

City Council Work Session 8/15/2012

a quorum is present, I'll

call this council work

session to order on

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 15th,

12, Meeting in the boards

and commissions room austin

city hall, 301 west second

street.

Just to get -- to give

[09:06:01]

everyone an idea of the

order that we're going to go

in today, first we're going

to go into executive

session, and when we come

out, we'll first take up

items number 1 and 6, those

are items that have to be

completed today.

Then when we get out we'll
have a discussion on the
bond items and if we get to
it, we'll start our briefing
from the individual
departments on budget.

On budget items.

Before we go into executive
session, I want to announce
that -- that item 58, on the
agenda for tomorrow, will be
withdrawn.

Just so folks will know.

It's the auditorium shores
item.

>> Item no. 58?

>> Mayor Leffingwell: 58.

>> Tovo: Is it the formula

1 issue?

>> Yes.

To the council will go into

closed session to take up

071

the council will discuss

8, discuss legal

issues related to the

november 2012 election.

Is there any objection?

Hearing none, the council

will now go into executive

session.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

We're out of closed session,

in closed session we took up

and discussed legal issues

related to item no. 8.

So now we'll take up item

1, we have a resolution

to adopt the maximum

proposed property tax rate

that the council will

consider.

For fiscal year 2012-2013
and set the property tax
rate.

Under state law, the vote on
the motion to adopt a
maximum proposed tax rate
that the council will
consider requires a roll
call vote.

So I will entertain a motion
to adopt a proposed tax
property tax rate, the
motion conducted would be

[09:36:00]

that move to -- that the
proposed maximum property
tax rate that the council
will consider for the fiscal
year 2012-2013 is 50

cents -- 50 and one-half
cents -- which would be --
505-dollars
per 100-dollar valuation.

Is there a motion for that?

Mayor pro tem so moves.

Seconded by councilmember
martinez.

We have a motion and a
second to adopt a maximum
5 cents
per 100-dollar valuation for
council to consider adopting
during the fiscal year
2012-2013 budget and tax
rate approval meetings in
september.

The clerk will call the
roll.

>> Mayor leffingwell.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Aye.

>> Mayor cole.

>> Aye.

>> Councilmember martinez?

[Indiscernible]

>> councilmember morrison.

>> [Indiscernible]

>> councilmember tovo.

>> Aye.

>> Councilmember riley?

>> [Indiscernible]

>> and councilmember spelman
is absent.

>> So that passes on a vote
of 6 to 0 with councilmember
spelman off the dais.

We will now set the date for
the council to adopt the
property tax rate.

For item 1, set the date
that the council will adopt
the fiscal year 2012-2013
property tax rate, proposed
time and date is september
10th, 2012, BEGINNING AT
in the austin city
council chambers at austin
city hall, 301 west second
street, austin, texas,
78701.

I will entertain a motion to
set the time and date as
proposed to adopt the fiscal

year 2012-2013 property tax
rate.

>> So move.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Mayor pro tem so moves.

Is there a second?

Councilmember martinez
seconds.

[09:38:01]

That motion -- all in favor
say aye.

>> Aye.

>> Appear possessed say no.

Passes on a vote 6-0 with
councilmember spelman off
the dais.

Without objection, we'll now
go to item no. 6.

By state law we adopted the
proposed maximum tax rate
that is above what state law
calls the effective rate.

We must set two public
hearings on the proposed tax
rate for your fiscal year
2012-2013.

Staff recommends setting the
hearings on thursday, august
23rd, 2012 AT 4:00 P.M.

And on thursday, august
30th, 2012 AT 10:00 A.M.

Here in city council
chambers, 301 west second
street, austin, texas.

I will entertain a motion on

item 6 to set those dates
for the public hearings on
the proposed tax rate for
fiscal year 2012-2013.

Is there a motion?

Councilmember martinez so
moves.

Is there a second?

Councilmember riley seconds.

All in favor of that motion
say aye.

>> Aye.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Opposed say no.

That motion passes on a vote
of 6-0 with councilmember
spelman off the dais.

So without objection, we
will go to -- to item no. 5.

[09:40:03]

To approve an ordinance
amending the order calling
THE NOVEMBER 4th --
NOVEMBER 6th, 2012 SPECIAL
Election to provide for
general obligation bond
propositions and declaring
an emergency.

Public comment is allowed.

Do we have anyone signed up
to speak?

Thank you.

No one is signed up to
speak.

So as you know, we had some
discussion yesterday on this
item.

And -- and we will continue

to have more discussion and
perhaps action today.

I would -- if there's no
objection, council, I would
like to -- I would like to
establish the procedure for
today's discussion.

That when amendments are
made, proposed to a motion,
instead of having them
described as friendly and
incorporated only if the
maker and the second concur
with the friendly amendment,
that we -- if any
councilmember objects to the
friendly amendment, we will
have a vote on that
amendment.

So without objection, that's
the way we'll proceed today.

So the floor is open.

>> Mayor.

>> Discussion?

>> Mayor.

>> Mayor pro tem.

>> Cole: Thank you, mayor.

I realize that we have been
in the process of
discussions and that the
citizens have went through a
very lengthy effort to give
us a package that -- that we
can work with and they gave
us a recommendation with 385
and they also gave us a
recommendation with 400
million and that we can
considerable discussions
yesterday about which item
to use as a starting point,
especially with respect to
the city manager's proposal,
the city manager has also
went through a considerable

effort twice to get us to a
potential starting point.

So because the issue has --

[09:42:01]

has risen about the tax
force recommendation and
city manager recommendation,
I have passed around a sheet
that includes listing both
the task force
recommendation and the city
manager recommendation and
then the next column
represents what I will be
proposing as a motion as you
have said, are amendments to
that motion for us to
consider and then also
changes from the task force
and changes from the city

manager.

And the idea is for everyone
to be able to closely follow
what we are changing from.

So with that said, mayor, i
will make my first motion,
which is for the women --
I'm making a motion to
include the following items
in the bond proposal.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: What
is the base of your
motion --

>> Cole: Some of the
base -- most of the items
are coming from the city
manager's proposal, but some
of the items will be coming
from the task force proposal
and some of the items will
actually be items that were

not included in either the
task force proposal or the
city manager's proposal.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: I
understand that.

But you are going to suggest
amendments to the city
manager's proposal?

>> Cole: Well, I'm open
for amendments.

But with -- right now, I am
only planning on starting
with the city manager
proposal.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
That's what I was asking.

>> Cole: And making an
amendment to it, especially
with respect to affordable
housing.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Okay.

>> Cole: So that the end

result will be the task

force recommendation.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Okay.

So --

>> Cole: I thought that

you were asking me specifics

on what I'm contemplating

might happen with --

>> Mayor Leffingwell: I'm

asking you are you making

the motion to approve the

[09:44:01]

city manager's

recommendation, realizing

that there will be changes
proposed.

Is that your motion?

>> Cole: I will make a
motion to approve the city
manager's recommendation as
OF AUGUST 6th.

That was not -- that was not
the day before yesterday.

That was the original city
manager's recommendation.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
Okay.

And that is the total of
\$385 million.

>> Cole: That has a total
of 385, I will let staff get
that up, the original city
manager proposal.

The first item --

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Well, before you start going through, maybe we should get a second to that motion.

Second by councilmember riley.

And remember, as you go through, and propose these amendments, if there's any objection, there will be a vote on that amendment.

>> Cole: I'll go through -- yes, mayor, are i will do that.

I will wait for staff and mike tremble tell me when you are ready.

>> I do want to pass out --
we have a little handout
that has the baseline, 385
recommendation, city
manager's recommendation in
the task force 400, you can
use that as a reference
point for kind of where
we're starting, then with
any changes.
So -- so we'll be ready in
just a second.

>> Cole: Okay.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
Councilmember morrison.

>> Morrison: I guess I'm
confused, the motion on the
table is to approve the city
manager's recommendation and
now you're going to propose

amendments to that?

>> Cole: Yes.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

That's correct.

>> Morrison: Okay.

I guess that I would like to
propose -- make a substitute
motion?

And that would be --
actually, you know, I think
that obviously we have a
really challenging situation
here.

And yesterday I went back
and sort of contemplated
what my real priorities are
and what could be a path
forward when we have such a
complex thing.

I actually talked to dave

[09:46:00]

sullivan because I remember
the standard process that
the mayor has now talked
about that we're going to
follow of trying to build
consensus --

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Their standard process, not
ours.

>> Morrison: Their

standard process, although
we have used it on the
budget, we have used it on
the comp plan where you lay
out a main motion and
hopefully you can massage
that main motion enough in
the end with amendments
enough that -- well, nobody
is going to necessarily

agree with everything, that
you can get to a point where
you can get a unanimous
vote, because I think that's
all of our intent.

For me the priority really
is the task force.

And what I wanted to lay out
was that -- in a main motion
that first with -- that
pairs the main motion itself
pares down the task force
recommendation to below 385
and then walk through
reductions, possible
reductions and additions
based on council priorities.

So that's -- I'm passing out
the motion then and so my --
so my motion is to move to
adopt the bond advisory task

force recommendation for a
\$400 million package with
the following adjustments,
so the adjustments
themselves are part of it.

Of the main motion and that
is to reduce --

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
Substitute motion.

>> Morrison: Sorry, yes,
my substitute motion.

So to reduce the a.p.d.
Northwest substation by
9 million, which will
bring it to 5.8 million.

Reduce the emmitt shelton
bridge by two million,
bringing it to 3 million.

Reduce the austin to manor
trail phase 2 by one million
to zero.

Reduce the i-35 improvements

3 million to

18.7 million.

Reduce the bike urban trail

and grant match program by 2

million to 3 million and

reduce the city-wide

bikeways program by

5 million to zero, which

would bring us to a total

bond package on the table of

3 and the reason -- the

[09:48:01]

reason these were selected

as -- as places to pare down

is because there seemed to

be at least potentially a

majority support for those

parings.

So that is my motion which i

hope puts us on a path to
success.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Is
there a second for that
motion?

>> Tovo: Yeah, I would
like to second that.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
Councilmember tovo seconds.

>> Tovo: I just want to
add a few comments.

We spent a lot of time --
there were two motions
obviously yesterday.

We spent a lot of time
looking at the one motion
that I didn't vote for to
see what elements were in
common, that was the
substance of councilmember

morrison said that was the substance for these items, the northwest substation, austin to manor trail was in that the -- the main motion that councilmember martinez made yesterday, i-35 improvements, these were all part of -- with the exception of -- well, anyway.

They appeared to have consensus based on the analysis that we did of who voted for which motions yesterday.

And I just wants to say a few words about the task force.

I know we talked about this yesterday but, you know, we have a lot of very talented folks in this city who spend

a lot of time working on our
volunteer boards and
commissions and we are
really fortunate to have had
such a high caliber group
working on our bond advisory
task force.

I think that is just a
credit to them and I think
we all did a great job in
selecting them, but they
really did a fabulous amount
of work.

There is one very
substantial difference,
mayor pro tem cole has
already identified it,
that's the affordable
housing, the difference in
terms of the affordable
housing fund.

I appreciate that the main

motion includes a commitment
to try to bump that up to
where the task force is.

I think that's the right
direction to be moving in.
But I would propose and just

[09:50:01]

really urge you, my
colleagues, to think about
what message we want to send
to the community about the
work that our community
citizens task force did
throughout this last --
these last several months.

