

Council Work Session - 10/9/2012

to call

this meeting to order.

Mayor leffingwell will not

[09:08:00]

be here today, he is

traveling on business, and

councilmember mike martinez

will not be here either.

And I understand

councilmember spelman may

have to leave to testify at

the legislature for a

subcommittee and so if it's

okay with everyone -- and

councilmember tovo has to

leave early so it's going to

be a short session.

What time do you have to
leave?

[Inaudible]

>> Cole: 11:15.

First I'm going to ask
councilmember spelman if he
has anything immediately he
wants to pull.

We have not been submitted
any items but it's been our
custom to consider items
recognizing we will have
limited staff available to
answer questions.

The middle button turns the
mic on.

>> Spelman: There you go.

You just have to push it
harder.

I have a question for
councilmember riley, if i
might.

And I'm not sure which
agenda item, if any, this
pertains to, although i
heard her tell that it
pertains to the city cab
item which I cannot come up
with right now.

Okay.

Pardon me while I lean over
in the most uncomfortable
possible way to make this

new technology work for me.

I have a question on item

69.

[Inaudible] probably wrong

the last few weeks.

Anybody from the

[09:10:01]

transportation department?

Transportation issue.

We can hold on it until

somebody is around to answer

the question.

>> Cole: We'll see if we

can get anyone from the
transportation department to
answer a question about item
69.

Is there any other item?

Councilmember Spelman.

>> Spelman: I actually
have a question on number
67.

And it is at least fairly
conceivable that a member of
the cap metro board who is
with city council can answer
the question and if not I'll
hold off until later.

The question, Chris, is of
the \$4 million that will be
spent on urban rail

planning, how will that be
broken down -- how will that
money be spent?

I understand as we leave the
campo meeting, two big
pieces, one is service
development planning, which
comes at the end.

One of them is [inaudible]
which comes at the
beginning.

I wonder how this \$4 million
is likely to be broken down
between preferred
alternative and --

>> Riley: I think we
better get [inaudible].

I'm not sure.

>> Spelman: Okay.

I'll pass, mayor pro tem

MAYOR PRO TEM.>> Cole: Do you have
questions about item 14
first?

>> Tovo: Yes, I do.

If my microphone is on.

>> It's on.

>> Tovo: Yeah, I want to

[09:12:00]

be clear on, first of all,
what we're being asked to do
here.

>> We forwarded a memo to council last week.

Due to the fact [inaudible] state comptroller one week prior to council action at the council meeting, we need to make that payment and i think [inaudible] memo stating that there was an indication about not making that payment.

So in essence we forwarded payment last week [inaudible].

What you are doing is ratifying the payment.

The \$81,000 request be paid -- paid into the state

[inaudible] fund which in
this case the state matches
[inaudible] of that amount
for the total amount in
which the city actually gets
full payment of the amount
they put in.

But we did not make that
payment last week.

[Inaudible]

>> Tovo: Thanks.

I'll have to refer to that
memo because it must have
come in and I must have
overlooked it.

But I have I guess a couple
other questions.

For one thing, it looks as if the agreement was actually entered into last may, and I wondered if you could give me some sense of how often -- I mean, when we were considering this for formula one, it was the subject of a council decision.

So I'm wondering what the -- what the precedent is for the city entering into an agreement regarding requesting the state set up an events trust fund without

[09:14:01]

council authorization.

>> Well, I have a couple of
my colleagues here
[inaudible] you have a major
events fund and the major
event trust fund is
designated mainly for super
bowl, those type of events.

>> Tovo: I understand it a
smaller fund, but it still
is a contract the city
entered into last may and i
guess I'm wondering -- well,
let's start with maybe some
background.

Has the city entered into
this kind of contract in the
past without council
authorization?

>> Yes, but none as relates

to [inaudible].

The other day how many
total, we have about 25
agreements since the
inception of the 2008.

Of that amount none has
exceeded -- I think two have
exceeded the council
authority [inaudible].

I think one of the
challenges is when the
initial estimate by the
economic impact analysis is
completed by the state, that
number is 60 to 80 thousand
dollars.

That is just an estimate.

After the conclusion of the

event, you have about 30 or 60 days to evaluate whether the assumptions were realized.

And I think the timetable that we're talking about in July, I think it was a portion of the month after that event they go through a process to make sure all the criteria is met, whether or not the functions were realized, and if they were not, there's potential that the amount could go below the original assumption.

[Inaudible] talk about the history, but typically the numbers have not exceeded

[09:16:00]

the [inaudible].

>> Tovo: I guess I can get
some more data on that
through the q and a process,
but in the other case where
they had exceeded the
manager's authority, were
those brought to council for
approval before the request
was sent to the state?

