

Council Work Session - 9/25/2012

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Good morning.

I'm austin mayor lee leffingwell.

A quorum is present so I'll call this work session of the austin city council to order on tuesday, SEPTEMBER 25th, 2012, AT 9:10 A.m.

We have no extra items on the agenda so this will be a true discussion, true work session discussing the items that appear on the agenda.

There are none called out in advance, but the floor is open now for any councilmember that would like to bring up particular items for discussion.

I would say -- I'm going to have a brief discussion on items 87 and 88.

They are technically not related.

Items from council, but i was contacted quite a few times yesterday by people from outside of austin in the region, and the concern is that both -- both of these, quote, take away all the progress that was made towards regional.

First of all, I'll address item 87.

In talking to the executive director of campo, actually as late as this morning, what this is is an item to withdraw and later resubmit the city's amendment request to the 2035 plan, which is -- we all recall was a request to remove it from the 2035 plan.

That was done, incidentally, by friendly amendment as we approved the comprehensive plan.

So staff submitted that request in accordance with the council direction and it was scheduled and campo then proceeded to go through a long period of public hearing on this item and others.

So there were at least three general public hearings held, one north, one in the central austin area, one in buda in the southwestern part of the region.

In addition to that, an extensive public hearing was held at campo at the september meeting.

Potentially all that would have to be redone.

There may be some legal issues about whether it would legally have to be

redone, but it's a practical consideration.

The feeling, at least the feeling on the part of the chair, the policy board chair, is that we would absolutely have to duplicate all of that work again.

That would be done at about the same time, in february of next year, campo will take up the 2040 plan.

And so basically both of those things would be going on at the same time and the feeling is they would be very confusing and they could be totally independent.

For example, one action to take it out of the 2035 plan, another action putting it into the 2040 plan.

The 2040 plan will take time to complete, up to two years, but it has to be done before 2015.

So the feeling around the area that campo represents is fairly strongly that this is -- this is an austin thing, that austin is trying to impose its will on the rest of the region, and there's, frankly, a lot of resentment over it.

And I think the desire on the part of the chairman at

least is to go ahead and
vote on this issue.

I just wanted to bring those
to everybody's attention so
that they could be
discussed, but it has
created quite a stir.

So councilmember riley.

>> Riley:.

>> Thanks for your comments,
mayor.

I would like to provide a
little more context.

What we're talking about is
amendments
that are being considered by
campo.

Campo does that a couple of
times a year.

They have been going through
the process with respect to
a number of amendments to
the transportation
improvement plan.

They expect to go through
another round of amendments
early next year.

For each of these rounds,
they are required to hold a
series of public hearings
and that's exactly what
they've been doing.

They would have been having
these hearings regardless if
we had come up with

anything -- sh 45 out of the plan.

They will be having public hearings early next year in connection with that set of amendments regardless of what we do then.

So -- so into that context of regular public hearings [inaudible] there is a -- a study, a modeling study that has come up that campo has been working very hard -- at the request of both travis county and hays county, campo has been working on a

[09:12:00]

modeling study that would show various scenarios for road improvements and especially in the southern travis county, northern travis -- northern hays county area.

Now, that -- we expected that modeling data to be ready in september and that would have been very useful to have because it would have given us new information for purposes of discussing sh 45.

As it turned out, shortly before the september meeting, campo identified a flaw in their data which meant that the whole modeling effort that had been underway for some time was essentially useless.

It was not available for consideration, and in fact it still won't be available in time for the october campo meeting at which campo will be considering that round of t.i.f. amendments.

So the question is where does that leave us in terms of what to do about sh 45.

We've talked about sh 45 a number of times this the past.

I personally don't see a whole lot of value in having yet another vote on sh 45 absent some new information such as that we would receive from the modeling study that has been underway.

And so at the september meeting I made a point of saying that -- that i thought it would make sense for us to hold off on voting on sh 45 until such time as we had corrected data available, which will likely be at the next round of amendments in early next year.

I know that message didn't really get through.

A lot of people still felt unsure as to whether there was going to be a vote on sh 45, especially the opponents -- rather the supporters of sh 45 kept

coming out to those public hearings in spite of the suggestion we pull back.

The campo chair was the one member attending at least one of those meetings and he

[09:14:00]

was saying he was gooding to insist we go ahead and consider this in october even in the absence of corrected modeling data.

I think even if we did have a vote in october on sh 45, we would likely still want to brave the issue in the early part of next year because then we would have fresh new data to consider, and I think a lot of people in the committee would want us to take a careful look at that date the and weigh the question of 45 in light of that new information.

Based on all that, I asked whether we could delay the concerns about our considering this in october, I asked staff if they could just notify campo that we were holding back on that amendment request until we had the corrected data, and staff said, well, we cell really can't do that because council -- and this is an appropriate part of staff that did what council asked them to do, submit the request to pull it out --

pull sh 45 out of the campo plan.

But I thought it would make sense for council to provide some additional direction saying we think we ought to hold off on this until we have that corrected data.

And that's all this resolution does.

It pulls back on that amendment request until such time as we have that corrected data.

I don't see it requiring a whole new round of hearings that would not otherwise be happening anyway because we will be having those hearings in early next year regardless of what we do.

Now, chair connally has asked that we consider just focusing the discussion on the 2040 plan as opposed to trying to have this in the context of this amendment.

My sense is that we are going to -- once campo gets the new data and considers it, we're going to be --

[09:16:00]

we're going to either want to have sh 45 in our plans or not and we might as well go ahead and consider that at the first opportunity,

which would be in connection to the amendment.

But if folks still tired of having hearings in context amendments, I'm open to focusing just on the 2040 plan if that's the will of council.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
Well, a couple things.

There are legalities of it and there are practical aspects of it.

Without -- we can argue about the legal aspects of it, and there very well might be other t.i.f.

Amendment cases going on early next year.

But if there weren't, we don't know that there will be, there could be, they would still be going on at the same time and it would be quite an additional workload on the campo staff and confusing to the public to do this at the same time.

The other thing is that there is no -- there's no legal relationship between the study, the study is not directly a requirement of making a decision on the amendments, as you pointed out.

That was coming up anyway regardless of the status of the study.

I think the overall comment that I've received is that the -- the chairman, policy board chairman, would very strongly, he's frankly not happy about this at all, would very strongly prefer to hear this discussion, as you stated, as part of the 2040 plan which will begin in february.

I think the practical effect of it, as I said and I'll say this one more time, it is a giant step backwards to our recent efforts to promoting regionalism because it is seen as an effort on the part of austin to interfere in regional

[09:18:02]

roads and transportation facilities that are outside of austin.

Councilmember spelman.

>> Spelman: As you mentioned, it is only legally required that campo consider through public hearings whether sh 45 is politically popular and there is no legal requirement that campo consider through transportation modeling or any other transportation process whether it will

actually do any good to improve traffic conditions.

On the other hand, I think at least to some extent campo ought to consider traffic conditions and the effectiveness of the road, not merely the political popularity of it, and if we were able to delay until the dynamic traffic modeling study is available -- is it January, Chris, it's going to be available?

They are not sure when.

If we could at least delay having a vote until that point I will feel a lot more comfortable, I think all of us with Campo would feel more comfortable rather than how many people are for it or against it in hearings.

I understand how Commissioner Connally is in a bind because he's representing Hays County and this road is going to be mostly in Hays County and will be primarily serving Hays County, but the dilatory effect on traffic conditions if there are any, traffic modeling study suggests there are some, are almost entirely in Travis County and the City of Austin in the form of additional congestion on Mopac.

So the gain is in commissioner connally's area, the pain is going to be primarily to us and our constituents and that's what regional cooperation is all about is sorting out who gets the benefits, who bears the cost and what on balance is going to be best for the entire region.

It seems to me this is exactly what campo was designed to do and we ought to make that decision on the merits to the extent

[09:20:01]

possible.

With that in mind, mayor, do you think commissioner connally would be willing to entertain a motion of postponement we have of the request we have on the table now until after that traffic modeling study is complete?

That would almost certainly remove the legal requirement to hold a new round of hearings, we've already held the hearings, we just won't be taking a vote until a little bit later, we wouldn't have to start all over again, but those of us concerned about the merits of the case and the value this road would or would not have to traffic conditions would be able to get the benefit of that study.

Would you be willing to convey that back to commissioner connally and see if he would do that?

>> Mayor Leffingwell: I haven't asked him that question, but certainly a postponement sounds a little better from the perspective of having to go back and hold additional hearings than a withdrawal and resubmittal.

You know, but obviously the preferred course of action would be just to call for withdrawal and submit it again at a later date if that's the desire that -- my feeling without having delved into it too much or not at all until you brought it up is that a postponement would be better than a withdrawal, but I don't know all the factors.

And you know, you mentioned correctly there may be questions about whether legally or not you have to hold these public hearings, but as a practical matter, it's not a matter of judging the popularity from the public hearing, it's a matter of public process, and I don't believe the chair, at least he so stated to me, was [inaudible] without additional public hearings after a long lapse of time like this.

That means of course that all the interested party are going to haul back down because they see the process starting over again.

[09:22:00]

It's going to be very confusing for everyone concerned.

>> Spelman: I don't think anybody wants the campo staff, commissioner connally, who has i understand gone to all the public hearings, I applaud him, I have not, none of us want to put additional burdens on anybody else.

And if a postponement would eliminate the need to burden anybody else but accomplish the same objective, I'm all for it.

The concern I've got is that just asking for postponement will not necessarily get us postponement, we would actually take a record vote on this which I do not have any information from last time, I can't see why that record vote would be any different than last time with the absence of new information.

But if commissioner connally recognizes we have the authority to withdraw and resubmit which may be a pain in the neck for everybody,

let's avoid the pain in the neck and do it the easy way.

Would you be willing to convey that to commissioner connally?

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Yes, if the desire is to postpone it, then the board would have an opportunity to vote.

The way this is stated, my understanding the policy board would not vote on it because it's withdrawn by the party who submitted the question.

>> Spelman: The only other thing I would add, mayor, i believe commissioner connally's willingness to vote in favor of postponement would be helpful to you will a of us.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: I don't know if I can get that for you.

>> Spelman: I understand, but if you could ask, i would sure appreciate it.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: I will look into that.

>> Spelman: Thank you, sir.

Mayor pro tem cole.

>> Cole: I have a question for councilmember riley.

I'm trying to understand
your reasoning between
making this resolution in
connection with the t.i.f.

Amendment as opposed to the

[09:24:00]

2040 plan and how that
reconciles with what
commissioner connally is
asking us to do.

>> Riley: I'm not sure
exactly what the timing is
on the hearings regarding
the 2040 plan as they relate
to the hearings on the
amendment, and I'm
happy to look into that and
if the council would really
rather have a discussion in
the context of the 2040
plan, I'm open to that.

I think there is a potential
for confusion if we -- if we
have processes going on at
the same time where we're
taking -- where we're
saying, okay, we'll keep sh
45 in the t.i.f.

Amendment -- or rather in
, but then we're
going to take it out of the
2040 plan.

I think if a majority of
campo believes that sh 45 --
well, regardless of how a
majority of campo feels
about sh 45, that decision
should be reflected in both

and the 2040
plan.

And so my sense is we might
as well have the discussion
in both contexts.

