, Animal Control, Finance, ETJ expansion, etc. from the results. I do not judge any of the citizen participants, city staff or my fellow Council members for these shortcomings.

I have an obligation to vote my conscience in the best interests of the City and the citizens. I hope that this document provides a clear and complete understanding of my position and upcoming motion of direction.

Chad Magill

**Motion of Direction to City Staff:
Regarding 20 Year Comprehensive Plan**

1. Accept & Approve Planning Commission Final Report/Recommendations
2. Do Not Adopt PlanCC2035 as our Comprehensive Plan. Rename “PlanCC2035 Comprehensive Plan” to “VisionCC2035.” Classify VisionCC2035 as a visioning document provided to city staff for their potential use in their annual business plan/budgeting process.
3. City Staff uses existing annual business plan/budgeting process to provide staff driven policy recommendations and ties each policy recommendation to their a 20 year outlook of policy recommendations with appropriate near term funding or identification of future funding.
4. City makes available on its website the Existing Comprehensive Plan.
5. Recreate/reestablish our City Planning Department
6. City Planning Department & Planning Commission evaluates existing plan to recommend modernization, updating, or removal of parts that are outdated or no longer applicable. Begin with our core mission of fixing and maintaining streets, public water supply, wastewater improvements, and public safety.
7. The Planning Commission, with the help of local (South Texas) consultants (if needed) who have a specific local knowledge, produces an updated Future Land Use plan for approval by City Council.
8. City modernizes and harmonizes all utility master service plans and ties them into Corpus Christi’s existing current GIS base maps beginning with core mission elements water, wastewater and stormwater.
9. All of the information related to the Goody Clancy, PlanCC2035 – now named VisionCC2035, shall be gathered and held by the City including control of the website. Final payment to all current consultants shall be made, and any work subject to right of cancellation shall be halted.
10. Staff may bring before Council any item contained in PlanCC2035, now named VisionCC2035, which has sufficient detail for consideration as an independent policy (for modernizing or updating the existing comprehensive plan) and funding decision by City Council.