>> I can check that.

>> Tovo: Okay.

Thanks.

>> My understanding

[inaudible]

>> Tovo: So back in may
when the assistant city
manager was requesting that
the state set up this major
events trust fund, wasn't
there -- isn't it necessary
to kick off that process by
getting an estimate as far
as working with the state to
get an estimate?

I've forgotten the exact
process, but it seems to me
there would have been good
evidence or some basis for
assuming that it would --
had the potential to exceed
the \$50,000 manager level.

>> Well, I think in the memo
we provided council, we
provided details that shared

that the process actually
started in december of 2011.

In january there was
correspondence with the
state [inaudible].

At that time there's an
indication that the
assumption of potential
revenue would be about
\$81,000.

There is an agreement
between the city, the state,
as well as the event
organizer I believe in may,
the actual event occurred in
july.

But as I stated previously,
there is a post-event
process that goes to try to

make sure that all the
criteria is met and whether
or not the assumptions
originally were realized.

And in this case it could
result because we never in
this case really have ever
exceeded the manager's
authority, it could have
gone below that amount, but
in essence that was the
process that we followed
traditionally.

>> Tovo: I guess, I mean

[09:18:00]

if I'm following the details
of what you've said, it

sounds like last fall or by
january you had an estimate
of 81,000.

Aen so I take your point and
I understand the process is
that after the event you
look at the receipts and
whatnot and determine the
accuracy of that original
amount.

But I guess when it looked
like -- when you had an
estimate that looked like it
was going to exceed the
manager -- the manager's
estimate, why wasn't this
brought to council last
spring?

>> Well, at this point i
wasn't [inaudible] of that

area, ma'am, and the acm at that time is no longer a city employee.

As I stated earlier, I know there are a number of processes that working with acvb, it could have been, one of the things that we're doing going forth looking at this process [inaudible] we're looking at including in the joiner agreement more specificity as it relates to the amount, which hasn't been the case the previous times and my hope is by doing that we have due diligence in ensuring these type of situations don't occur.

>> Tovo: And I understand

the amount is a whole lot
less than the formula one.

There's still clearly a lot
of public interest in this
and I think it is not
advisable for it to be an
administrative decision.

I think it needs to come to
council for action.

>> The fact that --

>> Cole: The city manager.

>> [Inaudible] should have
come, I don't know why it
was -- the acm authorized
it.

Only more recently found out
about those occasions.

In both instances it should
have come to council.

>> Tovo: Thanks.

[09:20:00]

>> Cole: I have a simple
question related to the same
thing.

I don't think we've ever
used the major events trust
fund, but has there ever
been something that was
passed through at that level
that did not come to
council?

>> The only time we used the

major events fund was f 1
and that came to council.

And in essence no payment
was disbursed from city
funds related to that, but
[inaudible].

>>> Julie hart with austin
convention and visitors
bureau.

We have not used the major
events trust fund
[inaudible].

State statute is very
specific about what events
are included in the major
event trust fund and
[inaudible] super bowl, ncaa
final four and so obviously
before f1 none of those were

held in austin.

From our perspective we have
used the events trust fund
very successfully to bring
about 25 events to austin
that would not have been
here otherwise.

The criteria it has to be an
event that could go outside
the state of texas in a
competitive bidding process.

In this specific incidence,
this has been learning
experience with the amount
of this.

Most of our trust funds have
been much smaller amounts so
it's opened our eyes to the
need for a new process and

we're very eager to work
with the city to make sure
it's a process that works
with everybody.

It has been a very good fund
for all of us.

The city is always
reimbursed fully and has
allowed us to get really
high profile events.

Matthew can give you
more details on that.

>> Spelman: The amount of
this looks like \$82,000, and
the threshold it has to come
to council, is that 50,000?

[09:22:02]

>> [Inaudible]

>> Spelman: Five.

Okay.

Presumably at the time when
the agreement was entered
into, the expectation was
our -- the amount we would
have to pay out was less
than \$55,000.

Is that accurate?

>> Correct.

>> Spelman: You said a
moment ago sometimes it's
higher, sometimes it's
lower, you have to prove out

the assumptions.

>> Right.

>> Spelman: How much up
and down does it eventually
prove out to be on average?

>> Matthew has the history
on this since he's been in
charge of that process.

He might be able to
[inaudible].

>> Good morning, matthew
payne, austin sports
commission.

I think there's been a lot
of jump really from what the
previous estimate was.

I think when we had a number
of a certain amount, we felt
like we might be able to
contribute to that fund on
top of this as the city
amount and that was
something that we just were
kind of assuming.