If the goal is to avoid
inconsistent outcomes, then
you would want to be sure
that we have an opportunity
to consider it in both
contexts.

>> Cole: I agree with that
and I think that should be
part of the resolution and
that is causing some
confusion.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: And
the more I think about it, i
do think the policy board
should at least have the
opportunity to make that
decision.

Made the request of them
now, they've gone through
tall the effort, they should
be able to make the decision
if they want to postpone it
or not.

>> Riley: I would just
say, if I may, mayor, my
sense is once we get the
corrected modeling data,
whenever that happens, i
think a lot of people in the
community will want us to
consider that and will
likely want to comment at
public hearings.

So regardless of what happens now, if we act on it now, there will be a lot of interest in having campo

[09:26:03]

amendments
based on the new modeling data.

And that's all that would be accomplished by this resolution.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
Well, I guess I've made my point, I don't need to say anymore except that the bottom line is I think this is a huge setback for efforts to promote regionalism.

Councilmember morrison.

>> Morrison: Thank you, mayor.

I wanted to add a little context because I'm very concerned about the prospective that austin is getting in the way of regionalism.

I think that it's important that we understand that sometimes there's going to be disagreements between the different jurisdictions.

And just to remind everybody, the reason we're here today is because when we did imagine austin,e

planning commission's version that we were considering, that the council was considering for final approval, did not include sh 45 in it.

When that came before us, just to note, nobody on the council made a motion to actually add it back in, which could have obviously happened.

So in terms of the approval that we made.

And I was the one that made this, the following motion, that was discussed at great length in the community through the imagine austin process.

It was sort of in and out and in and out and it was voted out I don't know how many times by the task force.

Once it was clear it was going to remain out in our comprehensive plan, I did make that position to move forward with this request of campo because it was a matter of making our constituents, our overall 2030 plans consistent with the other arenas that we're

[09:28:01]

involved in and I thought that was an important thing.

And I hate for folks in the area to think that because we are promoting what is our vision, that that means it's a giant step back for regionalism and I can understand if we'll be going to disagree with that, but I think we all need to be able to understand there are different perspectives and we need to have the ability to discuss those different perspectives at the regional level.

And secondly, I want to concur with councilmember Riley that I think that it really does make sense in terms of reasonable public dialogue to have the modeling information in front of us which, you know, was not really part of the conversation or well known when I made that motion in the first place.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: And I would just note that that modeling information was not made when the friendly amendment to exclude sh 45 from the comprehensive plan was made.

>> Morrison: That's correct.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: That information was not available then, but now all of a sudden it's very important.

>> Morrison: Well, and just to be exactly accurate, the -- nobody made a motion from the council to exclude sh 45 from the comprehensive plan.

It came to us, the comprehensive plan came to us without sh 45.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: And I believe the statement was right, but the direction to ask campo to remove it was a friendly amendment, and that's the genesis for this original action, the letter from our staff to campo to put that on as an agenda item to make that change.

>> Morrison: That's correct.

>> Riley: And just to be -- if I may, mayor, just to be clear about our regionalism and whether this item would advance or detract from it, to the extent there is any kind of

[09:30:02]

tension in our regionalism, it is not because we want better data in the context of the discussion about sh 45, it's because we have asked that sh 45 be taken out and that was clearly the will of the council and i think in the judgment of many of us that was -- that was the sentiment we were

hearing from a large part of the community, that there was an interest in taking it out.

It's not so much about this professional situation we're in now, -- procedural situation, it's whether sh 45 should be part of our long-range plan.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Any other comment on this item?

The other one that I wanted to bring up for a little bit of discussion is item number 88, which -- and I've read the exact language of the resolution and it crosses its words very carefully and technically does not recommend the jollyville salamander be list 9, but the perception is out there -- I started getting telephone calls yesterday that the city council is recommending it for listing.

And I saw in my email this morning a letter from the alliance which i guess was to all councilmembers, I don't know, expressing great support for the resolution which calls for the listing of the jollyville and austin blind salamanders.

Again, there's perception and there's sometimes a little bit different from reality, but the perception

is out there, again, that the city of austin is trying to make a decision on this and influence something that has, in their minds at least, very significant consequences in williamson county.

[09:32:01]

This I think again is not only regionalism we're talking about, there are other efforts that are taking place on the state and federal level that i think has the potential to do a great deal of damage to the city of austin and a particular group of people in the city of austin.

So, you know, and again, here's the statement, again, a carefully parsed statement but definitely a recommendation for listing, that is the perception that we're making a recommendation for listing, and we have no authority, no relevance in that process.

That is a decision that is going to be a scientific based, scientifically based decision that's made by the fish & wildlife service, solely by them based on all kinds of input and data that they will receive.

And it's really -- I don't think it's appropriate for a

nonscientific based body to make a recommendation in that context.

Councilman Spelman.

>> Spelman: Mayor, I agree with you completely that the basis for the decision on fish and wildlife service's part ought to be a scientific basis, and that accepting largely politically motivated content would be dilatorious to their making a science based decision.

The reason for this ordinance, this resolution, is to further fish and wildlife's capacity to make a scientific decision because we've had some scientists from the city of Austin and Watershed Protection who have been working exactly on the science of this issue for years.

They know a lot about these two salamanders [inaudible] do not know any about the two salamanders up for listing that are outside the city limits and this resolution specifically excludes those two salamanders about which we

[09:34:00]

have nothing scientific to say.

We've got scientists who have been working on these salamanders, data collected where they live, how many there are, what the effects may be of different development patterns, and it seems to me it is only assisting in regional cooperation and assisting the federal government's capacity to make a good scientific decision for us to provide the information we have collected over many years to fish and wildlife for their use in making this scientific decision.

And that is all this is asking for.

And the city manager is directed to submit comments prepared by knowledgeable technical staff, that's scientific folks, and watershed protection, the fish & wildlife service providing relevant data research, professional opinions of those staff regarding scientific factual basis for the proposed listing.

To protect two particular salamanders I species act.

Nothing political.

This is about providing information they may not have they could use in

making a good sound,
scientific decision.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
Well, I just think,
especially the folks in
williamson county see this
not as it is actually parsed
and written, but basically
as a thumb in the eye to
them and they take very
serious exception to it.

That's really all I have to
say about that.

Councilmember morrison.

>> Morrison: I want to
mention a couple of things.

One, appreciate councilmember
spelman pointing out what
this is and if there is some
need for us to do some
better communication whether
it's public communication or
one on one communication to
make clear what this
resolution is, I'm certainly
happy to participate in
that.

But again, I think that in
terms of the perspective of
regionalism, this is
particularly paradoxical
because there have been
other bodies that have
actually made statements
that they did not want the
certain salamanders listed
so other bodies have
actually gone well beyond
what we're doing here.

And then lastly, I did want

[09:36:00]

to mention that councilmember tovo, who is the lead sponsor on this and I understand she has personal issues keeping her away right now, and I had a conversation with our government liaison, we were cognizant of the issue could this affect other state and federal issues that are going on, and in response to that conversation adjusted some of the language that was in there so that i believe that our government relations folks got comfortable with the language that we have here.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: And I certainly appreciate you making adjustments and accommodations.

And first of all, I'm not supporting other political jurisdictions that made their judgments, not at all, and I think that's improper too.

I don't think that excuses us from going along down the same path.

But I think there is still considerable, very significant concerns that it will -- even the language as it appears here, will affect our ability to do what we're

trying to do right now
especially at the federal
level.

Any other comments?

Other items?

>> Spelman: I have
questions about two items
and a third item for
comparison purposes.

First question is about item
24.

Is there somebody here that
could speak on the technical
items of item 24, that would
be lovely, but if not i
would just like to say
something about it.

Nobody seems to be coming
forward so let me just talk
for a minute.

[09:38:00]

Item 24 is a grant to
skillpoint alliance for
\$288,000 to provide computer
skills for folks in three
high schools located in the
austin area.

And the backup reports that
because of over the time
this contract has been
issued, they have obtained
leveraged services of about
\$3.25 million.

Now, I can argue this round
or flat.

The round version is boy,
it's great that our \$300,000
has been leveraged to
\$3 million, the flat version
is wait a minute, is it
appropriate for us to
3 million worth
of aisd services just
because of our measley 10%
of that.

I'm sure it's much more
complicated and the real
point I want to get at is
that the argument in favor
of this item as presented in
the backup is primarily a
financial one.

We got \$300,000, we're
leveraging \$3 million out of
aisd in terms of services
provided.

That's great.

We've got nice leverage.

What I don't see from the
backup and apparently
because nobody is measuring
it, whew is the value of
this \$300,000?

What are we getting for the
money in the sense of people
better prepared for jobs,
people more likely to get
jobs, people who are going
to get better jobs, people
who are more likely to
graduate in high school or
what.

And I'm not sure it is
necessary to measure that

value in the context of this individual contract.

There may be other ways of measuring the value of services like those provided by skillpoint alliance to people like those that are going to be providing the service to.

But I would like to know in advance of making decisions of this kind what are we going to get for \$300,000?

What's the best guess for this kind of services this

[09:40:00]

kind of clientele can provide, this kind of effects on job prospects, on income downstream and so on.

If there is a way of getting that kind of here's the benefit we're going to get for this cost conclusion, i would like to be able to make the decision based on that basis.

I have another case that's a sim case.

Item 39, a contract to big austin to provide training to certified any crow enterprises.

Is that a good deal or not?

It depends what it is those micro enterprises can do

with that training and technical assistance.

And again, if we had a way of measuring the effects of this particular contract with this particular contractor and the training and technical assistance has been providing in the past to my tomicro enterprises, that would be best but might be expensive and painful.

It might be as good if we could rely on national studies done or studies done of other contractors providing similar services to similar micro enterprises.

To verify our -- some other number downstream as a result of information and things they can do with it.

So again, counting the number of micro enterprises firms we're going to provide assistance to is a good start, but I would like to go the the next step and say as a result of that here's what we're going to get downstream.

And the contrast is with item number 31, I believe it is.

Pardon me, it's -- hang on.

[09:42:06]

I lost it.

Where is it?

Item 26.

Where we're approving negotiation and execution of an agreement with foundation communities for \$200,000 a year.

26.

To provide case management, mental health and supportive services to homeless individuals.

This is unwith of those contracts which could be the same way, just count the number of individuals we're going to be providing stuff to and there's a lot of accounts here.

But the difference between 26 and the other two, 24 and 39, we've got an outcome measure.

We're measuring the number of unduplicated adult residents who will be provided a service, that's similar, measuring the amount of activity, but we also have a sense from previous experience that of those 72, 90% of them are going to stay in housing over that two-year period because of the services provided.

Now, the only thing missing here is what percentage would stay in housing if we didn't provide services and I assume it would be a lot less than 90%.

That's something I suspect [inaudible].

That may be true for all of this stuff.

But at least here I've got a sense for the outcome.

90% Of these people are going to stay in housing, i bet a lot fewer would stay in we didn't spend the \$200,000 to keep them that way.

The other two cases, I'm not sure what I'm getting from money.

I'd like to know.

Thank you.

>> Cole: Mayor?

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
Mayor pro tem cole.

>> Cole: I see burt lumbreras here.

I notice that we have a number of items on the agenda related to the homelessness community and we've had a lot of discussions and issues this week with the homeless

community and the question of whether and what we are doing to address those needs, so I wanted to ask

[09:44:00]

you about a couple of these items just for clarification.