As I said, housing is the
most substantial difference,
but as you look down here, i
really appreciate this mr.

Tremble, this list, there
are some other differences
in terms of funding for
things like neighborhood
parks, small community level
projects.

And I think those are
important.

They are important to a lot
of people in our communities
and, you know, we haven't
been through a multi--month
process of studying the
details as carefully as did
our citizens task force.

One of the things they
really did was to evaluate
all of the many, many
requests they were
receiving, all of the
emails, all of the people
who showed up to talk, the

focus groups they did out in
the community, larger
community meetings, to come
up with, in their best
estimation, what was a good,
well-balanced bond proposal.

I know it wasn't easy.

We have heard from some of
the members of how
challenging that -- that
prospect was.

So I would ask that we
really take that as our
starting point and work
together to figure out what
are the elements from the
city managers that are just
critical to discuss and to
vote on today.

So that is my pitch for
starting at -- starting with
the community task force

recommendations and, you
know, the -- and this
version, which gets us down
to where we need to be to
start looking at other -- at
other [indiscernible]
so the main motion gets us
to 384.

I'm going to hand out some
additional reductions for
which -- for which it wasn't
clear that we had consensus.

But I think should still be
up for discussion today.

And then also a page called
suggested additions.

And what we tried to do is
capture all of the suggested
additions that arose

[09:52:01]

yesterday, either in
councilmember martinez's
proposal or in the course of
our conversation, so that
we've got one place where we
can see the extent of what
those additions might be.

In looking at it I felt
pretty good about it.

If we can start with the
base of 384 today and then
talk about additional
potential reductions, we
might be able to make a lot
of these suggested additions
work.

So I think that we are -- i
think we are moving toward a
really strong bond proposal.

But I do think that it's for
are to start in the right

place and that's with the
community task force
recommendation.

So I second the motion.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Mayor pro tem?

>> Cole: I certainly
appreciate what
councilmember morrison and
councilmember tovo have to
say and fully respect the
work of the bond committee.

But first I want to point
out that in the substitute
motion, that has been made,
also will propose in the
motion sheet that I have,
the exact same amount to the
northwest substation, to the
emmitt shelton bridge and to
the austin-manor trail.

And the other items, the --

the last three items, which
are i-35 improvements,
bicycle urban trails, the
next two items, the i-35
improvements and bike urban
trails are at the bottom of
my motion sheet.

What I did was list all of
the items that were
different between the city
manager and task force
recommendation for us to
possibly discuss and I think
that between the proposals
that have within laid out
by -- have been laid out by
councilmember morrison and
tovo, that we will get to
all of the items for
discussion.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Okay.

I will say that I'm going to
vote against the substitute

[09:54:00]

motion so that we can have
our opportunity to work our
way through amendments to
that recommendation.

And have the opportunity to
vote on those amendments as
we go through them one by
one.

We didn't have that
opportunity on the
substitute motions since the
major amendments were laid
out as a part of that
motion.

>> Mayor --

>> councilmember riley.

>> Riley: I'm also going to vote against the substitute motion and I feel a need to speak up about a couple of items that are included in the motion because we didn't get to talk about them yesterday, i think some people may have concluded there was a consensus on those.

I want to dispel any motions that this is a complete consensus on those items, first of all, I have no problem with starting with the task force recommendations of 400 million, that concept seems fine to me.

That seems less critical to me than the number where we land on.

The you -- the important
thing is where we land.

But the two items that i
wanted to call attention to
are the last two bullet
points here.

The bicycle urban trail and
grant match program reducing
that by two million,
reducing the city-wide
5, zeroing out
the city-wide bikeways
program.

We have -- the -- cities all
over the countries are
dramatically expanding their
efforts on bicycle issues.

Austin has been a leader
traditionally on these
programs.

We were recently selected as one of six cities in the country to be demonstration sites for -- for a city-wide greenways project which really is squarely within the intent of the city-wide bikeways program.

Instead of being able to continue our leadership position on this, this -- we can zero out that program.

The other suggestion about -- about cutting the -- the -- the bicycle urban trail and grant match program is especially unfortunate because that

[09:56:00]

program has been very

effective in allowing us to
leverage transportation
dollars.

It is a way that we are able
to apply for federal
enhancement funding and
other things that are
getting more and more
important right now.

There is a -- through campo,
we know that there are
significant stpmm
transportation funds that
could be available, but
those are only available to
the extent that a local
entity is willing to step up
and provide a local match.

We have been able to do that
in the past and have been
very effective in leveraging
local transportation dollars

to -- to a greater degree
than we've been able to with
any other transportation
dollars, we're able to
achieve very -- very
effective transportation
investments based on
long-term bicycle planning
that has involved the whole
community.

These two items would
essentially put a stop to
all of our progress on all
of that planning and
progress on infrastructure.

These would be, these
suggestions came up at the
very last minute.

I can assure you they would
be very, very strongly

opposed by the bike

community.

We have already started to

hear from the bike community

about them.

There is very strong

resistance to both of these

items.

I just wants to dispel any

discussion that these are

easy consensus things that

anybody can live with.

Because I think that these

are very unfortunate

recommendations and would do

real damage to our progress

on bicycle issues.

>> Martinez: Mayor pro

tem?

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Councilmember martinez.

>> Martinez: I want to
share the same concerns that
councilmember riley raised.

While some of these may be
similar in nature in terms
of proposed cuts, it was in
the context of what would be
added back.

We haven't had that
discussion.

So in my mind there is not
consensus on any of these
because -- because we
haven't gone through and
deliberately talked about
the individual items, as i
suggested yesterday in my
motion, so that you could
see where we end up in the
end.

The other point that I want
to make is it keeps being
stated that we are sending a

[09:58:02]

wrong message to our
community that we are not
honoring the task force.

I find that a bit hollow
because -- because we had a
task force make a
recommendation to this body
to put single member
districts on the ballot,
only single member
districts, we had 30,000
signatures from citizens to
tell us to do that and the
maker and the seconder of
this motion voted against

that.

So what message was sent
then?

I bring that point up not to
get into it.

But to say that this is a
difficult job.

And so you can't on one --
on one item say we must
honor the people we
appointed, when on another
item you absolutely did not
do that.

And that's why I find that
hollow.

>> Morrison: Mayor?

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
Councilmember morrison.

>> Morrison: I appreciate

the comments from both of my
colleagues.

I think that with regard to
the value that you speak to,
councilmember riley, i
certainly agree with them
and the intent was certainly
to look toward moving --
having opened up some of
that funding and moving
toward amendments that would
add back some of the
specifics that we had heard
in the recommendation from
the city manager and it was
certainly not intended to
suggest that I had any
expectation that on each one
of these individual items
that we were going to have a
6-0 vote or a 7-0 vote.

I realize that, you know,
all of us are going to have
to be -- be open, if we can
get to make it so that we
can get somewhere.

And with respect to honoring
task forces or not, I mean,
I have given this a lot of
thought and we are in a very
complicated situation right
now with the dynamics of our
council and trying to get to
a productive -- a productive
path and that's why for me
it was a matter of really
trying to give some serious
thought to where my
priorities lie in this and
where do I feel like I need
to put my energy in working
towards, I think that the
spread sheets that mayor pro

tem passed out, really
speaks to the -- to the two
facets of the differences
between the two approaches
and one is the -- of course
the housing differences, and
then the second is the
much -- the much -- the
numerous small differences
and I feel like that is
where -- where the task
force painted the picture of
the community needs and
that's why the -- and that
might be a lot harder to get
to.

So that's why I prefer to
start with the task force
and its a priority for me.

[One moment please for
change in captioners]

>> Tovo: I do want to address the comment that councilmember riley mentioned, and that was about the bike program.

And I want to be very clear that we were not proposing zeroing out the bikeways program.

We were responding to the city manager's memo stating that other funds had been identified.

Through the city's transportation fund.

And so the thought is if other funds can and have been identified, that we ought to use those instead of bond funds.

There seemed to be consensus
around that, but I would
just like to offer that
councilmember riley, I think
I heard you say that you
were fine with starting
with -- I don't want to
overstate it, but I think
you expressed a willingness
to start with the taskforce
recommendation, and I do
think that would be an
easier way at getting at
some of the smaller changes.

So perhaps one way to go
about this is to take the
substitute motion and
identify what the issues are
beyond -- I heard from you
bicycle, urban trail grant
matches as an issue.

Why don't we amend our
motion if the maker is

comfortable with that and
we'll start with a higher
figure than 384.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Those would be to be
amendments that are voted on
if any councilmember
objects.

>> Tovo: So the other
thing I do want to be very
clear about is that there
was every intent to vote on
additional reductions and
additional amendments.

That was absolutely the plan
we were just trying to start
with something that got us
to -- one that began with
the taskforce recommendation
and two, got us to 384 and
then addressed the
additional reductions.

But I think I understand
from what you're saying is
you have some concerns about
a few of the elements in
this base plan and I would
just suggest that we -- I'm
certainly welcome --
certainly would welcome your
feedback about which ones
you would like to be
removed.

So that we would be at a
base that we can hopefully
build consensus around.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
Councilmember martinez.

>> Martinez: I'm not going
to be supporting any
amendment because I'm not
going to support the overall
motion.

I'm going to state my
objections now and call to
question the motion.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Councilmember martinez calls
the question on the
substitute motion.

Is there any objection to
that?

If there's no objection,
then we'll call the vote on
the substitute motion?

All in favor say aye?

Opposed say no.

That fails on a vote of
four-two with councilmember
riley, martinez, myself and
mayor pro tem cole voting

no.

So that brings us to the
main motion.

Mayor pro tem.

>> Cole: And let me just
start by saying I'm sure we
are all acting in good faith
trying to get to a 385
number and we'll try to make
sure we do that.

The first item that I'd like
to add is the women and
children's shelter.

For two million dollars.

This is the exact same
number that the taskforce
put forward, and that is a
change from the -- I mean,
that is not a number that

either the taskforce or the
city manager put forward,
but is a council-added item.
I would like to move that we
add the barton springs
bathhouse for two million
dollars.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Let's go one at a time.

>> Cole: Go ahead.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: The
women's and children's
shelter, is there any
objection to that being a
friendly amendment?

Hearing none, that's
incorporated.

>> Cole: Okay.

Thank you, mayor.

The next item is the barton
springs bathhouse for two
million dollars.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Is
there any objection to that
item, two million dollars
added?

>> Morrison: Yes.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: An
objection is heard.

>> Morrison: I would like
to speak to that.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
Well, let's get a motion by
mayor pro tem to include
\$2 million for barton
springs bathhouse, and i
will second that.

And recognize councilmember
morrison.

>> Morrison: Well, i
certainly see a great future
for the bathhouse with some
renovations, and I even see
in my own future being able
to use that renovated
bathhouse with great
enthusiasm.

I do -- did note the city
manager's comment on that,
and that was that there are
several higher priority
items at zilker park beyond
the bathhouse, and in fact,
I don't know that I can --
let me see if I can find
that very quickly.

The proposed improvements to
the building are considered
a continuation of the
current barton springs

grounds improvement, in the second phase of the overall project, which I'd like to note that we actually approved I think in 2009 or 2 million in certificates of obligation, which were non-voter approved bonds to do some significant work on the short-term.