And I think that window of
time after the event where
you are trying to evaluate a
little bit, trying to figure
out if the client, the event
organizers has their ducks
in a row, the time kind of
slips a little bit.

But as far as history goes,
that estimate is pretty on
target.

I believe only two or three

times where it's
underperformed and you maybe
need to go back and do a
revision.

Something we've been
proactive on going back to
the state saying this didn't
perform the way we thought.

>> Spelman: Slipping
through evening the changes
operating procedures.

If our new procedure states
if our estimate is amount
the city is going to be out
is over \$55,000 and comes
back to council, I suspect
that's a logical operating
procedure.

Seems what was followed in

this case, the difference it
turned out to be
spectacularly good event, a

[09:24:00]

lot more people showed up
and therefore our chair of
[inaudible] considerably
higher.

If that happens, even if it
doesn't happen very often,
it's going to happen in the
future and I suggest that
maybe it would be good for
you all to cover yourselves
even if your expectation is
less than 55,000, if the
expectation is over 40,000,
for example, but there is a

good chance that this might
be [inaudible] a lot more
people showing up and it
might get over 55, seems
like the threshold, it might
make sense to lower the
threshold to cover
yourselves to prevent this
from happening again.

>> That's a good point,
councilmember.

I think it's important to
know that in this instance
the amount that is
established through the
state after the economic
impact statement cannot be
exceeded even if the event
proves to be more successful
than anticipated, that
number is capped.

But you can go below the number based on that.

So it protects on the top end, in this case 81,000.

If everyone from the surrounding states decided they wanted to come to this event and the economic impact of 150,000, we wouldn't be obligated to pay above the 81.

However [inaudible] if it was not realized then we could lower it.

>> Spelman: Is the cap the same for all events?

Does it depend on the event?

>> It depends on each event.

The process that happens
[inaudible] the process that
happens is we bid on the
event.

A year before that we're
allowed to make application
to the state for the event
trust fund.

Within 120 days of the event
after we've gathered the
event history, got as much
history as we can, we have
an independent entity that
does an economic impact that
goes to the state and they
evaluate to see if it's
reasonable or not.

Then they come back with a
number that says this is
what we think the

[09:26:00]

incremental tax gain will be
to the stacks because of
this specific event.

That is the cap for that
event.

>> Spelman: That
incremental [inaudible] is
the cap?

>> Yes, sir.

>> Spelman: What was the
cap on this?

>> 81,000.

>> The city's contribution
was 81,000.

The total was I believe
about 500 --

>> 593.

>> That's incremental
[inaudible].

The local match is derived
from percentage of that.

>> Spelman: Okay.

So there is a maximum amount
that the state is going to
be out which is based on
what?

>> 6.2.

We pay one-sixth and for every dollar we pay the 25 and all that money is deposited to the trust fund and then the event organizer has the ability to request reimbursement for eligible expenses up to that cap [inaudible]

>> Spelman: Let me be sure I understand it.

We look at the event, bid on the event, hire somebody to estimate what they think is going to be the [inaudible] of the event.

In this case let's say

\$300,000.

That means that our share of

that would be $1/6$ or

\$50,000, which is lower than

your threshold having

council.

Then it develops that the

event [inaudible] it's

extremely successful and the

amount is something like 600

not 300,000, which means our

share would be about 100,

not 50,000.

Did this not happen?

>> No.

>> Spelman: Why not?

>> After the state did their initial evaluation, that is is the marks that is allowed.

We go back post-event and they will adjust down, they will not adjust over.

>> Spelman: Seems to me a sensible process either we believe our best guess is 55,000 or more or else the

[09:28:01]

cap would result in 1/6 payment being our share of being over 55,000.

The state cap is over

55,000, maybe we ought to
take a look at it.

>> One of the things so you
know the part of this
process that we've undergone
over the course of the last
several weeks with the legal
team, this team as well as
my staff, we want to
incorporate language that
talks about administrative
[inaudible] manager.

In this case that those
payments be made above that
amount without going to city
council.

That will be actually right
now it's not --

>> Spelman: It's in the

ordinance, I think.

>> We want to ensure that
any signed agreement whether
it's the city representative
or the state or whoever,
they understand that the
amount is 55 or 56,000.

I know there's been some
discussion about partnering
with acvb to cover the
delta, but in the end i
think the management clearly
supported that any amount
over his administrative
authority needs to be
escalated to [inaudible]
ultimate approval.

So we'll be coming back as
we modify and approve the
current process, we'll

possibly be coming back to
council and share with you
some of the options
[inaudible]

>> Spelman: Well, don't
possibly come back to city
council, just come back to
city council, let us know
what it is that you are
planning.

Thanks.

>> Cole: Any other
questions?

Okay.