The first one, which councilmember spelman has already brought up, is number 26 for foundation communities.

Can you basically tell us what this organization does?

>> Burt lumbreras, assistant city manager over community services.

Foundation communities is an excellent partner in terms of homeless services.

They actually have a proven track record of being able to house and support with wrap-around services homeless individuals, and as councilmember spelman noted, they -- they actually have a pretty good performance measures that we have tracked in the past and we certainly believe can accomplish that because of their good history.

Everything from promoting and fostering self-sufficiency, developing healthy behaviors and

lifestyles among the targeted populations, which is very key and very integral to our homeless service providers in terms of what they do.

Because it's not just a matter of recycling the individuals through the system, but being able to get them to a point where they can be self-sustaining and get into situations like permanent supportive housing which is council has been very supportive.

This goes directly in line with our targeted 350 units of permanent affordable housing that we are aggressively moving towards and trying to achieve.

Foundation communities is an excellent partner.

>> Cole: One other question.

I know that they actually work -- I thought we had some specific data on the number of beds that -- maybe that was [inaudible].

But when it talks about providing case management, i know that the council has

[09:46:00]

made it a commitment to try to move people to self-sufficiency and not

just move them around
geographically.

When we talk about providing
case management, what does
that mean?

>> Case management is really
the piece of the wrap-around
services that are needed for
individuals.

Not just the unit itself,
placing them in safe, stable
housing, but also case
management to be able to
identify what their
priorities and issues are
whether it's health related,
mental, whether it's, you
know, just counseling,
whatever the case may be is
just being able to provide
the support that they need
and specifically target the
issues that we need to work
with them on and being able
to have them live a
productive life.

The number that you were
probably looking for is that
the new program would
provide support services to
clients in 16 new units
through these projects.

That's what the
foundation --

>> Cole: Was there 100
overnight shelters?

I thought I saw that
somewhere.

That's okay.

We'll find it.

Let me move on to, I think it was item 29, when we talk about providing certain public health services to Travis County in exchange for \$2 million.

>> Travis County has been a key partner in health and human services.

Actually in two areas, health and human services and also in the area of animal services.

So you have two items here before you, one of those is on the public health, health and human services site and the other one on the animal services.

But the actual work that city staff will be providing in terms of public health would be everything from outreach and prevention, immunizations, disease surveillance, vital records, chronic disease

[09:48:01]

prevention, tuberculosis elimination and environmental health services.

Then we also do all of the work in terms of the inspections through our

environmental inspectors or restaurant and food places.

And in the animal services side, we actually provide animal services, animal control responses to calls as per the county, and so those are two long-standing agreements we've had.

This is the first time we've separated the agreements.

In the past it's been one major interlocal, but we have an accident partnership with the c.

>> Cole: I think it's important to note to address this problem with the homeless population.

The last one I want to ask you about is the facility we operate, item 31, for the a for a total contract not to exceed \$2,200,000.

I think there is discussion about what happens at the arch and a lot of reaction is to the people who are outside waiting for services of the arch.

Can you briefly give an overview of that?

>> Sure.

In respect to the services that we provide, obviously it's more of an emergency shelter where folks come in

through a lottery system and we pick up to about 210 individuals on a nightly basis.

And, you know, part of them being able to stay there is we focus on their individual needs with flexible case management, try to steer them towards safe housing needs that they have.

Obviously it's an overwhelming number of individuals and it's a big problem.

The other piece in terms of the folks that you see outside, that facility also

[09:50:00]

serves as to what we refer to as a day resource center.

So an individual that may not be necessarily housed there that evening gets an opportunity to go in, wash their clothes, use a telephone, use a computer, and in effect just use that facility for that purpose and then they are back out on the street.

It's certainly incumbent on the city and I think there's a lot of focus from the council and I know the city manager is very, very supportive of looking at what changes we can do to refocus going towards what

we all have agreed is a good model and that is the miami model of looking at how we can change the course of how we provide our services.

And instead of having individuals just check in one night and out on the street, how we can gear our facility and our services more towards the permanent supportive housing and keep them in safe, stable housing with the case management.

In effect this contract is really just continuing to do what we're doing as we're working through the model and I believe great progress has been made from that respect.

>> If I could just add to that a little bit, during the day the facilities, and they are open to men, women and kid so you have all of those individuals in throughout the day and it's in the latter part of the day that they conduct the lottery for purposes of having a place to sleep, you know, to sleep through the night.

And in addition to the things burt said, some of them get their mail services taken care of at the arch as well.

Those things aside, and, of course, it's a place where folks just hang out.

So while you see people hanging out on the front part of the building, the street side of the building, they also hang out on the back side.

There's a covered parking structure back there that is not entirely used for parking, just a small bit of it is.

The rest of the space is just an area where, you know, folks are able to hang out and spend their time in

[09:52:01]

the course of the day.

Typically there are tables and chairs that are back there so it's idle time and they hang out back there.

>> Cole: I want to say that the council for a number of years, ever since I've been on it including a lot of work by councilmember martinez and councilmember riley and -- well, just every single councilmember practically has done work to address -- councilmember morrison to address this issue.

It's certainly not a situation this council is

not aware of and not trying to address, and a number of us have been to san antonio and phoenix and now miami to try to determine best practices.

And I know that was done in the past and some of the decisions were made about where to locate social service providers and that now the conversation is coming up again and it is a good conversation to be having and the question is first and foremost, in my opinion, what can we do to reduce the homeless population.

And that's the one that we are tackling and we are actually having experts from miami come to town in october to talk to us at a town hall meeting, and that is actually going to happen at the lbj school and we're going to do that in conjunction with the lbj school, and the effort is to try to broaden the discussion to have more of a public policy discussion and to recognize that it is not just a downtown problem but a citywide problem and also a public policy issue that is bigger than just the city of austin.

For burt, help me with the dates of that.

>> Mayor pro tem, I don't have the dates in front of me.

I would be happy to get that for you.

>> I think that it is
00 to
00 at the lbj school, but
there will be -- that is
exactly right.

[09:54:00]

It's october 22nd from
00 at the lbj
school and we will post that
so all the councilmembers
are welcome to attend.

And we will have a moderator
from lieder ship austin to
actually conduct that town
hall meeting and it will be
highly publicized and I hope
that is recognized that is
one of the many steps the
city is going to to try to
address this issue.

And also today we are going
on an austin tour,
councilmember tovo and
councilmember riley and i
and that was councilmember
riley's idea and I'll let
him explain because that was
not my idea but it was very
going.

>> Riley: If I may, mayor.

We've talked about visiting
other cities to identify
best practices and we've

done some of that and had a lot of very healthy discussion about where we should be going in terms of the model for addressing the needs of the homeless.

But what we haven't done is really done a comprehensive tour of facilities in austin and we have a fairly robust array of services serving the needs of homeless folks and formerly homeless folks and folks who are at risk of homelessness.

And so I think it would be very helpful for us all to get refreshed and educated about -- about exactly what services we're providing now.

There's a lot of excitement around the country about changing the model for addressing the needs of the homeless.

And in order to do that, we really have to have a firm grasp of what our existing model is, how are we doing, what are we doing and how could we adjust that model in keeping with trends, best practices around the country so that we can really advance the ball on meeting the homeless.

We cannot just continue with the same old business of

[09:56:01]

trying to keep up with the homeless issue that we've been doing for many years now.

We have got to seek new answers to try new practices that are being demonstrated very well around the country.

And in order -- and I think it would be very helpful to see what's out there now in order take talk about exactly what ways the model could shift.

And really at the center of all this is permanent supportive housing.

And that is a fairly complicated -- I mean its root is very simple.

Get people in housing and meet their needs.

But in practice it can be very challenging because of providing a whole array of services to a population with all kinds of different needs on an ongoing basis can be very difficult.

We're talking about combining different funding streams and having a whole bunch of different folks work together cooperatively on an ongoing basis over multiple years and I know that's challenging for staff, it's challenging for

all of us to do that and really requires a coordinated effort on the part of service providers, nonprofits involved in housing and all sorts of folks out in the community who are interested in this.

I really applaud the mayor pro tem for helping lead the discussion to bring all those folks together to keep the conversation going because other folks in the community have been doing the same thing.

A number of us attended a forum this weekend, we actually called a city council meeting because we had a quorum of council at a conference on homelessness right here this weekend.

We've got a very positive discussion going and I think this tour is going to be a great way of keeping the conversation going and helping us understand

[09:58:00]

exactly what needs to change in order for us to make significant progress on homelessness.

>> Cole: Mayor, I also wanted to recognize councilmember spelman, who helped with former mayor of atlanta shirley franklin, who has been recruited or

actively recruited to come to lbj school, I think that's final now, to work extensively on this issue.

And that's one of the reasons we're going to be able to have the event at the lbj school.

I wanted to ask you councilmember tovo or councilmember morrison who talk about -- I don't care, either one.

Councilmember tovo, you have worked with the womens and children's shelter.

>> Tovo: Sure, I'll say a few things.

I want to apologize for being late.

I had an unavoidable medical appointment.

If anyone has questions about the resolution, i think my co-sponsors did a fine job responding to the mayor's concerns.

On the topic you have asked about --

>> Mayor Leffingwell: I'm not too sure about that.

>> Tovo: I'm happy to continue the discussion if need be.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Go ahead.

[One moment, please, for change in captioners]
.. really have been trying to address the increasing number of women, women and children in our emergency shelters downtown and elsewhere and it is a situation that really needs immediate attention, some churches, some members of the faith community have gotten together and have a safe sleep for women program going on.

The short-term solution, but there needs to be a longer term one, too.

So I think that's -- you know, we -- I think it was great that we were able to respond to that request.

But adding some additional money into the bond proposal.

Councilmember morrison, maybe you want to add.

>> Morrison: I would just like to note the -- we need to be addressing the whole spectrum of housing needs, we are working with triage with the homeless folks, the immediate triage of making sure they have a place to sleep that night.

Making sure that they can get into housing.

But again the next level is making sure that people can stay in housing, for instance with our home repair program that's so effective.

And so for me I think that it's just important that we keep in mind the -- that we need to address the whole -- the problem holistically and I think that we have the opportunity to do that.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Any other items to be addressed?

Councilmember riley?

>> Riley: A couple of items.

Actually, again, I would like to -- like my colleagues, I did not pull these out in advance, but I would like to ask some questions about the airport parking item, number 14.

If there's any way we can get some information on that.

And I know our aviation staff -- if it's not -- if we don't have all of that information I can just ask staff later, if that would be staff's preference.

I could submit written questions.

This item would -- would authorize execution of a construction contract in the amount -- contract amount not to exceed about 7 million, for a new employee parking lot at -- at the austin-bergstrom airport.

So I just wanted to get some -- one question would be this calls for 1,750 new paid parking spaces.

And I'm just -- trying to figure out what's driving that.

Are we about to get a huge influx of new employees?

Where are those employees parking now, what's prompting this need?

>> Sue edwards, assistant city manager.

Councilmember, I can answer part of that.

I can get you the rest of it later.

Parking out at -- at the airport is -- is full -- most of the time now.

In fact, if you go out there, sometimes if you're in the -- either in the morning or late in the

afternoon, you're walking to the very last parking space at the very -- very back of the parking.

Number one, parking is extremely short at this point because of the influx of -- of passengers that we've had.