It says that the parks department accepted the removal of the project from the overall recommended bond package for the following under the current pard cip program improvements have been made to the roof, showers and mechanical systems of the building, while other

improvements focus on the pool and grounds.

An improved entrance to the building is needed, however this is viewed as an enhancement to the facility rather than a structural issue.

And thirdly, zilker park has multiple improvement priorities, several of which ranked higher with respect to the bathhouse renovation.

So while I certainly appreciate the community's enthusiasm and work that's gone into this, I know that as you go down this list, there are going to be some really difficult decisions to be made, so for me this doesn't rank high enough to

support it.

>> Cole: Mayor?

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Yeah, I concur

and I'm basing my objection

in part on the city

manager's recommendations,

but just fundamentally the

biggest gap between the city

manager's recommendations

and the taskforce's is in

the area of affordable

housing.

And I would just request

that we go ahead and add

back in all the monies that

are in the -- in the

taskforce recommendation

because for me that is the

highest priority that we

get --

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

We're voting on this item up

or down.

>> Tovo: I understand

that, thanks.

That is the highest

priority, and I'm not sure

at the end of the day how

much money we'll have

available for that until

that -- until that point i

can't support adding barton

springs.

If we've got money

available, then yes, I think

it's a great project.

I think it's going to be a

community asset and I would

like to see some money in

the bond proposal for it,

but it's not my highest
priority and I don't want it
to come at the expense of
things like affordable
housing.

So I'm not going to vote to
support this.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: I'll
just say I am going to
support this and I want to
confirm that the actual
proposal will include a
requirement for friends of
barton springs to raise
\$250,000 and confirm that
that's in there.

If it's not I would like to
have that added to the
discussion.

>> Cole: Mayor, I will

certainly support that
direction.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: And
say that we did the same
thing a few years ago for
the deep eddy bathhouse.

It was an historically
accurate, well done, well
planned, well executed
renovation.

We're all proud of that.

And a lot of folks think
that barton springs
bathhouse renovation should
have been done a long time
ago.

I do too.

I think it's really a worthy

project.

The cost is not very high
and I intend to support it.

So any other comments on
that item?

So we'll take a vote on that
proposed amendment.

All in favor say aye?

Opposed say no.

It passes on a vote of four
to two with councilmembers
tovo and morrison voting no.

So that's incorporated in
the main motion.

>> Thank you, mayor, and i
do want to ask staff that we
keep record of the items
that are going 6-0 versus

split votes so that we're
able to know that at the
end.

So that's the only second
item that went 4-2.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: You
can rest assured the city
clerk is --

>> Cole: Okay.

Well, mike trimble can add
better.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: He
can do that too.

>> Cole: The next item is
the dougherty arts center
that I'm proposing at
\$4 million.

The taskforce asked for
2 million, the city manager

asked for 2 million.

I have a council proposal
for four million, given that
the dougherty arts center is
in such bad condition, and
we had testimony about that.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Before we go I want to
clarify that your motion was
for first reading only?

>> Cole: Yes, first
reading only, mayor.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Any
comments on this item?

Councilmember morrison.

>> Morrison: Mayor pro
tem, I wonder if you could
speak a little bit -- and
maybe this was clarified

yesterday and I just missed
it -- about what it's going
to bring to us if we have
four million versus two
million for the dougherty
arts center?

>> Cole: Well, I can speak
to that.

Tara hensley talked about
that a little bit.

It needs roof repairs, it
needs remediation.

It has -- I don't like to
say rats, but it is rats.

And we have also extent
notices to parents when we
enroll kids about the
conditions asking them to
understand that, but --

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
hensley is here to

answer that question.

>> Morrison: I guess the
real question is what do we
get for four million?

What does that get us.

>> Sare are hensley, parks
and recreation.

The mayor pro tem is
absolutely correct.

One is to replace this
billion, we're talking up to
10 to 12 million.

So first and foremost if we
had to replace it.

Second of all, it is an
aging infrastructure
building that was never
intended to be a cultural
arts facility in the first
place.

We took it over and it was a

navy site.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Navy
reserves.

>> And it has served its
purpose well.

We are putting duct tape on
it on a regular basis, so
the two million will help
us-- the existing site to
help some issues, however
what we're trying to do is
take whatever we don't have
to put into this existing
facility as we look down the
road to try to find partners
so we're not building a
brand new facility, but
we're partnering together.

So two purposes.

One is continue to try to
keep the building together
and use it in its current
state with patching roof,
patching holes.

She is absolutely correct,
we have some issues with
some critters.

And then the other problem
is then being able to take
what's left over and
hopefully use it as a match
for infrastructure
improvements or work with
another existing facility or
partnering with another arts
group so that we are able to
not build a new facility,
but partner and get more
efficiencies and
effectiveness out of

operations there.

>> Morrison: So would you say that the two million basically allows us to stabilize the current situation, but if we go to four million it allows us really to move forward?

>> It will allow us to have an opportunity to move forward more quickly.

>> Morrison: All right.

Thank you.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Let me just say I'm not going to support this proposal because we don't have a full plan for spending the four million dollars.

We do have two million dollars that's initially recommended to repair the

facility.

Keep it going.

When and if we get to the point where we can talk about additional work, which is as yet unidentified, we can talk about ways to fund that and perhaps with another partnership agreement.

I would support a lesser amount, but I'm not going to support the four million.

Any other comments?

Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: A comment and then a question.

I am going to support this because I think it's

important and I think we've
had some discussion and
we'll likely have others
today about the amount of
money we want to consider in
our bond proposal for
outside arts organizations.

I think it's really critical
that we recognize our public
facilities that are in need
of repair, and we hear lots
of comments, all of us do i
know, from the community
about the state of some of
our parks facilities, and
this is an opportunity to
begin to do something about
it that would be good for
the community.

I think the dougherty arts
center is a real value for
children who take classes

there as well as adults and

I think it should be

something -- it should

really speak to kind of

community we are and the

value we place on our

cultural arts.

So I am going to support

this.

We're talking about support

for outside organizations,

which do critical work in

our community too, but we

need to support our public

arts facilities.

Mayor pro tem cole, I wonder

if you can give us a sense

of where we're going?

Some of these relatively

small dollars add up and

might prevent us from doing

larger things.

So are you taking us down
this sheet?

>> Cole: Yes, I am taking
you down the sheet that you
have in front of you that
has a list in motion
taskforce recommendation,
city manager, august 6
proposal, council proposal
change from the taskforce
and change from the city
manager.

And what I tried to do was
consider the items first
that there was pretty firm
agreement on from the
comments that had been made
so that we would make some
progress.

And those were the top

number one three items in
that box.

And second I tried to put in
a cut that it looked like we
all agreed on so that when
we were going down we didn't
have to guess like we were
yesterday, are we balanced,
are we not?

Staff tell us where we are,
so we knew where we were as
we went down the process.

Of course, anybody can
request a totaling at that
time so you can see that
assuming we pass the
dougherty arts center and
pass the next item, then we
are pretty close to being we
are pretty close to being

balanced.

>> I would like to add one
comment.

I certainly support the arts
and I would support having a
nicer dougherty arts center,
but this whole exercise is
about making difficult
choices and I find it a
little difficult to put two
million dollars extra into
the dougherty arts center
that we don't know yet how
we're going to spend and at
the same time reducing i-35,
which is our -- i-35
planning projects by
7 million at the same
time.

I would much rather see that
money spent on it.

That's a higher priority for me and it's needed now, especially in view of the fact that we're trying as hard as we can to get i-35 projects.

And I guess there will be several different ones shovel ready, so that we have opportunities like we recently had to make improvements to mopac.

That was only possible because a lot of preliminary work had been done.

And the opportunity is going to, I think, exist in the future to have funding to execute these projects, and so I think that's a higher priority for me.

It's the most serious
traffic problem we have in
this entire city, and i
think we should be doing
everything we can to try to
remediate that.

Not cure it, but try our
best to remediate.

Councilmember riley.

>> Riley: Mayor, I share
your priorities on that.

I-35 is absolutely a very
high priority.

The issue for me is that we
may have an opportunity
sooner rather than later to
work on a long-term solution
for the dougherty, and this
investment of potentially
two million dollars in that

solution could actually wind up saving us money and putting us in a better position to be able to minimize that cost, which we heard could be in the range of 10 to \$15 million to actually replace the facility.

That is a very significant expense that we know is looming on the horizon and this rather small, modest investment, could enable us to mitigate that expense.

And in the meantime my hope is that we would be going out for an interim transportation bond item before the completion of this entire bond cycle as we have done a couple of times

in recent years.

We know that there are transportation issues on the horizon and I suspect we will have an opportunity to bring those to the voters much sooner than we would have the opportunity to go to the voters with something like the dougherty.

So it's simply a matter of timing.

I think that a very modest investment in moving forward with the dougherty could make sense now.

And we will have an opportunity to step up our efforts on i-35 and other transportation issues in the near future sooner than we'll have another

opportunity to work on the
dougherty.

So I will be supporting this
item.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Any
other comments?

So then we'll vote on this
amendment.

All in favor say aye?

Opposed say no.

It passes on a vote of 5-1.

I'm voting no on this and
councilmember spelman is off
so that becomes a
part of the main motion.

Four million dollars for
dougherty.

>> Cole: The next item is
the northwest a.p.d.

Substation.

I am proposing that it be
entered for the amount of
\$5,833,000.

And this is a reduction from
the city manager proposal
and the taskforce proposal,
but as discussed yesterday,
we will begin the
preliminary work and design
on this facility.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Yes.

And just to reiterate, this
is for acquisition and
planning.

This won't cover
construction of the
substation, but at least we

can get started on it.

I will be supporting this
item.

Is there any objection?

So that's incorporated as
part of the main motion.

>> Cole: Next is the urban
rail project.

It was not included in the
august 6 proposal because we
did not use it at that time
so it is simply a reduction.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: From
the august 6, yes.

Is there any objection to
that?

And I would just -- I've
said this many times, but i
just want to make sure it's

clear to everyone that this
reduction does not affect
our plans, materially affect
our planning on the urban
rail, connect austin plan.

We will continue with our
work on environmental
studies, alternatives
analysis and so forth and we
have adequate funds to do
this for the next three or
so years.

Before we get to the point
where we take the next step.
So I will be supporting that
too.

>> Morrison: Mayor, I have
a question.

I just want to make sure
I've got the proper

information in front of me,
and we're talking about the
city manager's august 6th
proposal.

I'm still looking at my
notebook.

I take it that's outdated.

And I would like to know how
because it actually mentions
city manager, I believe,
has --

>> Mayor Leffingwell: The
city manager made a number
of recommendations to his
original recommendation by
way of a memo that we all
got.

>> Morrison: So I really
apologize, but I need to be
reminded of that memo and
what those recommendations

are because I didn't get it
noted in my notebook.

Is it in the --

>> we talked about an
august 6, so the basis we're
using is the city manager's
385 recommendation.

The one thing that we did
mention is the urban rail,
two million dollars item.
But that's already been
noted.

The other proposal you got
from the city manager you
voted on monday.

We're not talking about
august six, we're talking
about the city manager.

>> Morrison: So that said
remove the recommendation
for two million for urban
rail.

Where did that move in?

>>

>> Morrison: How did my
notebook change?