Which is a good thing on the one hand.

So in order for us to provide that parking for the passengers, we need to build another parking space for the employees.

And this is not all city employees, I think we only have about 300 some odd city employees at the airport.

But this also is parking spaces for those individuals that have the restaurants staff and some other staff that are there.

>> And I've asked about employees because the agenda item says that this is a construction contract for the abia new employee parking lot project.

>> That's correct.

That's -- what we're doing is we're taking the employees who are parking now where passengers park and moving them to an

employee parking lot so we can provide additional parking for the passengers.

Ful.

>> Riley: That new parking lot will have 1,758 parking spaces.

And I guess I'm just not following if we only have -- well, will those 1750 be used by employees?

>> They are for employees -- in addition to the employees that are city employees, you have individuals who are working on contract out there, you have individuals who are running the restaurants out there, you are having -- there are individuals, there are all sorts of individuals that work at the airport and that's over a thousand individuals who actually every day work at the airport.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Don't forget all.

Pilots and -- all of the pilots and flight attendants who live in austin and commute to other cities.

A subject I'm well familiar with.

>> That's what that is for, so we can really free up

about a thousand spaces for the public.

>> Riley: Okay.

With respect to the employee parking, have we given the fact that we're often full at the airport, the parking -- although i noticed the photo in the backup that we received shows about, the satellite photo showing about half the parking full.

But there's at least sometimes when it's not full.

I don't know when that was taken.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Kind of like those capital metro trains, councilmember.

>> Riley: Right, they are only full sometimes, that's true.

So -- have we undertaken any kind of parking cash out programs or other efforts to encourage employees to consider alternative transportation to the airport?

>> That's a question that i did ask jim smith but i haven't gotten a response yet.

I will find out.

>> Seems like it would be a good opportunity.

Any time -- if the parking for the employees is close to the parking for the others, it's all part -- when we look at the map, it looks like a great big surface parking lot.

Conceptually, if an employee chooses to take some alternative means to get to work one day, one more space could be made available to the public, that has a value, that is a value to the airport and the employee could share in that value.

So the point is for a lower cost than building a huge expensive new parking facility, we could be encouraging alternative transportation and making existing spaces available to the traveling public.

So that's -- I just want to make sure that we've -- that we've fully explored those opportunities there at the airport.

Then I also have to ask one other question, I remember a couple of years ago, when we had an item related to paving of this parking lot.

I think at least part of the parking lots out there were getting a new surface.

We talked about the fact, seems like at the time we talked about this being the largest parking lot in the city and possibly in central texas.

At the time, the -- i thought that I remembered the airport talking about a vision of moving towards structured parking in the future.

I just wanted to see if that is accurate and if that is still part of the vision for long-term future at the airport.

>> It is still part of the vision.

>> Riley: Here we're now moving outside the -- the oval where all of the surface parking is, where the acres of surface parking is.

Instead of going up there, we're moving outside of that and putting in a new surface parking lot adjacent to it.

There are plenty of other surfaces nearby where we could keep doing that, keep expanding.

But if the vision is to move move toward structured parking, when would that happen?

>> I would have to get back with you on that one.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: I would just like to make two comments on the parking.

Number one, all of that money comes from revenue generated by the airport and can't be spent anyplace else.

It has to be spent on the airport.

Number two, in terms of parking, it's a major revenue generator from the airport.

They use that revenue along with landing fees, gate fees, franchise fees, to provide the service for the airlines that of course is a big revenue generator for the entire community.

So it's not -- again, that revenue comes from the people who use the airport.

Not from the taxpayers.

Councilmember morrison?

Before I -- mayor pro tem I'm going to turn it over to you.

I have a delegation upstairs that I have to talk to.

>> Cole: Not from hays county.

[Laughter]
just kidding.

I.

>> Morrison: I just wanted to mention that we recently approved a master plan for the airport.

So I think it would be interesting to go back to that master plan and see, frankly I can't remember exactly what it said about parking and when we're going to be turning over to more structured parking, but I think that's a good question, a good piece of information to get on the table.

I would like to mention that most of those people that are paying those parking fees are actually Austin taxpayers.

Many of them anyways, because they live in the city of Austin.

>> Cole: Any other comments?

>> Morrison: I have a couple of other topics.

I just wanted to mention two topics that I wanted to talk about.

I don't know which staff are here at this point.

I wanted to have a discussion about -- about item no. 140, hid global.

And then 46 and 47, which is about the tract and proposed amendments to an agreement we have.

I will let you choose --

>> the fact is they are not here.

They are not here because they weren't pulled in advance.

>> Cole: Councilmember martinez.

>> Martinez: I have another item.

I saw rob spiller earlier.

He's not here.

I have a transportation item that I want to ask a couple of brief questions about.

I apologize, I did not pull this one either, I was trying to get to it while rob was in the room, he slipped out.

>> What number was that?

>> Item 74, the low-speed vehicle ordinance.

>> Mayor pro tem, if you are waiting for an item we can

take up right now, I've got one.

>> Coming in the door.

>> Never mind.

>> Hey, rob.

Appreciate you coming back in.

Just wanted to get -- just kind of a brief explanation on -- on item 74, which is the proposed ordinance that comes in subsequent to the pilot program that we've had running.

So where are we headed now with the low-speed vehicles and how did all of the -- all of the issues of safety and manufacturing safety components of vehicles, how did all of that work out and are we now fully moving forward to a franchise agreement or is it just an ordinance that would allow an operator to use electrical low-speed vehicles in a certain area of downtown?

>> A little bit short on breath, I apologize, robert spiller, department of transportation.

The recommendation is based on the pilot, the pilot i will tell you was somewhat inconclusive, but give us information enough I guess

institutional courage to recommend that we make it permanent.

That we move forward with a plan that is consistent with the pilot to have fixed route service on a basically a franchise, not a franchise but a licensing approach that would allow operators to come in and contract for specific or get licensed for specific routes to move forward.

Utc heard the overview of this item and had suggested that there was a -- there was requests from the current operator to allow deviations from that route.

The fixed route, utc was -- was comfortable with that, but staff remains concerned that we don't have enough experience yet with fixed route to contemplate deviation from fixed route at this point.

We really need a little bit more experience in terms of enforcement and management.

Of those fixed route services before we would be comfortable trying to manage a route that might deviate by several blocks from the fixed route.

Verification is a big issue for us, it is making sure that we have staff to be

able to verify that the operator is performing according to the agreement.

So this -- this proposal would be to -- to move from a pilot environment to a permanent allowing electric low low-speed vehicles which means council that I think we have satisfied given the limited service that the safety of the vehicles is reasonable.

>> Martinez: So when we talk about the license agreement, has staff made a determination to limit the number of license agreements or can anyone approach the city to be a part of that fixed route service?

>> You know, councilmember, I would rather come back to you with an answer to that, off the top of my head, i would risk giving you wrong information one way or the other.

But I believe there is contemplation, you know, that you would license by route, so that we would try to -- to have some reasonable number of opportunities to be associated with an operator.

I know that we've had interest expressed bring several of the taxi franchises to add this to their concepts, similar from

the other organizations that run, whether they be peddy cab or other -- pedicab or other similar services.

>> The reason that I'm asking, rob, is would you have specifically been working with one company in particular who has had a substantial interest in this service.

And we've asked this company to comply with all kinds of different requirements as it relates to safety, as it relates to routing, as it relates to hours of operation.

You know, how you operate.

And I want to make sure that what we're doing is not now just opening the door for anyone and everyone to come in with a golf cart and start driving around on these routes and picking folks up when we've made this one company go through several years of figuring out what works best for austin and now we're moving forward with this ordinance that appears to have relaxed a lot of the safety regulations that were once being required of the pilot program participants.

>> That is not my understanding of the way the ordinance -- we would expect anyone operating to meet the

safety requirements as identified for vehicles and so forth unless there's a safety item that we found is no longer sort of useful.

But my understanding is that, no, we would require the same level of safety issues from anyone that would provide that service.

>> Martinez: Okay.

If you could just follow up before thursday on if staff has determined a fixed number of franchise agreements, not franchise, license agreements, or whether or not it's open to other potential requesters for license agreements.

>> Yes, sir.

Of course, one of the this i think so that we would also be looking for as operators perform is how they've performed in the previous, you know, experience to make sure that they are performing according to the requirements just like we do with taxicabs or pedicab.

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> Tovo: I have a few follow-up questions.

I apologize, I missed the first half of your question,

but the ordinance does limit it to three franchises.

>> Thank you.

>> Tovo: Sure.

I did have some questions, i had heard there was some concerns from the operator about some of the safety features, that they're having some difficulty with them.

I think one had to do with the hinged doors that are specified in g 2.

Another was I believe the 3 point harnesses.

I assume that you've heard and think we need these proper advices, I wonder if today or thursday you could talk about why -- just acknowledge that you have heard --

>> certainly we've heard those concerns from the very beginning, we believe those are safety issues that are very important.

We know that there have been incidents prior to the pilot where people were not secured in the vehicles and have not stayed in the vehicles, hinged doors prevent people from just jumping on on the street or at least dissuade people from stepping on when the

vehicle is moving and also keeps people in the vehicles when they go around the corners.

Same thing with the three-point constraints.

Our research tells us there are technologies or manufacturers that supply those compatible devices.

In fact we defined these -- we do find these vehicles to be consistent with what's available on the market.

We've heard concerns about before market or after market devices and we've tried to be pragmatic about making sure that even if it's an after market device, that, you know, we can and he bide by that, as long as -- abide by that as long as it meets the safety requirements.

>> Tovo: Great.

I assume you are still in contact with the particular company that has the franchise now, I guess they were having issues with their doors falling off?

Do I have that right, chris?

>> I understanding is that we continue to be in communication and we observe the operations to be sure

whether or not they are
abiding by the ordinance.

Yeah, we are happy to work
with operators to meet the
requirements, but as I said,
it's my understanding that
devices that meet those
requirements are available
on the market.

>> Tovo: Thank you.

>> Cole: Councilmember
thomas.

>> Morrison: Thank you,
rob, could you elaborate a
little bit.

You mentioned the issue
about whether or not the
operator would be allowed to
deviate from the route.

You said utc was supportive
of that, but you felt that
it wasn't -- it was too
early to allow that or if
you could just elaborate?

>> Thank you.

One of the concepts of the
pilot came from a -- the
monday report on that type
of service.

Or on taxi services and the
suggestion was, you know,
given this is new for the
city, what the
recommendation was is to try
fixed out sort of excuse me
low speed electric vehicle
services, gain some

experience with that, and then move to -- to a separate pilot to do maybe some deviated routes up to a couple of blocks.

You know, given that it's a new service, councilmember, I think there was learning on both the operating's side as well as the enforcement crews as to what was part of the pilot or what was not part of the pilot.

It's our belief that we're comfortable as a staff carrying out council's wishes with regards to fixed route service and are interested in doing a future pilot.

But my staff from the street tell me that they really need more experience of managing this type of service, which is different than taxi service, different than -- than pedicab service for a bit longer before we would be comfortable moving forward with the pilot.

So it could be our recommendation, staff recommendation to enact fixed route and consider implementing a pilot within the next year.

>> Morrison: For deviation.

>> Yeah.