>> We just said that two
million didn't free up.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
There was actually more than
two million in that memo
freed up, wasn't there?

>> In the memo, yes, but the
memo I just wanted to be
clear the memo came out on
monday.

So we're talking about
AUGUST 6th.

>> So the only difference to
this beautiful color of
blue, yellow and green chart
you gave me is that the
urban rail corridor projects
would be zeroed out.

>> Correct.

>> Morrison: So there's a
freed two million there.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Is
there any objection to
that -- before we do that,
councilmember tovo?

>> Tovo: That's okay.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Is
there any objection to that.

That's incorporated as a
part of the main motion.

>> Tovo: We're working our
way down this sheet and i
guess I'm still trying to --

your running total at the
end and gets us to 392.

>>

>> Cole: The running total
will get to 385 at the very
end of the sheet.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
We're counting on that.

>> Cole: And mike will
mike
trimble.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
Mayor pro tem, go ahead with
your next.

>> Cole: The next item is
austin cities which I am
proposing for 5.4 million,.

We've had considerable
public discussion from that

as well as council

discussion.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Is

there any objection to

4 for

austin film studios

renovation?

Hearing none, that's

incorporated in the main

motion.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: The

next item is east 51st

vision plan, which also has

received a lot of

discussion.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Any

objection to this item?

Three and a half million

dollars for the east 51st

street project.

I'll just call it project,

not vision plan.

If you don't mind.

All right.

That's incorporated.

>> Cole: The next item is
violet crown trail.

I will ask that the final
numbers be two million
dollars.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Any
objection to incorporate two
million dollars for the
violet crown trail?

Hearing none, that's part of
the main motion.

Cole coat the next item is
the wheelchair accessible
fishing pier for \$150,000.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Any

objection to this item?

Hearing none, that's

incorporated \$150,000 for
the fishing pier.

>> Cole: The next item is
the neighborhood partnering
program, 1.2 million.

And this is a very popular
program and I will add that
I co-sponsored that item,
but lead on that item was
councilmember spelman.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Any
discussion or objection?

Is there any objection to
this item?

Hearing none, that's
incorporated.

>> Cole: The next item is
a reduction to park patrol
facility so that the final

number is \$2 million.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Proposed two million dollars

hensley

here?

Could you tell us a little

bit more about this project?

>> Sarah hensley, parks and

recreation director.

I think our friends in the

police department are also

here.

This is another opportunity

for co-location of park

rangers and the police

patrol, park police patrol.

Primarily what we're going

to look for is the ability

to co-locate around the hike

and bike trail area, lake

area where we have now with
the boardwalk coming on a
lot -- see a lot more
increased participation.

So I don't know if the chief
wants to add, but it is
co-locating of a facility so
that we can --

>> Mayor Leffingwell: What
I'd like to ask you is this
is a reduction of
\$2.7 million.

How does that affect you?

>> Oooh.

Chief, do you want to answer
that 2.7 reduction?
If they reduce that, it's
going to limit the size of
the building.

I don't think they're going to be able to do a lot of their location of facilities -- their equipment and supplies and things which they were going to add.

>> Shaun maddox, assistant chief at the pd.

Yeah, the reduction would be prohibitive of building out the facility as envisioned.

To be a station for the -- a , park and specialized patrol as well as the rangers program.

The facility is projected to be able to store police vehicles, atv's, be able to

deploy a police boat from
the facility and those kinds
of things.

So it would -- it would
alter dramatically what that
facility was envisioned to
be.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Would the facility be
functional at two million
instead of 4.7?

I would say that if we find
ourselves in a position like
we are with the northeast
right now with an
underfunded project.

>> Have to go to a thatched
roof.

[Laughter].

City manager?

>> I want to remind everyone we've talked about this issue before and we've had the problem in the previous bond program of inadequately funding a facility project. And that's what this stands to be.

At this funding level it will not meet the original expectations that the staff has determined are necessary.

So my suggestion would be that we provide enough funding to allow them to do design work.

If you're going to reduce this and look at actually construction, either by

other means or in the next bond program, but we don't want to be strapped with trying to meet that set of expectations when we know out of the gate we simply don't have enough funding to do it?

>> Mayor Leffingwell: So i would like to follow one a question like this.

So two million dollars is what the proposal is instead of 4.7.

Would that be just an amount of money that's going to sit there and do nothing?

>> Well, I don't know that we need necessarily -- howard, you will have to help with this -- two million dollars to do design work for this facility.

That may be more than we
need.

But it's clearly not enough
to carry out the scope
that's intended, as this is
being proposed in our plan.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Before you answer, howard,
he just want to say I want
to emphasize that that's one
of the things we talked
about at the very beginning
of this process is that when
we identified specific
projects, the funding should
be adequate and not trimmed
down.

We saw this with the
combination of new municipal
court building with the

northeast substation

that was approved.

That was pared down to the point where we couldn't do that, so that money has just really not been used.

We saw in the library where that money was pared down from what we really needed to do and now we are going ahead with the labor, but it's not the kind of facility that we had planned to built.

We had to make dramatic changes, reducing that by about 25 percent.

So go ahead and give your answer.

>> Howard lazarus, director

of public works department.

The challenge with the facility project is that until you get into actually developing the program and knowing what you're going to use it for and going through some estimates based upon pair metric planning figures like per square foot cost it's hard to really know what it's going to cost.

And is there a process you go through.

But you can estimate how much you need for design and all the coordination that we have to do based upon an early estimate which I think is where we're at.

So putting aside two million dollars for design of this facility and other parks facilities enables that department to put forth a detailed design on this effort so that when there's another subsequent funding opportunity, whether it's a grant opportunity where we need to know what the amount is, or a subsequent bond, we have a much more certainty as to what we're going to need.

And that leads towards better allocation of capital dollars.

So by putting two million dollars aside now it will certainly get this facility

to the point where we can
get documents that we can
bid and get -- and know what
the price is.

And I don't think it will
lead to an overcommitment of
funds.

A lot depends on the
language that's attached to
it.

I think that's an
appropriate number.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: So
you think it's a valid
expenditure even though you
won't be able to build the
facility.

You will be able to plan for
it, have it -- I'm beginning
to hate this term -- shovel

ready.

>> We can have a facility
when we talk about something
being ready for
construction, that has a
complete set offered by
documents and we're readying
to get permits.

We've done it where we bid
it (indiscernible).

But having a set of drawings
that are readying to gives
us the advantage of knowing
what the cost is so we can
make better use of bond
funds in the future or if
there's an opportunity for
grant funds we know what to
ask for.

>> So we can do the
paperwork, but couldn't

build it.

>> Not for two million

dollars.

7 million

was in the taskforce

recommendation and the staff

recommendation.

>> And I think what was

and

pard is that that will give

them a compromise facility

for what their needs are.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: That

will give them a facility.

>> But it won't give them

the needs that they

specified.

You can build something, but

it won't meet their needs.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: You

can build something for a
lot less than that.

City manager?

>> I guess the point is, and
to summarize what howard is
saying, two million dollars
is sufficient for planning
and design, not for
facility.

That's the point that's
being -- that's being made
here.

And should that be the
decision -- and this
language here says park
patrol facility.

I guess I'd want to make
sure that there's some
clarification in that
language so there's no
misunderstanding of having

an expectation that there
will be a facility at the
end of the day because there
won't be.

We're going to plan for it.

>> Morrison: Mayor?

I'm going to support this
motion.

One thing that I think is
important and I wonder if
we've really explored is the
possibility of doing -- so
the idea is to put this near
the hike and bike trail.

The possibility of doing
perhaps a small substation
near the hike and bike trail
for a joint facility,
because clearly we know that
there are a lot of people
that use the parks there,
but we have parks all over

the city and we have some
parks that have very high
needs for public safety
presence.

And so I wonder if we could
explore the possibility
under this project and that
would be to do a joint
facility, like a major joint
facility in another area of
town and a substation near
the hike and bike trail.

I'm thinking particularly
of, you know, dove springs.

And I know that we have
the -- with high needs,
their park in many ways is
not used because of concern
about public safety.

I also know that we own some

land out there and we're --
we have in the bond package
both the proposals a project
for the mounted patrol
headquarters to be built out
at southeast.

And so if this goes forward,
I would like to add
direction to actually
explore, if it's acceptable
to my colleagues -- before
going forward with this
concept of the major
headquarters for parks and
parks rangers at the hike
and bike trail, explore the
idea of a smaller station
near the hike and bike trail
and something in a high
needs public safety area of
town for the major location.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: I think that would be a totally different item to be proposed as another additional amendment to change that.

Chief mcdonald?

>> Michael mcdonald, deputy city manager.

Let me just add a couple of comments because I think what we're actually proposing would satisfy what you're looking for anyway.

Several years ago when we consolidated into the police department, the park officers became a.p.d.

Officers, so really what we're proposing to do here is to take those police

officers that are assigned
to the parks along with the
park rangers and co-locate
them.

And them being co-located in
that way would in essence
create that type of presence
that you're talking about on
the hike and bike trail.

In that park system on the
hike and bike trails.

In many ways it would
function because you would
have an ongoing presence.

Part of what chief talked
about when you're trying to
achieve that is the place
for all of them to show up
and operate out of that
facility.

So you would in many

instance that substation
presence that you're looking
for, you would get that once
we have a design and
implement it.

>> Morrison: Yeah, i
appreciate that.

I guess what I was trying to
promote was to have that
major presence in another
area of town.

Where we know we've got
crime issues and they're
really trying to lift up the
area.

So rather than having it all
on the hike and bike trail.

I wondered if there was a
way to do sort of a small
presence on the hike and

bike trail, but really to
have their major presence in
another area of town that
they operate out of.

That was my suggestion.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: And
again, I think if that's
what you want to do, you
ought to propose that as a
separate and additional
amendment because this is
specifically for this, this
one facility.

>> I have another question
for the chief.

>> Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Chief mcdonald or
others, so the point came up
yesterday and again today,

have there been any
discussions, has the bond
committee and staff explored
the idea of locating the
park patrol facility with
the mounted patrol facility
and combining those two for
cost efficiencies.

And I understand before you
say it that it's not
centrally located, but again
we've got parks everywhere
and if there's an intent to
have a substation here and a
main facility, it seems to
me there are other
alternatives that could be
explored and joint use is
one in a time of scarce
dollars should in my opinion
always be the first
consideration.

>> I'll let chief maddox
comment on some of the
operational, but again
having an facility where
they can meet and deploy,
the old traditional show up
works, but there are other
needs associated with
mounted patrol where you
have to -- the amount of
space you need to keep the
horses and maintain them and
all of that.

So trying to design it in
such a way within the city
to do those sorts of things
to support the horses that
the upkeep that needs to
take place with them would
be a challenge at a location
like this.

>> Morrison: Of course, it

is -- right now it is within
the city limits.

I understand that's part of
the interest in moving it
out of the central city, but
currently our equestrian
facility is within the city
limits.

>> Yes, councilmember.

The equestrian facility
is -- the land has been
purchased, 88 acres over on
McANGUS ROAD NEAR WHERE
The circuit of the americas
is going to be.

It is a far out facility as
far as deployment citywide
goes because you're going
from one extreme corner of
the city to citywide.

Some of the issues that do
go with that as well as in
the central city-park
corridor we do a tremendous
amount of bicycle patrols.

We use atv's and those kind
of things.

We're looking at a
trailer issue of having
to trailer equipment in on a
daily basis.

And trailer equipment out on
a daily basis to meet those
needs of the city as well.

So all of those were taken
into account when we started
looking at where would we
put a park facility.

To service the parks
throughout the city we know

we could put officers in cars to get them to those facilities throughout, but to use the specialized equipment, the atv's and the bicycles, where we use them right now it makes sense for the facility to be there.

>> Morrison: Okay, thanks.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: I think what I would like to propose is that we increase that to four million dollars using two million dollars from the dougherty arts center.

And bringing that item back down to two.

Is there any objection to that?

>> Cole: Yeah, a little

bit.

Just a tad.

[Laughter].

>> Mayor Leffingwell: So

noting that there are five

objections --

[laughter].

-- I'll withdraw that

suggestion.

I'll just vote no on the

item.

So there was objection and

so we have to have a vote.

All in favor of including

that item say aye?

Opposed say no.

It passes on a vote of

five-one with councilmember
spelman off the dais.

I was voting no.

>> Morrison: Mayor?

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Councilmember morrison.

>> Morrison: Before I know
you are intending to move
on, and before we do go on
to the next one, I wanted to
propose an amendment that we
consider the item for the
design of the park patrol
facility that an initial
step in that design would be
to consider alternate
locations, joint use
possibilities and
configurations, for example,
a small substation centrally

located, and then
potentially a larger
facility not centrally
located.

>> Cole: Mayor?

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
Could we consider that
direction to the staff.

You don't have a dollar
amount attached to it.

>> Morrison: It would be
to amend the actual
description of the project.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
Instead of park patrol
facility --

>> Morrison: It would be a
park patrol facility with an
initial step of looking at
those options.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Okay.

I object to that.

>> Cole: Councilmember

morrison, I guess maybe we

lazarus up

here, mayor.

I'm not sure if you're

suggesting that our

department consider other

locations, then I think we

can give that general

direction without disturbing

this particular facility

that is planned.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Yeah.

And we do need to vote on

your proposed amendment of

two million dollars for the

park patrol facility first.

>> Morrison: We did.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: All
right.

I've got it checked off.

>> Morrison: And I heard
the mayor, and maybe
misheard, object to going
that direction and heard
that we needed to vote on it
separately.

>> Cole: Merit can correct
me, but I think you can make
separate directions to
consider park patrol
facilities throughout the
area and especially in east
austin or other areas that
they're needed.

I think you can do that.

But not to disturb this
item.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: A
dollar amount will not
attach to it.

>> Cole: And not
disturbing this item.

>> Morrison: I think we
need to acknowledge that
that step would need to be
done initially before
spending money on designing
a specific location.

If we're looking at options
and different
configurations, before we
spend money on designing one
specific plan, we should
look at what the options
are.

goode could --

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Let's see.

You want to go back and
change this item that we've
already adopted as part of
the main motion.

>> Morrison: Yes.

I want to amend the main
motion, which is what we --
which is to adopt the
description of this item.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: You
would have to move to
reconsider the item that we
just voted on.

>> Morrison: I'm making a
different motion, not to
change the -- not to change
the dollar amount.

I'm talking about massaging

what the actual --

>> Mayor Leffingwell: But
your motion changes the
title and purpose of the
project, so we would have to
reconsider -- that's my
ruling on that.

City attorney, do you have a
comment?

>> I'm not going to overall
your motion --

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
Well, you can't overall my
motion.

We appreciate your advice
anyway.

[Laughter].

>> I'll just make a
suggestion that I think
councilmember morrison, that

might be more appropriate as
kind of direction to staff
within the overall context
of the discussion that the
council will maybe want to
give to staff to consider
that before moving forward
on this particular item that
those types of discussions
and evaluations occur.

That would just be my
suggestion as that how to
handle that particular item
instead of doing it through
a motion.

>> Morrison: Thank you,
city attorney.

What she said.

[Laughter].

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

lazarus -- and i

disagree with that, city

attorney.

>> Mayor and council, i

think the issue here is what

is the intent of the project

that is listed because we'll

go through a process that

addresses requirements,

community input as part of a

detailed scoping effort.

We're not talking now about

size of the facility, we're

talking about kind of the

general scope and the

intent.

As we go down through design

we have to comply with what

the intent of the ordinance

is.

That doesn't really

prescribe what this is going
to look like when we're
done.

It just means -- it just
puts out what the intent is
towards achieving this
facility.

So it really addresses the
specific language in the
bond proposal what the
intent was I think.

We're basically -- we're
really talking about --
[inaudible].

>> I think to add a little
bit to the conversation, i
don't think our bond
covenants preclude us from
the facility.

If we pass the bond item
that says build a fire
station in onion creek and
we pass another bond item
that says improve parks
facilities and we find that
we can improve a park
facility and build a fire
station at the same spot,
the bond covenants don't
preclude us from doing that,
which fulfills the contract
with the citizens.

So passing this item to say
design of a park patrol
facility, I don't think
would preclude staff from
looking at potentially
co-mingling with another
department.

>> Morrison: Thank you for

that.

If that's the case, that's
great, but we have been very
specific.

We have heard very specific
language already from our
staff about build a park
patrol facility on lady bird
lake.

So as long as we can clarify
that -- that we will be
looking at other options as
part of the -- as part of
the effort, then that's
great.

I'm fine with that.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: And
we haven't discussed this as
building a park facility on
we need to
reconsider the previous --

is that what you want to do?

You want to reconsider the
previous item?

>> Morrison: I guess I'd
like to hear from our
attorney that's coming to
the podium?

>> Lela fireside with the
city fire department.

And what I understand what
you all are doing right now
is coming up with your ideas
for what you hope the way
the bond funds will be
spent.

The propositions that we've
drafted and the ordinance
that we're asking you to
approve today either on
first reading, where you
seem to be going today, but

ultimately prior to the date
to call the election, speaks
in more general terms.

And you know, we hope to be
able to use the funds in the
manner that you're
identifying for the
propositions in the dollar
amounts that you're
identifying.

But we're wording it
generally so that if there
are opportunities that come
up for projects that the
funds can be used for, the
description is general
enough to allow that
progress to be made.

So -- but if you --

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

You're saying after this

item has already been voted
for, a park patrol facility
on lady bird lake, that we
can go back then and add
direction to say look at
other places to build it.

>> What I'm saying is that
right now what I understand
you to be voting on are the
types of projects that you
want in the bond package,
but the ordinance itself is
not listing out the
particular projects.

Unless you're directing that
the ordinance be amended to
list out the particular
projects.

>> City manager?

>> So you're saying that
what's in play now is broad
enough to allow not only

what we've expressed is our intent with this two million dollars, but it's broadened us so that we can consider a variety of solutions, if you will.

Including the kind of facility that councilmember morrison is talking about.

>> Yes, that's my understanding.

>> Okay.

But we have been pretty specific about what our intentions are with respect to the two million dollars. We've been specific about that.

So in the absence of some additional direction from

council, again, we've been clear about what our intent would be.

>> Mayor, if I may.

I wanted to point out that in the backup in the wonderful notebook that staff provided to us, this item description is the park patrol unit currently operates from a lone trailer.

The project details the design and construction.

Of course we would with the two million change that to design, of a secured law enforcement facility that will support park patrol operations.

And when it comes to the map
it specifically says site to
be determined.

So for me that suggests that
our written language shows
that we have not identified
lady bird lake.

There's clearly some
contemplation of lady bird
lake.

has
wreath that in developing
the requirements options
could be looked at.

And that gives me a level of
comfort and I wonder if the
city attorney would suggest
that that's a reasonable
level of comfort.

[Laughter].

>> Well, I feel that it is

with the propositions as
they are currently drafted.
But with the direction from
the majority of council is
to call it out in a way that
we create a contract with
the voters to put this thing
in a particular place, then
we obviously will honor that
direction and include it in
the ordinance.

But what I understood you
all to be doing right now is
on first reading discussing
the project to try to get to
a total dollar and then also
to categorize the dollars
where they're going to go.

And there may be items that
come up where you are
talking about that and we'll
need to address that with
you.

And then hopefully to have
some flexibility going
forward.

If it turns out that a
particular site is not the
perfect location, that
there's enough flexibility
unless you really intend as
a majority of you for that
to be in the ordinance and
part of the contract with
the voters.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

We'll go ahead with it as it
is with clarification to --
more clarification on second
and third readings.

>> Thank you.

>> Morrison: And just
to -- a last month.

We don't have it written --
we have it specifically

written in our --

>> Mayor Leffingwell: But
we have discussed it.

We have discussed it.

>> Morrison: We have, so
maybe there needs to be a
vote to change the written
materials to get that
aligned.

>> Riley: Mayor?

I concur with councilmember
morrison and I don't see it
written down that it would
be related on lady bird
lake.

To the extent that it is
written or described
anywhere, I would suggest
that we instead of saying it
will be on lady bird lake,
if we want to mention lady
bird lake, we could just say

lady bird lake or other
suitable location that can
convey that our principal
intent is lady bird lake,
but if that doesn't work,
then we would identify some
other suitable location.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: We
can get it all figured out
before second reading.

>> Riley: I do have one
question about it.

Councilmember morrison is
right, the backup does say
site to be determined, but i
also notice that right below
that it indicates the cip
planning areas that there's
an x in the box for central
east, which seems to convey
the expectation that the

location would be in the
central east area.

And I wanted to make sure
we're all aware of that and
that's our understanding
that even if it doesn't wind
up lady bird lake, that we
would still remain in the
central east area.

I just wanted to raise that
as a question.

>> Morrison: Maybe we
could have the attorney look
into that.

And perhaps that could be
part of our follow-on
conversation.

>> Cole: Mayor, I just
want to add that of course i
support this direction,

especially recognizing the
high needs in central east
austin, but we are not
asking the attorneys to make
any type of contract with
the voters.

The next item for the
potential reduction is the
montopolis parking lot is we
need to fund our parking
lots for a city facility
through existing funds and
not have them as part of a
bond item.

>> Morrison: I.

>> Tovo: I object.

I would like to talk.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Objection by councilmember
tovo.

>> Tovo: I guess I have
questions for staff about

the montopolis recreation
center parking.

I know that is a joint
facility and I would like to
talk a little bit about the
value of the parking lot,
the state of the current
parking lot, what that does
for this community
recreation center before
they --

>> they're coming over to
answer.

>> Tovo: Super, thanks.

I know this has been a
priority certainly of that
community and also of our
city management to make sure
that the montopolis
recreation center gets the
attention it needs in terms

of renovations and dollars
and resources.

So it gives me -- I'm very
concerned with the proposal
to eliminate the parking
lot, which would seem to me
to be an important
component.

Sorry, I'm trying to buy
time for you here by talking
and talking.

Glad you're up.

>> Thank you.

Carlos rivera, director of
health and human services.

The montopolis facility is
very small and it was small
from the beginning.

You know, there's barely

enough parking this for
staff.

So this is different from
the joint recreation hhsd
facility that has been
proposed in the bond
package.

We're doing a lot more
business through our w.i.c.

Program, which is what's
housed in montopolis.

So we need to expand the lot
to accommodate not only the
staff, but the increase in
client flow.

>> Tovo: Thanks.

So currently you have not
enough parking for staff.

Where do the staff park?