>> Morrison: So the idea is that adding the element of deviate from the fixed out is significantly more complicated --

>> it increases the area coverage that our enforcement officers need to monitor the service.

It increases the complexity of -- of where that deviation is occurring and is that an appropriate deviation from the service, it also increases the potential, potential conflict between low speed electric vehicle service and regular taxi service as well as pedicab service.

So again we believe that -- that given the dynamics, it would be better to stay with fixed route as part of the underlying and then do a pilot with deviations.

>> Okay.

Do you have a sense for when we might -- how that pilot might come about?

Will you be -- will staff be coming back to us or working through utc in a little while --

>> yes, I would offer that as the route to do that.

Recommendation so to speak.

Sorry.

And we would -- you know, i think that the focus of the first part of the year would be to bring the system into full-time operation and get the additional operators on board.

Then after -- you know, demands seem to level, then we would look to do a pilot for deviations.

>> Morrison: Great, thank you.

>> Cole: My other questions, thank you, mr.

Spiller.

City manager, is your staff here ready to talk about councilmember morrison's item 140?

Councilmember morrison are you ready?

>> We have staff here.

>> Morrison: Does the city attorney have --

>> Cole: Hid global corporation.

>> Morrison: Thank you for being here.

This is item no. 140.

It's an economic development
380 agreement with hid
global.

When we had our discussion,
I guess two weeks ago or a
week and a half ago, there
were a few items that were
suggested both by myself and
mayor pro tem cole.

And I know that the
applicant was going to be
going back and talking with
their folks about those
issues and I wonder if you
have a report, can give us
an update on where things
might be on that --

>> certainly, certainly.

Brian [indiscernible],
economic development
manager.

We shared those amendments
with the company.

They are reviewing them with
legal.

They have one question
related osha requirements
and whether there's a
difference in city osha
requirements versus federal
osha requirements, so we're
working with them on that.

They do have some proposed
language, but we are really
ironing out the details of
that in order to bring that
back.

As you know, when we have one of these agreements they go to council as presented.

So the company can accept or reject the amendments and move forward that way.

But what they are looking at are the details of a couple of those amendments so that they are comfortable with the language, then we would bring those back with any modifications or move forward as presented depending on what the company wants to do going forward.

>> Morrison: And since we're poised to take action on this I guess on thursday, my question is do you have a sense for how the company -- what their sense of whether they are going to be comfortable with what was suggested.

>> They are looking at all of them at this point in time.

They haven't given us a go ahead with all of them as presented.

We're going to work through that with them.

Actually one of their representatives got in town yesterday afternoon.

It's my hope to sit down with him and really iron out those details and present whatever response they have to council in advance of thursday's meeting.

>> Morrison: That would be today or tomorrow?

>> Correct.

>> Morrison: Good.

Because I think if we can get some time to think about what their response is before we have to take the time to -- to actually take the stuff to vote on it, that would be very important.

>> Yes, that's our intent.

>> Morrison: And one other issue that's certainly been highlighted and I think if anyone read the newspaper today and got to the editorial page you would have seen an editorial about the county's consideration of requirements, because they are also looking at -- at an economic development agreement with hid global and the discussion there is about whether there will be a requirement to higher a certain percentage of travis county residents.

I'm curious about, we have a lot of discussion going on about standards for economic

development agreements and our special committee, we still have work to do on that, that's certainly a topic that we'll be talking about because I think it's very worthy of discussion.

Do you have any sense for where -- where hid global is in terms of looking at requirements for hiring locally, whatever that means and --

>> are you referring to where they are in discussions with the county?

>> Morrison: Yeah.

>> I know that they are planning to meet with them and the goal is to iron out out a term sheet, if you will.

That agreement would incorporate whatever those terms are that they all agreed to.

I do not know where they are in terms of being agreeable to hiring requirements or what those hiring requirements may look like based on where the county is in their discussion.

So I don't have that detailed information.

>>> Can you reminds me where they are going to be located, pretty near nor the

northern border of the city
of austin?

>> The tech ridge
development which is
northeast area.

>> Morrison: Okay.

Right, because when I think
about where that draw will
be, as a draw for an
employee population, it
looks like the idea that
some folks would be coming
from out of austin and
probably going to be a
reality, if they are coming
from the north.

But I'm very much on board
with ensuring that we have
some assurance that there
will be folks from at least
travis county that are a
certain percentage that are
going to be employed by
them.

>> We ask that question in
the business information
form.

They look at the
demographics when they start
looking at where they will
be hiring from.

Their anticipation is 89%
would be hired locally.

You know, the main thing
that we look at as well,
whenever we do our financial
modeling, we base our -- our
commuting patterns based on

what our city demographer indicated is the general percentage, so whenever we model, for example, the number of jobs that will be created locally and the financial impact of that, we discount that by 40% to reflect actual commuting patterns.

So we do take into account that there may be individuals from other areas from outside the city, if you will, hired.

But in this case, you know, they are looking at that area, they are looking at the availability of public transit for their location.

So they don't have an actual definition in terms of percentage that they will hire but they do have an anticipated percentage of 89%.

>> 9% Locally in a -- 9% locally what -- 89%, what does that mean, central texas.

>> The austin region, if you will.

That being said as i mentioned we do look at what traditionally the number of employees living within the city of austin limits would be.

>> Morrison: Thank you.

>> Cole: Questions
councilmember morrison or.

>> Martinez:.

>> Martinez: I know we get
confused every week
[laughter]

>> Cole: At least I didn't
say tovo.

>> Martinez: I think what
councilmember morrison is
saying is what we talk about
in our subcommittee and it
certainly has value.

One of the reasons that i
brought this to the
subcommittee as a subject is
because of what we're going
through right now.

It is I'll just say at worst
frustrating, at best just --
just laborious to sit here
and go until the 11th hour
to determine what exactly
this agreement is going to
look like.

That's what my goal in the
subcommittee is to try to
avoid that.

So -- so we call these
economic incentives.

I really want us to create a
policy out of the
subcommittee that is truly
an incentive to achieving
the goals.

Whatever those goals are and values are.

So if -- if 80% local hires is a value, then -- then hid or whoever comes in seeking that tax abatement is incentivized to achieve that number.

If they don't, it doesn't mean that the entire tax abatement goes away.

It just means that commensurate to our values as a council, they may not get 100% abatement.

That to me is incentive based.

This is not -- you know, my goal is not to have a cut and dry answer because each company, each business is different.

And I believe you have to have that flexibility to allow those businesses to be successful and operate successfully.

But I do think we can impart some values as a council that become codified in the policy that say we believe in -- in prevailing wage for construction jobs, with he believe in a living wage for permit jobs, we believe in local hires to a certain value of that tax abatement.

So the company knows I can get 100% taxes abated if I need all of these values over the life of this, but have to continue to meet these values each and every year.

Not a forgone conclusion day one that for the next 10 years we're going to forgo taxes.

But as you meet those incentives, you continue to earn that investment from the city of Austin.

That is what I'm trying to avoid with this economic subcommittee that we run into each and every time we get a proposal before us because I think it's frustrating, and for this council to -- to sit here 48 hours before this agreement is going to go before the public, we still don't have these answers.

And I just -- I want to say that -- that's again, that is exactly why I've put the work forward in asking my colleagues to join me on this economic subcommittee.

I'm all for economic development.

I'm all for 380 agreements.

I just don't like being held hostage at the 11th hour for questions that we should

be able to answer before
it's even posted on our
agenda.

>> Councilmember, sue
edwards, assistant city
manager.

We appreciate that very
much.

It is as frustrating for us
as it is for you as a
council.

I think over time as we have
recognized that the values
in the community have
changed and the policy
itself has not changed and
so it would be -- it would
behoove us, we would be most
appreciative, when -- when
that discussion occurs and
we finally come up with a
policy, because it is -- as
brian indicated a company
will wait until the last
minute looking at things,
talking it over.

Whereas if they knew those
were the specific
requirements that we were
asked in the first place, it
would come to you as a
package and we appreciate
your putting together that
committee.

Thank you.

>> Councilmember martinez, i
wanted to ask you a question
about that committee because
when we talk about --

about -- when you talked about values, our values being -- being reflected in the ultimate document that comes before that committee, I would like your thoughts on the best way to -- putting aside this particular agreement where we want the disadvantaged worker being considered to bring an item before the committee, we don't all sit of the committee, we certainly want that input and focused attention on that issue.

>> Anything that -- any other councilmember who is not on the committee that would like for us to discuss, feel free to shoot that to one of our offices and we'll put it on the agenda.

We do have one meeting coming up that I think the agenda is already set, but there's definitely time for more discussions if other issues aren't addressed that the council would like to have addressed before we make a recommendation to the full body.

>> Cole: My other questions.

>> Mayor pro tem?

>> Councilmember Riley?

>> I just wanted to ask --
do we have time certain?

>> Cole: I'm sure that we
could get one, I don't
believe that one has been
set.

>> I believe it's part of
00 public hearings,
but on thursday you can set
something other than that,
you can give the public
notice that you are going to
consider that today.

But it's just part of the
00 public hearings right
now.

>> And if I could just add
one reason that I asked
is -- is -- is talking with
some folks who are
interest -- the taxicab
issue which is item 72.

They would like a time
certain on that one.

And -- and their preference
would be -- that those two
items be considered sometime
around the same time.

Because they both -- they
both involve wages for low
income workers and there's a
lot of folks interested in
both items.

So -- so -- so time certain
is always -- their
schedules -- their schedules
[indiscernible] it would be
useful for them.

>> Cole: I see no reason
we cannot set this item 72
00

time certain, but I will
definitely pass that on to
the mayor.

>> Councilmember morrison.

>> I just wanted to ask
councilmember riley, do you
have a sense for what would
be an optimal time certain
to set.

>> Actually, I'm not -- i
could check on that.

It's either four or six
would work.

Should we say the 4:00.

Would you all prefer that.

I don't think that --

>> Cole: Councilmember
spelman had a comment.

>> I haven't heard a strong
preference between those
two.

>> Spelman: If we set it
00 he probably would
not be able to take it up
00 because
of proclamations.

If you want to take it up
before proclamations.

Perhaps we could take up the
30, that
would give us sufficient

time to take care of that
before all of our public
hearings would start.

This will be the first public
hearing --

>> that sounds good to me.

30 For the taxicabs and
00 for the -- for the
other public hearings
starting with the
incentives.

>> Spelman: Either that or
realistically we would have
00, I
suspect people would
probably prefer the earlier
time.

>> Cole: Well, hold on.

Councilmember Tovo had a
comment on this.

>> Tovo: I think we've
resolved it.

I had a similar conversation
we talked about a 6:00 time.

There may be some advantage
to people who have daytime
jobs, but I take your point
that we never really start
at 6:00 anyway.

I think that solution is a
pretty good one to have the
cab driver, taxicab permit
issue at 3:30.

>> Morrison: The only
thing that I wanted to add,

I'm not sure how heavy our zoning agenda is.

And so I'm not sure if we'll 30, I just would want people to know that.

And, sue, do you know where we are --

>> it's not that heavy.

I think you have three discussion items is what it is.

>> Mayor pro tem let me correct this particular agenda doesn't seem to list the normal times, but that's been the council's practice is to take up public hearings at 4:00.

So I think on thursday you can set them for any time.

I don't see a time on there.

I think we're about to reach consensus on item 72 for 3:30 and item 140 to 4:00.

We will pass that on to the mayor's office.

Okay.

Any other questions?

>> Spelman: Different subject?

>> Cole: Yes, a different subject, thank you.

>> Spelman: A very quick question not for city staff, but my colleagues on item 91.

That would appeal an ordinance we passed on april 26th of this year.

Regarding the electronic filing of campaign finance and lobbying.

Why are we repealing that ordinance?

>> Well, I would like to note that we have also item 8, this is related to 89, which is we have an error on the agenda, that's actually sponsored by myself and councilmember riley.

And not councilmember tovo.

Who likes to stay as far away as she came from things technical.

>> I think staff just made an assumption [laughter]

>> Morrison: So here's the deal.

When we passed that ordinance awhile back, it was to take action and in response to the charter review committees recommendation that we have an electronic campaign database.

We got -- that ordinance said to the staff, go forward and make this happen.

Subsequent to that our city clerk did quite a bit of work with ctm and folks around the state actually and came up with -- with some cost estimates.

It looked like perhaps we might be looking at perhaps 800,000, to implement this.

We've had some good discussions with folks in the community and other folks that were on the review committee looking at what the real priorities were.

We actually have our working group on open government through our commission and there was some robust discussion about there might be some other ways, actually, to do this so that we don't have to spend \$800,000, so what we are doing with these two items, first of all, we would repeal that first ordinance 89 says let's go about it a little bit differently.

Let's investigate all of these different opportunities that we have before we make a final decision.

And one of the opportunities is in fact there is probably all of us on the council are familiar with the state campaign finance system that allows you to enter data, it actually creates quite a few of the pages of the report that we have to submit.

So there was an item considered at the lege that would have made that system available to all municipalities that would have meant that we could take that -- part of what we are doing in 89 is endorsing that idea and asking that we make that part of our legislative session.

The bottom line we have to look at different opportunities for implementing this recommendation from the charter review committee and we want to hold options open a little bit until we see what happens at the legislative session.

One exciting thing, okay exciting to me is that the code for america responded a hack athlon on the 8th of sent.

One of the groups at the hackathon was looking at creating a system for developing this.

So that's -- this campaign finance database and so we

already have a start from a sort of civically developed one.

That's one of the paths that we want to continue to follow.

>> Spelman: So this is not a change in the overall to give us time and breathing room to come up with a cheaper and easier means of accomplishing the same thing.

>> That is a much shorter way of saying what I have just said.

You have accomplished the same thing.

>> Spelman: That was probably the first -- thank you very much, mayor pro tem.

[Multiple voices] I was about to make fun of myself, but now I don't need to because you have already done it for me.

>> Cole: This is true.

I have a quick question for councilmember tovo on item no. 85.

Ful I noticed that you and -- I noticed that you and councilmember morrison and riley are asking for a coast and feasibility of our

online resources that have to do with our bond.

I know there's no staff here but I'm wondering if you could tell us brief what is online now and what you are trying to improve so that the public knows that since we are currently considering or having a bond election.

>> Tovo: Sure, thanks for asking that question.

This is a recommendation that came from our bond election advisory task force, they made a list of policy recommendations and this was it is first one that we make available to the public.

A very user friendly database that would show how the moneys are being spent, where they are being spent, what the projects associated with our bond proposals are as we go forward.

So this is actually an item that when we contacted staff, they have already begun working on.

Just such a database.

So this is -- this is a resolution to affirm the importance of that and say, you know, we fully support moving forward and getting some estimates on how much

it would cost to create that database.

And I would need the staff to really fill in what's available on line.

Certainly we do have information of what's on line about past bond proposals and the kinds of projects that have benefit generated from them.

But I think the task force's interest was in really creating again a very user friendly database that the public could at any point see this much of the project was completed, these funds have been allocated to it.

It has been in my part of town or in the northern parts of town, really get a geographic that we can all be aware of.

Not just -- just how widely dispersed the bonds program has been and in real-time.

>> Cole: I certainly appreciate this item.

I do want to make sure that our current bond proposal is online and that brochure is accessible.

>> Tovo: Actually, I see trimble, maybe I'll invite him up to talk a little bit about that.

But yes this would sort of be for the future.

trimble, did you hear the questions?

>> No, I didn't.

I was running over here.

>> I will turn it over to the mayor pro tem.

>> Cole: 85
that is asking for a feasible and online resources that provide information about our general obligation bonds.

What I wanted to be clear about is what is actually online about our bonds now.

Especially the ones that are up for -- for consideration by the voters on november 6th.

>> Right.

So we do have a lot of information that's online right now.

We have our bond brochure that's up, so we have all of that information available and you can click on the propositions and learn more about those and the projects that are included in those, but we also have all of the information that was used to get to that point.

So we have all of our information when council was looking at this, when the task force was looking at this, we have the task force final report, we have some of the other resources that were available through the process.

So people can actually go back and look at, you know, resources, kind of where we started with the needs assessment, kind of work all the way through.

So all of that information is available still online.

>> Cole: Thank you.

Any other comments, questions?

Councilmember Riley.

>> Riley: Just a quick point on item 75, that's the item about the -- establishing a parking benefit district in the university neighborhood overlay district.

I'm excited about that item.

It is the first parking benefit district that we -- that we will have here in this city and that follows on a lot of work by community stakeholders, developing the suggested terms for a parking benefit district.

There are a couple of points on which the university area partners would -- would have liked to see something.

A little bit different from what's on the table now.

And I think there's good reasons for -- for sticking with what's on the table now.

But I suggested that we revisit the issues and -- in a year just to see how the district is working out.

And -- and consider whether we ought to make any change with respect to those points.

I wanted to give you a heads up.

The two points related to the division of revenue, whether we go with a 70/30 split of gross revenue or some other split.

We are going with the recommendation that the -- the split net revenue based on the recommendations of the stakeholder working group that worked for about a year developing a proposed revenue split.

Then the other issue relates to the allegation of meters -- allocation of meters between the city and the district.

There's already 35 meters covered by the parking benefit district, the question is whether those should be considered part of the parking benefit district.

The staff feels for now that would create problems if we did put it in, but they are open to revisiting the issue after the district has been in place for a year.

Anyway, I wanted to point that on everyone's radar screen and that we approve this with the direction to staff asking that they take a look at the district after a year to just check in and see how it's going and to consider whether any adjustments need to be made with respect to the two issues that I have mentioned.

>> Cole: Okay.

Councilmember morrison?

Are we ready to go on --

>> Cole: You have the floor.

>> Morrison: I have seen guernsey has made his way over the bridge through the woods or whatever.

I wanted to talk about items 46 and 47, the friesenhahn

guernsey
if you can talk about what
this is about.

In the year 2,000 there was
a tract of land owned by the
friesenhahn family located
south of barton creek mall,
southwest corner of loop 360
and mopac.

It was a tract of land that
was the only tract that was
left that the city was
trying to acquire between
loop 360 and a point further
up along 360 and kind of
would stick out as a sore
thumb if the property was
developed with the already
approved site plan for a
multi-story office and
parking garage.

It was approximately 60
acres in size.

And at the time we had a
great desire, overwhelming
desire, to purchase this
tract to basically make that
land complete as far as the
undeveloped tract.

bill walters
basically an option to
purchase the land at the
time.

The city had a standards,
standards that costs
about \$6 million.

There's an estimate by the
walters, i
think it's about \$10 million

and at the end, when everything was said and done, council approved spending over \$6 million -- on the purchase of the tract, in addition -- in addition allowing -- allowing a tract of lands, i think it was called technology park, to have a certain allotment of impervious cover, I think it was 150,000 square feet of impervious cover would be allocated so it would allow this tract that was over the recharge zone, in the barton springs zone to be developed and then to bank about 185,000 square feet of impervious cover that could be used anywhere in the desired development zone, by walters for a period of up to about 2015.

He could use it -- they could use it themselves, they could convey it to another party.

There was an agreement that was signed and the agreement basically spoke of just what I said.

It was not specific with regard to the type of impervious cover.

Because in austin we had two types of impervious cover, we had watershed impervious cover, water quality and drainage issues and then we have zoning impervious

cover, which is probably looking more of open space, light and air, provided to tracts.

There was an ordinance that was passed about that same time as the agreement was finalized.

Perhaps shortly before that agreement was signed, that spoke specifically of limiting the impervious cover to -- to watershed impervious cover.

Time passes.

walters does sell off about 25,000 square feet of impervious cover.

For the construction of a multi-family project in northwest austin.

He makes an attempt in 2005 or 2006 to utilize some of it for a development along lake austin boulevard that the city ultimately rejects because it was -- had to do with zoning impervious cover.

It's been up to about 2009.

The one stop shop, mr.

Walters approached me, asked again about zoning impervious cover for -- for a single family developer on the southside of town in the desired development zone and

see if we could get I think
an 8% increase on some lots.

After much discussion of --
over that, also discussion
about the conveyance, we
came to the same conclusion
I think that was concluded
by my predecessors in
'05-'06 that it can't really
be transferred through
zoning.

It's not an easy way to do
that.

>> Morrison: Can i
interrupt you one second for
explain the difference
watershed and zoning and
impervious cover because
sometimes one is less than
the other.

And --

>> yes, very much so.

Watershed impervious cover,
as I said before, is really
dealing with water quality
and drainage type of issues.

In many parts of the city,
particularly in the western
parts of the city, it's
usually more restrictive
than zoning.

If someone wants to develop
a tract of land and the
watershed impervious cover
is 80%, suburban watershed,
predominantly, in the city,
in the eastern side of town,
I'm developing a tract

that's zoned gr, which is a very common retail type of zone in the city, that's 90% impervious cover.

If I'm building a retail project, I would only be able to develop at 80%.

The lesser of the two.

The total reverse occurs when you are over the barton springs zone.

I might have gr zoning located at the y in oak hill, I could do 90% but watershed whopping 15%, so I could maybe only develop maybe 15% under current code under watershed regulations, for the particular agreement that was made between the walters, again that would only apply to the desired development zone.

Although the urban core of the city is in the desired development zone, the urban core does not regulate impervious cover.

We only rely on zoning impervious cover for -- so for the vast majority of the city's core, from maybe ben white going up to about 183, maybe mopac going over towards east austin towards 183 ed bluestein, a vast amount of that area is not subject to watershed impervious cover.

So there would be no ability
for mr. walters to use that.

For the parcels that are in
this city, that have higher
zoning impervious cover, he
could exercise the transfer
of watershed impervious
cover to those tracts.

That may be zoned gr at 90%
or cs or cs 1 which are 95%
impervious cover.

And transfer impervious
cover to those tracts.

Of there's -- there's many
of those tracts are railroad
developed, though,
because -- are already
developed, though, because
they are closer in.

is an area
that stretches from 620-183
fanning out clockwise all
the way down to maybe --
almost to manchaca road, all
within the desired
development zone.

he could seek
to increase from 65% to 80%
in the suburban, for
instance, he could utilize
it there.

walters approached
me, I think he was concerned
that he wouldn't be able to
exercise the use of all of
these impervious covers
because there's a time
limit.

To the year 2015 in order
for him to utilize these
credits.

He had only used 25,000.

And he still had I think
approximately about 150 left
to use.

He explained to me that
there was a concern that he
had that -- that when he
signed the agreement he was
looking at impervious cover
more generally than maybe
what the ordinance was
approved for originally.