>> Well, they're very

creative.

They park in the surrounding area.

We try to fit as many cars as we can into the parking lot, but again the parking lot is very small to begin with.

And with the increase in clients it makes it very challenging.

We try to give the clients preference over our parking needs, of course.

>> Tovo: So can you tell us a little bit about the number of clients -- i apologize if I'm putting you on the spot about this.

Perhaps some is in our backup.

I would assume some are families that will then have to walk a distance to get into the building?

>> I don't know the numbers offhand, but yes, there are families who live in the general community and some of them do walk and a good amount of them drive into the area.

>> Tovo: And I guess I was saying, as a parent myself, it's not the easessiest thing to try to shepherd children along into buildings.

So probably a lot of our families who use that center do drive because they have young children.

>> Kimberly maddox, chief

administrative officer.

Just to answer rho your
question, there are
approximately 1800 w.i.c.

Clients a month going
through that facility at
this time.

To give you an idea of the
volume.

And of course most of them
have children with them
because of the nature --
>> Tovo: I was going to
say because that program
serves parents with
children.

And can you tell us a little
[bit@bit](#) about the rationale
for having this included as

a possibility within the
bond proposal?

What do you see as the need?

What are some of the
considerations that we
should be -- have in mind as
we vote on this item?

>> We're hopeful that over
time the montopolis -- our
current montopolis site will
be replaced by a joint
facility with pard, which
would alleviate some of the
concerns because that
area -- because that
building would have
sufficient park fog all the
clients.

But we don't need a
decreased need over time, so
we need to be able to

accommodate the needs of the clients.

Is certainly goes -- we're looking at the parking lot specifically, but we also might eventually have some facility needs given that the program is growing.

>> Tovo: So I guess I just want to get back to this idea of how many -- we've got 1800 clients.

How many would you say -- how does that work out on a regular day?

How many clients do you have who then might be forced to try to find parking and kind of shepherd their young families along the streets?

>> I would need time to get that information to you.

>> Cole: Let me ask you a question, mayor.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
Mayor pro tem.

>> Cole: When you talk about the planned joint use facility, I'm trying to understand or it was generally my understanding that that would reduce the need for the parking lot.

>> Yes.

With pard, yes.

>> Cole: Okay.

But when is that planned?

>> It's in the current bond

package.

>> Cole: The current bond

package.

[One moment, please, for
change in captioners]

>> you may know more than
that.

>> Yeah, you know, we want
to use the montopolis
facility to accommodate our
administrative staff for
wic, I think we can do it
with the existing facility,
also a neighborhood in that
facility.

Those programs are
accumulated with the
montopolis site, if they
are, we should be okay with
the parking lot, given its
current size.

>> May I ask a follow-up question?

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Yes.

>> Tovo: Can you tell me when would the new facility be completed?

>> Again, we're probably at once

the bond is passed -- i would have to look, howard would help us with this in public works, but by the time we do public involvement, preliminary designs, go through that whole process, at least two to three years.

So get a brand new facility going, you're talking two to three years.

>> Tovo: For those three years you would have to ask

those 1800 families to try
to scramble and the staff to
scramble for parking on a
daily basis sounds like if
you don't have enough
parking to accommodate the
staff on a regular basis.

>> [Indiscernible] three to
four years for that.

>> Oka.

>> You know the staff have
been able to deal with the
parking constraints to date.

But again our concern is
if -- as a facility gains
more and more use, that
parking is an issue now and
it will become a greater
issue in the future.

Certainly we'll try to be as

flexible as possible.

But any assistance will be
appreciated.

>> Do you have a sense of
how far some of your clients
need to park?

>> That's something --

>> Tovo: You can get back.

I will just say, you know,
one I said that I wasn't
going to support it and i
won't.

But I regret spending a
million dollars on a parking
lot when we have so many
other pressing needs.

I understand the interest in
at least interrogating it
and seeing if there are
other ways to work around.

Seems to me this is a need
we need to continue to keep
in the bond proposal.

>> If I could just respond
real quickly the \$900,000
price tag is actually for
two parking lots.

One far south facility,
also.

>> Thanks for that
clarification, would you
remind us what that is -- is
that the far south is off of
william cannon in south
austin, home to one of our
immunization clinics as well
clinic
facility.

Again you have families,
same issues, not sufficient

parking for staff and the
client flow.

It is on a very busy street.

A very busy thoroughfare.

So you have families with
young children that would --
it's an issue of not having
sufficient parking.

>> Yeah.

I was going to say that is a
very busy area where that
clinic is located.

>> It's a far busier clinic.

>> Than montopolis, yes.

It is a busier clinic than
montopolis.

>> Being on.

Montopolis.

>>> Okay.

Thanks.

>> Councilmember martinez.

>> Martinez: I want to say

I appreciate the attempts to

try to get to a final

proposal here but I can't

support this item because of

the needs in southeast

austin.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: And

I just want to say I will

support this amendment

because it is needed.

There's no question about

it.

But this is all about

prioritization, as I said

earlier today.

Which is needed the most 1

and this -- this I think is

something that we can scrape

by on for a few years until
this other facility is
built.

But -- but again, needed but
I'm going to support the
amendment.

>> Mayor?

>> Morrison: Question.

I have one more question for
staff.

The far south clinic, is
there any -- is there a plan
to shut that down in a few
years, too?

>> No, no.

>> Morrison: That's a very
busy clinic.

>> It is a much-needed facility, no.

>> Morrison: I guess that I want to say that I won't support the motion, either.

Just to share one of the observations that we made at our committee, public health and human services committee, that is when you look at the breakdown of where the bond dollars are going, of course, the lions share is going to transportation, one percent of the bond dollars are going to health and human services facilities.

And I just think that to try to scale back even more

is -- is not where I want to
see the city go.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: And
I would just point out if
this amendment is not
approved, that means we're
going to have to find this
\$906,000 somewhere else on
this list.

>> Cole: Yes, mayor.

I was not -- it's my
fault -- aware of the
southeast austin clinic and
its needs.

So I will withdraw --

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
Withdrawing?

>> Cole: Yes.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: So
that means we're now
\$906,000 over the cap.

>> Cole: Exactly.

You've got that michael,
right?

All right.

The next item is the emmitt
shelton bridge.

That I am proposing for \$3
million.

Which we heard testimony
would get us through the
design phase yesterday.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Is
there any objection to this
item?

Hearing none, that's
incorporated into the
motion.

>> Cole: I'm proposing the
herald court facility at
11,077,000.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Okay.

Any objection to this item?

I guess that I would like to
ask, that's a reduction of
about \$5 million?

I know that we discussed it
yesterday, but I just want
to reiterate what do we get
for 11 million as opposed to
16 million?

>> Cole: I will again ask
the city manager howard to
answer that question.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: I
was asking him.

>> Mayor, we can, part of
the discussion in how much

to allocate to the facility
included a conversation
about how much of that cost
we could bear through other
means.

We had determined that we
could build a facility to
meet the requirement with 11
million plus in bond dollars
and the remainder would come
from some other sources.

So we would get the facility
that we desire for that
amount of money.

With the understanding that
we're going to have to
allocate some funding from
transportation fund over a
period of time to
[indiscernible] some debt.

..

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Okay.

With the understanding that
you are going to have to
take money out of
transportation to build it.

>> Right.

It would be essentially \$5
million financed over 20
years, so that comes out
to -- to \$275,000 a year or
so that we would have to put
towards it.

We do pay for facilities out
of the transportation fund
and we have managed our
capital debt out of that to
where there will be a
decrease in some of the
moneys that we have budgeted

for capital costs.

So I don't think the impact
on -- there will be an
impact in terms of a number
of lane miles that we can't
do.

But given the tradeoff, i
think the facility over the
long term will make us more
efficient.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: All
right.

Is there any objection to
this item?

Hearing none, that's
incorporated as part of the
main motion.

>> Cole: Okay.

The next item is affordable
housing.

And I am proposing that we
put the item in at the task
force recommendation of
76,800,000.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Is
there any objection from
councilmembers on this item?

Hearing none, that's
incorporated into the main
motion.

The main item is interstate
35 and I fully understand
that this is our most
congested freeway, but
looking at the backup
materials, I saw that most
of it is used, would be used
for signage and way-finding
and not for another
additional lane.

I appreciate the importance

of having -- of having items
shovel ready, but this
amount is being reduced
simply, it's being suggested
that it be reduced by a
small amount to -- to give
us funding to be able to do
some of the other items that
we have identified.

So the bottom line number
that I am suggesting for
i-35 is \$15 million.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Is
there any objection to this?

Let me just say that -- that
I'm going to support this,
I'm not going to object, but
it is -- it is very
disappointing that we can't
make any more progress than
this on our number one
transportation problem in

this city for the number one problem in this city, which is transportation.

But I guess \$15 million is better than nothing.

So that's incorporated.

>> Cole: The next item is design of new projects and in keeping with the idea that we don't want, we want to have items designed to make them shovel ready, we also want to fund items that we can't actually -- can't actually start to work construction on.

So I propose this item at \$4 million, which is a million dollar cut from the city manager's proposal of 5 million.

And an increase of 2 million
over the task force
recommendation.

>> Tovo: Mayor, I would
like to talk about this one.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I actually wanted
to raise this today for
consideration as a possible
cut.

So I appreciate coming down
from 5 million, but I would
like to talk about coming
down a little bit more and
part of my objective here is
to free up some room to get
back to the task force
recommendations on some
other critical needs.

If you look at the sheet,
comparing the city manager
and the task force proposal,
we do have what I would
regard as significant
reductions in metropolitan
parks, needs assessment said
33 million, there's a one
million dollars between the
task force and city manager,
neighborhood parks,
improvements, renovations, a
\$45 million needs
assessment, a one million
..

Neighborhood parks,
improvements, open space, we
have a one million dollar
gap and of course an overall
gap of 3 million.

So again, you know, as the
mayor said multiple times
today, it is -- well, now

I'm summarizing and I can't remember your actual words, but there are tough choices and these are difficult decisions.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Close enough.

>> Tovo: That was the sentiment was the same.

I agree completely.

But I do think that what is for me a priority in this line item is the south lamar work and I believe that was estimated at about a half a million dollars, so I would like to see us reduce this down to 500,000 and keep some of that additional -- what does that give us?

5 Million to add back
into the neighborhood level
parks, the metropolitan
park, the neighborhood parks
and the neighborhood park --
neighborhood plan parks
improvements because those
are the kinds of projects
that happen in people's
neighborhoods all across the
city and really matter
significantly in terms of
quality of life.

Not that the congress avenue
and others aren't important,
too, but I think we need
to -- we need to get out
across the city and the
neighborhood parks money
allows us to do that.

So again I would like to see
this number reduced down to
a half million.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Okay.

Let's see if it passes.

>> Cole: Mayor, I would
like to make one comment.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Mayor pro tem?

>> Cole: Actually, we
received \$130 million
unexpectedly from the
federal government and we
could not use that because
we didn't have any projects
within the central city of
austin that was ready for
construction and we actually
had to partner with ctrma to
do work on mopac and so the
need to actually solve our
transportation problems I'm

trying to balance that
between understanding it's
not just construction, but
it's also designed but not
spending too much money on
design.

I'm concerned that if we
take all of the design money
except for one area, that we
will find ourselves in a
similar situation.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: And
I agree with that, mayor pro
tem.

So there's objection.

So we have a vote on this
line item.

All in favor say aye.

>> Aye.

>> Opposed say no?

Passes on a vote of 5 to 1,
councilmember tovo voting no
councilmember spelman
off the dais.

>> The next item is street
reconstruction which i
have -- which I am proposing
a final number of
\$36,228,000.

The task force
recommendation and the city
manager recommendation was
40 million-dollars, this
is -- this is a very
important item, but it is
done throughout the city and
I believe that we can
appropriately stagger this
and fund some of it in other
ways.

So that's my proposal.

>> And could I ask mr.

Lather, what does this do to
our program of -- our 80%
program?

Or other programs.

>> If I could ask the
question, mayor, before i
start, what was the
reduction in the --

>> Mayor Leffingwell: It's
a reduction from \$40 million
to 36,228,000, pretty exact
number there.

>> Cole: That was
3,772,000.

>> Street reconstruction is

the principal and primary means that we have to address the failed streets in the city, those that are rated f and d which are marginal.

The street reconstruction program includes not only the actual pavement and subgrade, but it also includes a 30% allowance for drainage projects.

So we also address localized flooding through street reconstruction.

We also coordinate with the water utility on water main replacement.

So these projects all go together.

We also address through this line item intersection improvements and the capacity of many of our streets are more determined by conflicts with the intersection than the roads themselves.

To answer your question more directly, we spend on all of those things about 15 to \$20 million a year.

And since we started the accelerate austin program, that's about the level that we've been at.

So if we take \$3 million off, do the math for the reduction, probably about half a year of our total progress, \$3 million for a

typical street is probably
one project that will be cut
out from a neighborhood or
from a collector street.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: So
will you be able to meet
your goals?

>> We'll be able to maintain
the payments at 80% or
better.

I think the assistant city
manager good said yesterday
that's sort of a target for
us, we would like to do
better.

But it's not going to keep
us from maintaining 80% of
the streets as fair or
better.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Okay.

Councilmember Riley?

>> Can I ask in the past,
when we have gone out with
interim transportation bond
elections and I'm thinking
in particular of -- in -- in
2000 and 2010, I believe,
the last two interim
elections, were there any
funds included in those
interim elections for street
reconstruction?

>> There were.

2000 Bond program had a lot
of named projects in it.
Many of those were to be
done in collaboration with

the -- with travis county.

So those projects after
going through some
challenges with real estate
acquisition and -- and, you
know, synching those up with
county dollars are going
forward [indiscernible] our
challenge and commitment
was -- I'm talking about
public works and austin
transportation was to have
that funding obligate or
committed by the end of this
calendar year.

At the end of september
we'll have 75 percent those
funds committed.

The main area we don't,
partnership programs,
[indiscernible]

preservation, non-street
reconstruction.

Those projects will be
street reconstruction from
the 06 bond and the 2010
bond.

Those moneys will be fully,
almost fully committed by
the end of the year.

>> Okay.

>> Riley: Mayor, perhaps
one way of looking at this
is that in the events that
we are able to go out and
within the next few years on
interim transportation
election then we would be
able to consider including
some funding in that
election for street
reconstruction and that
would be consistent with

past practice.

That would ensure that we would remain on the pace that we have strived to set with respect to maintaining our streets.

>> We have plotted out the -- the draw down curves, going out of business curves for lack of a better word for all of the bond programs since 1998.

The program will start to gear down if we don't continue to -- to fund it during fiscal year '14.

Because -- because again the rate of expenditures that we've experienced to deliver a product is at about \$20 million a year.

That also does include, i

might add, that includes
sidewalks on the streets
that we reconstruct as well
as part of the bike plan
putting in the bike
facilities so we accomplish
a lot within that program.

I take it from that answer
if a subsequent bond
election were to be held
after 2014, you would be
below, below your goals.

>> We wouldn't be able to
address the failing streets,
which we wouldn't be able to
make any improvement.

I think that's the best way
to put it.

>> Well, again, same comment
here.

Most serious problem with the city or transportation problem we went through this, a few years ago, and we wound up with -- with so many potholes in our street that it actually got a lot of people's attention.

We have been on track for the last few years to try to remedy that situation and make it a -- made a lot of good progress, this basically sets it back, in my opinion.

>> I think one of the things to consider also, as i mentioned before, is the coordination with the utilities, particularly drainage and the water

utility.

As the water utility works
on its remediation program,
leak remediation program, we
have partnered with them to
reconstruction those
streets, one of the outfalls
of a greatly reduced program
would be streets that are
left in worst condition
because they still have to
do their subsurface work.

So -- so funding level that
we proposed at about the \$20
million a year, it's
necessary to keep that
progress and sustain it as
we go.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Right.

So when we have a street reconstruction program, we partner with the water utility who has lines underground, obviously water lines and wastewater lines, we partner with watershed protection when they have something to do with improvements on the street, could include sidewalks, lakelines, all of these -- bike lanes, all of these things, if the public works component is missing, we either could not go forward with the entire project, which involves several different city departments or it would be a substandard project and we would have to go back and redo it I guess sometime in the future.

>> I would add we also
partner with external
agencies which is texas gas
and the telecommunications
providers took in
[indiscernible]

>> Mayor Leffingwell: That
also.

So it has far-ranging
effects.

>> Certainly.

>> Councilmember morrison.

>> Morrison: I want to
congratulate you because i
think the -- I think, you
know, the coordination of
all of those different
partners and all has really
shown up and made a
difference, not only in the
money and the efficiency and

all, but also for the people
that live nearby or have to
move through areas where the
street is being
reconstructed.

It makes a huge difference
because I remember sixth
street being torn up time
after time after time and we
don't do that anymore.

And I think a lot of that is
due to the work that you've
done and can you help me, i
know that I asked you this
before, but I'm trying to
get my arms around
specifically numbers-wise
what it means.

We're talking about our goal
of 80% of the streets are
above a certain grade.

Above fair.

Which is below target.

>> Fair or better.

>> Which is our target and

it's -- have we met that

now?

Because before we hadn't,

before we were way below

that.

When we started the program

in fiscal year 2009, we were

at just under 73% of the

streets were fair or better,

28, 27% of the streets were

either in poor or failing

condition.

Over the last several years,

through the street

reconstruction, we've been

able to address those d or f

streets.

Through the transportation

fund, which are operating

dollars, we are able to
preserve those that are
rated as a or b and some of
those that are marginal we
are able to improve through
increased overlay effort.

Those are all operating
dollars.

>> Morrison: Is c a fair?

>> C is fair, d is
marginal.

We have been able to do some
work on the d's to get them
back up to b or c.

Because of the climate an
the use, they are constantly
deteriorating we need to
constantly pay attention to
it.

A lot of the work that we
have done have been maybe in
some of the easier areas,
some of the projects that we
need to address now, I can
talk about harris branch
parkway is a good example.

>> Morrison: We've heard
about that.

>> Stassney from terry to
burleson is a street that's
fail.

Those are going to take a
lot more effort to improve,
those are only done through
capital dollars.

But also cite that in the
last citizen report card
that we got, 66% of our
citizens were satisfied with
the condition of their

neighborhood streets.

Which was more than 20
points higher than the
national average.

Most of the money that we're
going to spend in the -- in
the next several months and
years are neighborhood
streets, neighborhood
collectors.

To include a lot of work
in -- in northeast austin
and central east austin, as
well as the inner core of
the city which is where the
oldest infrastructure is.

>> Morrison: When we say
we are five years ahead of
schedule, what does that
mean exactly.

>> We had programmed

achieving 10% by the end of
fiscal year 18.

At this year about 82%.

So 12 -- so we're sort of
there.

>> Morrison: Okay.

So we're -- sounds to me
like we should -- are
shifting into a different
mode of either we change our
goal and try to fund a plan
to increase that standard or
we get into a maintenance
mode of keeping things,
keeping 80% of them above
fair.

Fair or above.

>> I think if we don't
address the capital issues

we will never be able to
address those parts of the
city where the need to
reconstruct is there.

In the areas where there's
newer infrastructure, we
have implemented the
effective preventive
maintenance program, we can
maintain those streets for a
very long period of time
without significant capital
reconstruction.

But there are areas, and i
have the map here, if you
look at central east,
central west, the older part
of the city, that's where we
need to address the issues
and some of those areas
construction gets expensive
because of -- because of
awful the -- you know, all

of those --

>> thank you, I appreciate
that.

To me it's important to --
if we -- we understand that
it's a low bar.

If we want to change the
bar, let's change the bar
and plan for it and make
sure that we fund it.

But I guess there's, you
know, there is a never --
there's an endless bucket of
money that we could fill for
transportation.

And for me it's important
that we -- that we work
methodically to our goals.

>> One of the things that
we'll do for next year is
budget, because we're going

to look at comparison of
peer cities to see what
their expectations and
standards are.

As well as what is a best
managed and best management
practice to -- to
understand.

Because there is a point
[indiscernible] marginal
returns as well because we
are constantly
[indiscernible] laws of
thermo dynamics --
>> you are not going to win
those fights with the laws
of thermo dynamics.
>> We can get to a draw with
it.

I think we need to readdress
as robert said yesterday, it

was a good goal to get us started but maybe the bar needs to be ratcheted up a little bit more.

>> Morrison: All right.

I do have one question for our city attorney.

One scenario is that this is approved on first reading and we come back and discuss it again on second reading.

Will it be -- allowable to -- to actually come back and change this dollar figure again?

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Yes.

>> Yes.

[Laughter]

>> so it won't be a matter
of reconsideration at that
point because we're on
second reading.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: It
can be amended on second and
third readings further.

>> Morrison: Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
With -- so before we -- this
is the last amendment that
you are going to offer, i
would note that we're over
the \$385 million cap.

>> Based on our
calculations, you basically
need about \$900,000 over,
our raw total is 385854, but
because we want to round
when we do the propositions
we are saying for all intent

and purposes 900,000 over
where you want to be.

>> Cole: Is that -- I'm
sorry, is that a result of
the removing the montopolis
parking lot?

>> That's correct.

>> May I also just reiterate
from yesterday, you have
allocated the dollars to the
specific projects or talked
about that.

What you actually need to do
is if you want to go ahead
and take a vote on that, you
actually need to take a vote
on that ordinance and then
allocate the direct total
amounts to each proposition
and that would be the first
reading of the ordinance.

And I think staff has done

that.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Laid
out here in that way.

>> Yes, sir.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
Yeah, so we can go back
and --

>> ones --

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Do
that after this.

But let me just say
symbolically at least, if
this last line item is
adopted, I'm not going to be
able to support the main
motion.

Because it does exceed the
385 million-dollar cap that
we discussed.

Realizing that it will
probably be symbolic and

hopefully that situation can
be corrected.

But just for the record I'm
going to vote no.

>> Martinez: Well, there
could be other amendments,
mayor.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Yes,
assuming that it stays that
way.

So I guess we have to deal
with this last street
reconstruction amendment
first, which is a reduction
of \$3.8 million.

To both the task force and
city manager -- city
manager's proposals.

Is there any objection to
that?

>> Martinez: I just have a

comment, I don't have an objection.

I would like to ask the mayor pro tem if she would consider making the total amount 35,322,000, therefore finding the 906,000 so that we could stay at 385 and hopefully get four votes on first reading, knowing that it may be amended --

>> Cole: That is very friendly.