Which limited only watershed
impervious cover rather than
zoning impervious cover.

There might be -- he was
looking for a solution to
remedy that that might be
acceptable to the city and
to himself.

With regards to that.

After a long discussion with
him, there's not many
options available, this was
an item brought to city
council, any item would have
to come back before you if
there was any modification
to the agreement.

The only suggestion would be
to look at the value of what
that impervious cover is.

I spoke with real estate
services, discussed the

matter with them, we came back to looking at probably a combination of fee waivers and also -- also a cash value of the impervious cover.

There was -- there was certainly a disagreement between bill and ourselves with regards to what that value is.

But we came to an agreement primarily what you have seen before you which is what the staff is bringing forward as a recommendation.

There's a hint that certainly if we do not come to an agreement, there may be -- may be other legal walters will resue.

With that I will -- pursue.

I know we discussed this in executive session, if you would like to go into more detail we can go back in the real estate matter into executive session.

>> Morrison: Thank you for that.

I know that it's not necessarily a simple item.

In terms of the proposed agreement that we're looking at, it's [indiscernible] cash that would come out of our stabilization reserve

fund, then also \$500,000 in credits.

887,000 And then 500,000 in fee credits.

Could you clarify that's credits for development fees and it's my understanding that that's for development anywhere, including over the aquifer, is that correct?

>> That's my understanding as well.

However it is not including parkland dedication fees.

These are only development fees that would not include capital recovery fees is your only development fees that relate back to basically the -- the development process.

So it would be site plan fees, building permit, electrical, plumbing and mechanical related fees.

Associated review fees and it also increases the amount of time to 2017 for two additional years.

So that would be basically about five years to recoup that over time.

>> Morrison: Okay.

Just for folks that are interested, the backup or

the new ordinance could be a little bit complicated to read because it's just amending specifically amends very specific words and so it's important just for folks that might be interesting to go back to the original ordinance and read it within that.

So -- so I have some concerns about this.

I'm trying to understand, you know, what real benefit it would be to the city to renegotiate this deal.

I understand it would be a benefit to mr. walters.

Do you have any comment on that?

>> I think that I would discuss it in executive session if you would like to discuss it matter.

>> Morrison: All right.

I do want to mention, one of the flags for me is that we're talking about \$887,000 in cash out of our budget stabilization reserve and having just been through the budget process and the two days that the council spent discussing what really is a very small proportion of our multi billion dollar budget, a lot of it was about budget stabilization reserve and what was appropriate for use

of budget stabilization and where we were going to be ending up with all of that.

I just want to note to my colleagues I feel a special sensitivity to funding that may or may not be available through that particular budget fund, having just struggled through the great needs that we have in this city and -- for support with cash.

So -- so I would, if anyone is interested in sharing their thoughts on the matter, I'm struggling over this one and I think that it's -- it's one that we need to pay some attention to.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
So -- so this is -- what is proposed on this agenda is a result of a mediation process; is that correct?

>> There was -- there was a suggestion by the city manager to -- to consult an outside attorney regarding this matter.

We have done so.

The only thing that maybe has been modified, the staff recommendation is that there was a release clause that has been placed into the ordinance, releasing the walters

from future claims regarding
this matter and --

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Is
that a yes or a no,
mediation process?

[Multiple voices]

>> mayor, there wasn't a
formal mediation.

The lawyer talked to mr.

Walters separately I believe
from the city so it was not
a formal mediation, no.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: But
an agreement?

An agreement with counsel
for the city?

>> I think I would
characterize it more with a
consultation with the
outside attorney.

Both parties were present
when we were discussing.

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Is
the agreement recommended by
the staff?

>> It's a recommended by
staff, yes.

>> Mayor Leffingwell:
Okay.

[One moment please for
change in captioners]

.

in terms of the watershed -- I mean the urban core has always -- well --

>> the urban core is not changed as far as the impervious cover.

There may have been times since 2000 they modified the impervious coverage situation.

We will consult with watershed about what the particular changes are since 2000.

But generally, no, there has not been substantial changes, I believe to the watershed regulations.

so the map -- in other words, the map where those impervious cover credits where walters could use the impervious cover credits has not changed since the time he executed that agreement with the city?

>> The map that's on the viewer right now, the area in green is the drinking water protection zone.

That would not be available for transfer.

The area that is in gray is the urban core, which cannot be used for transfer, because there is not an impervious cover of the water.

That is the dark gray in the center.

The area that is kind of a light peach color, you see reds and some oranges and some purples, those are tracts of land that are within the city limits where there is a possibility of impervious cover being transferred, specifically the ones in reds and purples and oranges, those are tracts worth zoning.

It is higher impervious level cover and impervious cover and would not need a change for that.

And the lighter is the e t.j.

, where he could use those for himself.

>> The entire right size is eligible for use.

That is a fairly good swath of land.

>> That land, which is closer to the city, the availability of utilities, roadway, infrastructure, those things are part of the development process.

It may be a little more difficult for him to try to market in the gray areas than closer to the city where the utilities and roadway structures are existing.

I didn't understand that from the map we looked at in executive session that all of the light gray is a possibility.

In terms of the map that we are looking at this, it is hard to see on this --

>> I'm sorry.

that would be great, it would be useful to have it added to the backup.

The areas where he could use his credits are the light gray area, the red and the purple?

Am I understanding that properly?

>> Right.

And the light peach area, but he may need a zoning change to increase the impervious cover and utilize that.

Because in that case, the impervious cover may be higher than the watershed.

back to my question, how much of this map existed during the time where he executed the agreement with the city?

>> When the agreement was probably executed the city limits were probably slightly smaller.

In 2000, beyond that, there hasn't been probably a substantial change, except for those fluctuation zoning where you may have zoned things since 2000.

The structure, usually when somebody does a zoning change, they don't usually sit on a tract of land that long, they usually pursue development of those.

Within the city, probably not much change.

only the areas annexed since 2000.

>> The area where to use the impervious cover credits, hasn't gotten smaller it has actually gotten larger because he annexed in the e.t.j.

He has more opportunity to use the credits than at the time of the agreement being executed.

>> As far as land area, that's correct.

so you have addressed this question before, but i don't fully understand the answer yet.

When the -- well -- mayor, did you want --

no, as you know, we had an extensive executive session on this, a lot of these things could be better discussed and responded to in executive session.

Because this is -- the entire thing is a legal issue.

Not that we're deciding to give mr. walter something.

The question is a possible legal action.

as I said, I'm happy --
I think perhaps we do need to discuss this further in executive session today or thursday.

The point I'm making, that in terms of the value of the impervious credit he has more land to use than he did in the time of the execution of the agreement.

It is my understandhe had legal representation with him at the time?

>> He did have legal question.

I have more legal questions.

In answer to your question councilmember morrison, I have questions about reexecuting an agreement that has been negotiated.

>>Mayor leffingwell:
Councilmember morrison.

I understand we had extensive conversation about this in executive session.

I want to make sure as much information as is possible is available for the public to understand what we're considering.

>>Mayor leffingwell:
Councilmember tovo.

I asked for other documents to have as backup.

Because -- I think I made that request -- it is difficult to follow the amended language that is in the backup, if you are a member of the public.

>> I will double-check.

If not there, I will put in a couple of the original ordinance and the agreement.

thanks, greg, i
grenther,
rather.

so are you
requesting an executive session
at the meeting on thursday?

I think if you want to pursue these kinds of questions that can only be answered in the context of local advice, we need to preface for that.

I'm happy to add it, but ultimately as a policy issue, i hope we will have members of the public that are deeply familiar with the case, come down, tell us their opinion, too.

It is a policy matter, as far as I'm concerned to renegotiate an agreement that was struck by this city and to use taxpayer dollars to buy out something that I believe he has a fair market value.

He entered into an agreement.

not quite
that simple.

There is a disagreement.

I understand that,
mayor.

that's what
we can't discuss here.

I'm not sure that we
can't because he's alluded to it
already.

If you would like to discuss it
further in executive session, we
can.

Ultimately, it is a policy
matter to use taxpayer dollars
and waived fees to provide these
two a developer.

I'm afraid
without the total context, the
questioning can be misleading,
if the questions can't be
answered in a legal context and
they're just hanging out there
as legitimate questions that you
just can't respond to.

>>Tovo: ok.

At this point, we don't have any
questions hanging out there, but
it probably would be useful to
have a discussion.

well,
questions that are raised by the
discussion.

>> We will prepare executive
session.

I'm not sure the attorney who conducted it is here today.

So we will prepare for thursday.

any other
items for discussion?

I have a couple of quick
ones, mayor.

Just a quick comment about
.. i.f.c.

83.

This was an item that I brought
forward with councilmember
martinez and councilmember.

.

-- Councilmember spelman.

I wanted to say, you will see
the fiscal note is in the range
of I believe, \$3,000.

I want to make the point that
about 80 of that are actual hard
costs that need to be expended
for that one day sherret.

That is supplies and fd.

The rest is the cost of
employees.

I've gone back and forth with
that -- I'm certain -- I want
the exact amount.

I want my colleagues to be aware
that it wouldn't cost the city
\$3,000 than we wouldn't have

otherwise spent, it will be about \$80.

The \$3,000 plus reflected there are the cost represented by salaried employees that will receive their salary whether or not we do the one-day charret.

>> We were looking at this before, when we look into having channel 6 -- I forget what it was.

On a saturday, channel 6.

When we got the fiscal note, the vast majority of it was cost for salaried employees to be there.

I think it would be helpful in the future -- I mean, i certainly think that it is appropriate to recognize that it will be hours that our salaried employees will have to commit.

I think it is appropriate to separate those two different categories of cost -- two different categories of cost when it comes to the fiscal note because it affects our budget in a different way.

When we have salaried employees work on saturday, just like when councilmembers work on saturday, that doesn't change how much take-home or gross pay we get that week.

It stays the same.

That does not hit our budget actually.

That would be a request of staff to look at the possibility of dividing those two lines out in the future.

>>Mayor leffingwell:
Councilmember morrison?

and actually three items from the office of real estate services about the rainy street, the rainy street property that there is a proposal to sell.

The city's property and there was some discussion before.

It is interesting we now have three different options on the table, and there was discussion about whether some of the sales to the new owner would involve parking spaces or not.

And now it looks like we have three options, one where it is pure cash.

One where there is the original number of parking spaces in the deal, 30.

And one where there are 20.

I don't think we necessarily have somebody from real estate, but I do see -- I wanted to ask staff to sort of layout those different options, how the figures were calculated that in-between figure of \$400,000 or 20 spaces and then I have a question, I see the director of parks is here, too.

She might be able to help us get some context.

>> City manager, I believe councilmember, that those figures were derived from the 1 million that was the cost of the property itself.

So there was a tradeoff in terms of the cost of the parking space at \$30,000 a space.

>> Ok.

I see.

That was arithmetic, as we say?

Ok.

Great.

I oncer if mr. lumbers.

This had to do with providing spaces for parks and rec facilities in the area and i wonder if you could give us a brief overview of your thoughts on that but what are your thoughts if we move forward on the long range plan.

>> Director of parks and recreation.

Two things we did, as we renegotiated, it was clear and expressed to council in the final meeting of the renegotiate of moving forward about the lack of parking for them and the fact that they had discussions with the -- the mexican american cultural center.

I was at that meeting about trying to share parking.

At that time, the chair of the board and the board decided they did not want to enter into the agreement with the austin rowing club for parking.

I was asked by the mexican american cultural board would i look into buying the property, which is the little piece there which is where the trailer sits, to put parking on.

Which I then followed to do some due diligence in looking at would it be a viable option to purchase?

What would be the cost?

What kind of parking could I put on that?

Would it work for transportation.

And I met with others to talk about the feasibility of the city purchasing that through pacreation or would there be another option, which is before you today.

I was doing my work based on the mexican american cultural centerboard that center board that asked me to buy the land --

>> when you say buy, you mean buy it from --

>> from public works.

>> I would end up buying it from one city department to the next.

>> Right.

>> It didn't make sense feasibly to do that that is when the idea came that I thought was creative, to look at a partnership as the rfp to look for parking there.

To look at the long-term plan or study as council asked us to look at when negotiating with austin rowing club, can you look at alternative parking ways to address the issue for parking at the boat club -- rowing club.

One was work for one-year negotiation agreement for convention center parking for staff.

That is one year only and will end unless we renegotiate that.

It has not been as big of a plus as they anticipated because it is a little further away.

In the meantime, we looked at the memo of the logistics of the existing lot there, further up on the entrance, not right there by the boat house, it is four spaces if you change the direction of parking, you can do 10 instead of four.

No new asphalt, just changing the direction of the parking.

As related to the study, the study says pointed out by

councilmember riley, they don't believe there is an enormous amount of parking for at least five years.

However, at the end of the five years, there will be a need per parking based on what they're anticipating.

They did mention, in the study, which is critical, that there were times when there were events and other activities going on that were in conflict where the lot was overflowing and there was no parking available.

That is where I started looking at sort of a mid range effort, that is when I said, wait a minute, let's look at the lot that may go out and be purchased.

That was really it.

Looking at alternative ways.

Since then, we have been able to be successful in restructuring the small area.

Of course, this was another option, of course.

The other option as I think you received a resolution from the mexican american cultural center board asking that we move forward in metering the lot and they would like to have, after paying off the meters and the cost associated with running the meters, that money would go back

to the book, the actual center for the payment of some staffing issues related to monitoring the area, picking up the parking area as well.

The other thing we're looking at is putting in a gate, which we are working on now, that we would close at night, after the event or after the evening hours, so that we don't have that problem of people coming in, who live in the area, parking there and staying overnight and they're still there in the morning when we are trying to conduct business.

When and if meters do go in, the discussion is centered around that it would be open to people who would pay for parking and then short of those who were attending the center would be authorized, stamped for not having to pay.

But that is where we are.

At this point, the resolution has come forward, I believe to council, but there has been no action on that.

>> Um, do you know if staff's going to have a recommendation about the metering of the mac?

>> Our recommendation is that we meter that lot, absolutely.

>> And that would solve the problem for the boathouse then?

>> If we meter that lot, it will help with parking, but -- what it will be is open to anyone, allow for anyone to park there.

Which means anyone attending the businesses on rainy street, the growing businesses that are handing there along rainy street will be able to use that lot and pay for parking.

The good news is there is parking.

The bad news is it will be open for anyone to use and it won't be just for what we had to do was put staff out there with we knew we were having major events and close it.

Do we have any assessment of the parking needs for the boathouse on an hourly basis?

Certainly, it is my understanding there are a lot of early-risers that get out and row and using it in the morning, that wouldn't be a conflict.

Perhaps, I can certainly see, especially on the weekend when folks are coming down, because we are broadening the use of the boathouse, although a lot of people arrive by foot.

There is a lot to work together there to see whether the meters would be available to serve the boathouse.

>> This is true.

The numbers do show that the
is a very popular
time.

Later on in the morning is a
popular time.

Afternoon and evenings are
popular.

Weekends are packed.

I had a visit last week to the
boathouse and the expectation
that we had hoped is true.

They're becoming overwhelmed
with use.

They have a lot of people that
are foot traffic and bicycles,
which I requested after my visit
for my bike racks to be placed
to accommodate that so we are
encouraging people not to drive.

Obviously we want them to walk.

There will be a trail there once
the tunnel is completed maybe
they can park somewhere else and
walk.

This was an effort to try to
bridge short term, medium and
hopefully long-time, we will
have to address at the concern
of the mexican american cultural
center board, I will say, there
is a growing program base there.

The problems are good.

People want to come.

We're encouraging now, with the good grace of the budget with the programming staff, this means more programs and more people.

That is our concerns, we will have more cars and people attending in this area than we will have spaces, while we want to encourage them to walk and ride bikes and car pool, I'm worried we'll be right back to where we were in several meetings I had to attend, which is trying to basically say we have to block that lot off and not let anyone else park there, which is really hard when it is a public facility.

>> Right, if we have meters, will we be able to block it off at certain times to users of the facility?

>> For events such as some of the major special events we have.

We will have to do that and monitor it.

There is just no other way.

But for every day-to-day type of service for programming and any other activity, we will have to really watch it and see as the events go on, during spring break, the regattas that go on with the other businesses, entities, colleges, universities that are coming down.

I mean, I'm working right now just to provide spaces for storage of the shelves because there is not enough room there at the site.

So we're seeing a huge increase of use, but not -- yet, we're going to have to wait and see, i think.

>> Um, ok.

One question, you were talking about the parks department really didn't have the funds to buy the piece of property.

Because -- so we're looking at one of the options is we know that the value, the appraised 1 million and one of the options is to have the buyer pay \$100,000 and offer the spaces.

In that case, does the parks department have to cost off the extra million dollars?

>> No, not that I know of.

>> There is a million dollars that is not there anymore.

>> I haven't been told that.

I hope not.

>> I don't know why that would be any different than buying it outright for 1.1 million.

I think maybe my colleague councilmember riley has something to add.

just a quick comment on the hearing aspect.

I'm assuming it is to be -- it will be meters for everybody, but if you have business at the , you can get your parking charge stamped, you wouldn't have to pay for it.

I'm assuming that also means if you are parking there and using the rowing center, you would have to pay.

>> That's correct.

>> Yeah, just to provide a little more context to this.

There are times when parking is in short supply around the m.a.c.

Even if we went full-bore on this site and went 30-space option.

That would not solve the parking issue on rainy street.

Last year, according to the rainy street study completed in july, there were megaevents generating a need for 500 spaces or more that occurred on nine days over the past year.

So -- the report goes into the various ways of addressing that, which typically involves things like shuttle -- satellite lots, shuttle services providing access into it and out.

We will still need to do that sort of thing, even if we go with the 30 spaces.

The real question is, what do we do for the more routine vacation, and there is a general routine usage of facility, both on rainy street, the boathouse and at the m.a.c.

For that purpose, I believe making use of the surface parking that is currently offers a reasonable way to move forward, that works out well for everybody.

board has passed a resolution as mentioned, supporting a parking benefit which would involve installing meters and having some portion of the revenue support activities at the m.a.c.

Long-term there are other options for structured parking, on those sites where you currently see the surface parking.

That has always been a part of the long-term vision for the m.a.c.

The rainy street parking study i mentioned went over some of the options.

If you look at the numbers within that report, it is interesting to see because they have a number of options for --

well, five, typically, as to how you could expand the parking capacity there at the m.a.c.

The two highest end options are two structured parking garages, either above ground or below ground.

Above ground is \$30,500 per space.

Below ground -- having an underground parking facility at site was costed at \$35,000 a space.

The cadillac option is over \$35,000 a space.

Looking at the options before us on thursday's agenda, if we just do nothing about parking, we get 2 million into the general fund.

1.2 Into the general fund.

That is item 42.

Item 41, would go for 30 spaces, that would reduce the sales price down to \$100,000.

1 million in general fund revenue in order to support the creation of 30 parking spaces.

That comes out to \$36,667 a space, which is more expensive than the cadillac version.

It would be cheaper on a per space basis to do an underground parking facility at the m.a.c.

Site which is part of the vision
than to go with
that option.

Item 43, which is dropped it
down to 20 spaces, that turns
out to be more expensive.

That means we're foregoing
\$800,000 of general fund
revenue, to get 20 spaces and
that is \$40,000 per space.

That is the most parking option
considered for the m.a.c. site.

This is a very expensive way of
addressing parking needs.

It does it by putting parking on
rainy street, where we have all
kinds of goals about bringing
life and vitality to the street.

Generally putting a big parking
garage on rainy street is not
the way to bring vitality.

Nobody will come down to a site
just to park there.

There has to be something there.

, if we
did something on the m.a.c.

Site, even if it is short term
use of the surface parking, it
is more convenient for the users
of boathouse because it is
closer.

It is consistent with the short
and long-term plans and it helps
create revenue.

I think it makes more sense to make use of the current parking and look to weather we can address additional parking needs through long-term plans for structured parking at the m.a.c. center.

>> Mayor?

mayor, I wanted to add that this site is within the wallow creek tip.

So the redevelopment that a developer is considering will help the finances, but the sale of this property, because we actually own it, is public land, and that money will actually go to the general fund.

So this is a time where we're looking at the drawings for the wallow creek and considering a lot of wallow creek items, but this is an item for wally creek that is land to respect redevelop the tif but go to the general fund in the tune of \$1.2 million on item 42.

>> Mayor pro tem, one thing i did want to correct.

If I understand you councilmember correctly, you were calculating the cost of the parking based on the \$1.2 million?

2 million was offered simply because they would not have to do parking.

So they would not pay that
\$1.2 million on item 4 or 43.

So you calculate it on
\$1 million.

So what I'm saying is the
original offer and the offer
that is for 43, which is the 20
parking spaces is based on a
million dollars and not 1.2.

They would not give us
\$1.2 million.

I wanted to make that --

>>riley: if I may.

If we wanted for item 42, we get
\$1.2 million.

>> Yes, sir.

if we go instead with
item 41, we get \$100,000.

Which is approximately
1 million less than
\$1.2 million.

>> I understand what you are
saying.

that means we are
1 million in
revenue, in order to secure 30
parking spaces.

So if we really want to
calculate the cost of the spaces
1 number
because that is the amount that
we are actually foregoing in
order to secure the spaces.

Same thing on item 43.

We forego \$800,000.

In order to secure 20 spaces,
which to me working out to
\$40,000 a space.

>> I don't disagree with you on
your calculation.

I wanted to make sure the
parking spaces were \$30,000
apiece.

I was not saying -- I wasn't
calculating that as a -- let me
back up.

You're correct in that, that
2 million without parking is
1.2 million.

I was saying that parking spaces
only cost \$30,000.

I wasn't translating them into
money.

>> Right, and we're paying a
far-greater cost than that if we
go for either of the two
options.

ok, thank you
councilmember riley.

Councilmember spelman.

I thought it was cost
somewhat less of \$30,000 a
space.

The numbers up until recently
was \$15,000 or \$20,000 a space
has the price gone up?

>> It has happened in the last 24 months, in working with green and sea home.

The parking spaces have become very expensive.

the cost of concrete or rebar gone up.

>> That is not my area of expertise.

The professionals say it could be up to \$40,000 a parking space.

Is astronomical.

it is more than twice my expectation.

So I'm a little behind the times, I look forward to finding out why later on on thank you.

any other questions, comments?

Without okz, this meeting of the austin city council is adjourned without objection.