[Laughter]

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Does anybody have any objection to that?

I'll just object so that we can get a vote on it.

All in favor of that

reduction say aye.

>> Aye.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Opposed say no?

No.

So that passes on a vote of

5-1.

I'm voting no and

councilmember spelman is off

the dais.

That puts us below the 385

million-dollar cap.

Any further amendments?

Are there any further

amendments that anyone would

like to propose?

>> Mayor.

>> Mayor.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:.

>> Martinez: Thank you,
mayor.

I don't have any further
amendments.

What I wanted to do was make
some comments and say that i
will be supporting this on
first reading, knowing that
we still have a lot of work
to do to get second and
third reading passed.

The proposal that I made
yesterday and that others
made were not dissimilar to
what we're doing today.

Six of the seven items that
I proposed yesterday are

included, that's why I'll be supporting it on first reading, but I do want to speak about some of the items that aren't included that I fully support.

One is mexic-arte museum which they have requested five million for a new museum.

I believe that they have put together a fair proposal to us.

That would require them to raise substantial capital.

If we were able to allocate five million in bond funding for the museum.

I'm going to remain supportive of that.

I'm going to try to work to
get it back in on second and
third reading.

The other item is the 360
fire station.

At a main yesterday I was
hoping that we would commit
to at least acquisition and
design because I do think
that it's needed.

If it doesn't make it into
the bond package, though, i
want to just lay out that i
will begin working
immediately towards budget
to include a wild land
management division within
the fire department.

Again, we -- every month the
public safety commission has
talked about the priority

for dealing with our urban
wild land interface and we
have yet to really take any
steps in that regard and
here we are coming up on the
one year anniversary of the
bastrop fires and we still
haven't done anything.

Now, our firefighters are
doing a great job, but we as
a council haven't made any
commitments.

If we can't at least put a
fire station design and
acquisition in this bond
package I would hope that
you all would join in
supporting the fire
department with a wild land
management division so that
they can help us determine
where best to place this

fire station, not only to protect citizens, but to protect the millions of dollars that we have already spent in open space, and the \$30 million that we're going to ask the citizens to spend again in open space that we need to protect as well.

So I will be supporting this for first reading.

>> Morrison: Mayor?

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Let me say, councilmember, I'm going to support that.

I agree with you on that, that we ought to at least make some progress.

But just to -- just for the record, I think we have done a lot since the bastrop fires.

Particularly the fire department has done a lot of outreach, walking door to door and -- and talking to folks about how they can help themselves and we've established this -- this region-wide group to address these issues, too, so we have made incremental progress, but I agree with you and will support that effort to incorporate a wild lands division, at least make some progress during this budget cycle.

And -- and I guess after we approve this motion, we're going to have to go through each one of these items and take another vote to approve or disapprove each

proposition.

I just want to pose a question, no answer right now, but I would like to get some information before second reading about the feasibility, just exploring it right now, of dividing the transportation bond proposal into two parts.

The first part being road projects and the second part being bike and ped projects.

Just to see -- just to kind of see how that looks.

Not saying that I'm supportive of that at this point.

I just want to get some kind of analysis of it.

Councilmember morrison?

>> Morrison: Thank you,
mayor, I want to thank
councilmember martinez for
his comments because there
are certainly some pending
issues.

And I think that, you know,
previously in terms of
talking about the priority
personally that I felt for
the task force there were
two sides to that.

One was the -- the amount of
the housing bonds and this
gets us there.

The other were the -- this
was just sort of the flavor
with the different
priorities on the smaller
projects and I see that they
are listed out here.

And so because it doesn't
integrate that, those other
projects, I'm not going to
be able to support this on
first reading, but I am
going to -- I am going to
give some thought to how
this might be massaged and i
would like to just list out
what my priorities are of
those items that are
different because there are
more than a handful but for
me it comes down to -- to
the difference in
metropolitan parks
improvements and renovations
as well as neighborhood
parks improvements and
renovations.

The open space acquisition.

And then the fourth

difference is the

transportation item north
lamar and burnet corridor
improvements is another one
million dollars.

So that's -- that adds up to
5 million and I would also
like to mention the a.d.a.

Fishing pier, which I think
is a fabulous project and
with a small amount of
money, 150,000 --
>> it's in, you voted for
it.

>> Morrison: It's in
there?

>> You voted for it twice.

>> Morrison: We only have
four I apologize for that.

Those are my four

priorities.

And I do hope that -- that
we can get some -- some buy
to address the needs at
mexic-arte, also.

So hopefully we can give
some thought to all of those
and come up with some ideas.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Councilmember riley.

>> Riley: Yeah.

I want to -- I share some
sentiments expressed by my
colleagues, I do expect to
vote for this on first
reading.

But in my mind this remains
a work in progress.

We still have opportunities
on second and third reading

to try to define this.

I believe strongly in the
mexic-arte project.

A lot of work has gone into
the vision for that project,
I think it's a very bold and
exciting plan that has
generated a lot of community
support and so I'm remaining
remainingcommitted to looking for
ways to continue to work
that in.

Also agree with comments
made by councilmember
martinez with respect to the
importance of fire
protection in the northwest
area.

And in particular I -- i
expect to join him in
supporting the creation of a

wild land division in the
course of the budget
process.

My hope would be through the
development of a wild land
division that we would
obtain additional expertise
in -- that would be helpful
in identify and securing the
optimal site for a future
stations.

It may well be that the
timing could work out well.

If we get a wild land
division in place, we
continue to look at the
needs for the new station
that we will be in a better
position to pursue that fire
station in the future.

And there's of course the
other bond projects, foster

project that we've heard
about I think is a worthy
project in some way.

And to the extent that we
can continue discussions on
those, then I'm -- I'm very
open to saying what else --
to seeing what else we can
do to try to reconcile
everything we need.

This is a very difficult
process as we all have found
that there are -- it is not
fun having to cut anything.

So I remain hopeful that
we'll find ways to mitigate
that pain as we get into
second and third reading.

>> Cole: Mayor?

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Mayor pro tem.

>> Cole: I want you to know that I don't love this package.

As a matter of fact I don't even like it.

Because we could not do all of the projects that I wanted to support, which includes every one of those that y'all named.

But I tried to make a good faith effort to put in what you had shared with publicly or in hearings those items and still stay below the tax rate.

And I welcome your amendments along with the chosen cuts that you making to make to balance them out.

I am especially concerned

about the transportation
items that the mayor has
already discussed.

And I am concerned about the
park items and the lamar and
burnet improvements.

That being said, I think
that I'm very pleased that
most of you have indicated
that most of you are going
to vote for this on first
reading and that we are
making progress.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Yeah.

I would just say that i
would associate myself with
your remarks and also
councilmember riley's very
strongly remembering that we

began this process with a
needs assessment of almost
\$1.5 million.

Those were all good
projects.

Billion.

No, I didn't say million.

One and a half billion
dollars, with a b.

That has been pared down to
le half a billion at
this point, 385 million to
be exact.

This was not an easy things.

A lot of people worked very
hard on the staff, on the
task force, people who made
their individual comments
submitted their individual
comments and especially
members of the council have

worked very hard to make
some many cases, heart
rending decisions about
these priorities.

I especially want to
associate myself with mayor
pro tem cole's comment that
I don't like this composite
package all that much.

I wish it could be better.

It's hard to see many
changes but certainly i
think all of us ought to be
open and receptive to any
ideas that anybody has for
second and third readings.

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I want to start
by thanking mayor pro tem

cole and my colleagues, i regard housing as one of our very top challenges in this city, I think that it's absolutely critical that we adopt a bond proposal that includes a substantial amount so I appreciate very much your commitment to raising it back up to the task force level.

I had personally hoped that we would get closer to 80 as we did in our motion 8 is a very good start in this.

So what I would -- for me, i would like to do some more thinking about some of the projects that I named earlier, parks, naked parks, and councilmember thomas just mentioned them as --

councilmember morrison just mentioned them as well.

Also I would like to ask staff that we get clarity on a few differences between the task force and the city manager's recommended proposal and how that might affect those projec.

One is colony park utility infrastructure, another is building renovations also within the parks.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Councilmember, can we take this vote --

>> Tovo: I'm just airing as everyone else has what their priority concerns are for wrapping up for moving forward for second and third

reading.

And these are mine.

So to reiterate, the parks,
the neighborhood parks
items, and again I would
like some clarity from the
parks department of how
those reductions, what I see
as reductions from the task
force to the city manager's
budget might impact those
projects.

So again thank you for the
work of my colleagues in
getting us to this point, i
hope we can get across the
finish line on second and
third.

So I'm for the going to
support it today but I did
want to acknowledge the
significant effort of

getting affordable housing
back up from the city
manager's recommendation.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: All
in favor of the motion as
amended for exactly \$385
million or rounded off to
385 million.

>> Mayor, if you want we go
through --

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
We're going to do that next.

>> Propositions based --

>> Mayor Leffingwell: I
thought that we would go
ahead and vote on this first
and then go through the
propositions.

All in favor say aye.

>> Opposed say no.

Passes on a vote of 4-2 with
councilmember morrison and

tovo voting no.

Now let's go through the
propositions, I'm sure that
you are going to give us the
right, the corrected number.

>> We are going to actually
put that up on the screen
for you as well.

I think, yes.

So just to kind of go
through the numbers, right
now your total package as
passed is 384,948,000.

Transportation and mobility
proposition totals
143,299,000.

[Reading graphic]

1 one footnote I do want to
put on that, we include the
women and children's shelter

as proposed as a change this morning.

In the health and human services proposition, assuming that it's the same purpose and intent as the -- as the other women and children's shelter repairs that we have.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: So we can take all of these items at once it turns out.

If I could have a motion to approve on propositions for want of a better term at this point, 1 through 7 on first reading.

Councilmember martinez?

So moves.

Seconded by mayor pro tem
cole.

All in favor say aye.

>> Aye.

>> 7 On possessed say no.

Passes on a vote of 4-2 with
councilmembers morrison and
tovo voting no.

Okay.

So we have one more item
remaining on our agenda.

Councilmembers, I would
suggest that we might want
to postpone that item.

That being the case can we
postpone it -- okay, we can
postpone it until friday.

>> Mayor.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Just
double checking.

Councilmember martinez.

>>

>> Martinez: Just as a
point of information, friday
afternoon we are scheduled,
the economic development
subcommittee scheduled to
meet at 1:00.

We are posted for a special
called council meeting at
2:00.

I really don't think that
we're going to get through
any of the agenda with less
than 50 minutes of a
meeting, so I'm going to
just announce that we will
reschedule that meeting as

necessary.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Okay.

>> Martinez: But I also

want to let everyone know

that two weeks from today i

will start at apparent

leave, so I will be --

paternity leave so I will be

out for at least five weeks.

So the committee if they

meet in that time more than

likely will not have me

around unless we're having a

good day at home.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Well

deserved, congratulations.

City attorney?

>> Item 7 is not currently

posted on friday's agenda,

but we could amend it to
include it on either the
postings for saturday or
monday.

>> Okay.

Let me suggest monday.

>> Okay.

>> We will amend that agenda
to post it on the monday.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:

Without objection, item 7 is
postponed until next monday.

So now without objection we
are adjourned at 11:50.