Councilmember tovo, if it's
okay with you, I see someone
from the transportation
staff here so perhaps we

will get them to answer some
of our -- some of
councilmember spelman's
questions.

>> Spelman: Thank you,
mayor pro tem.

I appreciate it.

[09:30:09]

>> Councilmember, sorry, i
was delayed getting here.

>> Spelman: No problem.

Thank you for coming.

Two quick questions.

Two questions which I think
can be quick.

First on 67, where you are
asking us to authorize
negotiation and execution of
an interlocal agreement for
an urban rail study program
in the amount of \$4 million,
I wonder if you could
describe how that \$4 million
will be broken down
between -- in terms of the
major parts of what it is we
would be buying with that.

>> Right.

Let me try to answer that
simplisticly.

It will be going to
restarting the alternative

analysis.

As you know, councilmember,
we came before you this past
spring and talked about a
recommended or likely first
investment scenario going
approximately from the
downtown commuter rail
that's operating today out
to mueller and looking at
that as primary corridor
route.

That is consistent with the
statement of first in need
that we publish this part of
the environmental process
that we started about a year
and a half ago.

And which talked about
economic investment

[inaudible]

>> Spelman: Sounds like
this is all stuff which we
need to do.

>> Yes, sir.

>> Spelman: Does not
preclude -- we haven't
decided which street we're
going to go on, the general
idea making the [inaudible]

[09:34:01]

to mueller is going to be
vetted.

>> Yes.

Certainly we believe we understand what are the potential streets to get us between those four key locations and we have an idea as to which the best route is, but certainly further discussion [inaudible]

>> Spelman: If you could get me more information by thursday, that would be great.

>> We have it broken out by year but I would like to summarize to it make it easier to explain.

>> Spelman: With your permission, mayor pro tem, i would like to shift gears.

>> Cole: Absolutely.

Let me ask one question.

One clear followup.

This is a federal grant so
there's no city of austin
fund at issue.

>> Well, it is a federal
grant with the funds that
come through capital metro
administered by the fta.

There's about a million
dollars of tip funds that
we've identified through the
budge yet process to match
so it makes a total of
\$5 million.

>> Cole: Councilmember
riley.

>> Riley: Some concerns
about ensuring maintain
focus of [inaudible] in
addition to figuring out how
we're going to move people
from points within the
center.

I appreciate you mentioning
project -- but for purposes
of this \$4 million, will
this -- will this study look
at the connections from
further -- from points
further out or is it really
just focused inside between
the points [inaudible]?

>> Councilmember, the
purpose of project connect

was to look at the entire system and so one of the key needs that were identified by project connect and the recommendation is they need to connect those systems

[09:36:00]

that come from more distant locations like leander and east austin to the major employment centers in central austin.

Remember central austin was when we talk about downtown, capitol complex is a pretty big area.

People would be challenged

to walk in business suits

[inaudible].

And then also I need to

connect to mueller because

of the economic

opportunities that that

proposes.

And so this really focuses

in on the central part of

the corridor but is part of

a system.

One of the key things we

heard in the environmental

process that we kicked off a

year and a half ago and why

we [inaudible] public more

is we heard clearly from

agencies in the public you

need to show us how this

connected with the larger

system so that's what we've
been [inaudible].

>> Riley: Okay.

So we can be sure that we
are looking at people across
the region from those points
they could access the urban
rail system that would be
examined [inaudible].

>> Yes, sir.

In fact, through project
connect, the two highest
priority corridors
identified were the
northeast, north central
northeast corridor and the
central corridor.

You can imagine a box around

central austin, sort of a
central corridor, how you
would get around this that
central corridor similar to
cities like san francisco
and new york, that central
activity area is too big for
one to normally walk because
it is an important element
[inaudible] how it connects
to those regional systems
that we've already invested
in or planned investment in
is very important.

>> Riley: Great.

Thanks.

>> Cole: Councilmember
morrison.

>> Morrison: Thank you.

Just to follow up, I guess
you've confirmed this is
funding coming from the feds
and we're talking about --

>> it is some funds which
were federal funds returned
to the state for formula and

[09:38:00]

this is being capped from
the state through the
[inaudible]

>> Morrison: A nice
straight path.

>> I wish I could say it was
straight.

>> Morrison: And I'm
interested in the time line
for these studies and it
sounds like your answer to
those questions might
involve a time line.

Will that come to us?

>> Well, I can actually give
you better understanding.

My understanding is that cap
metro intends to take a
similar issue to their board
for a november discussion.

Once they have the authority
to negotiate to get these
funds agreed upon, we have a
contractor that has
previously -- is previously

involved and remains
involved ready to rekick off
the environmental as well as
the need for process.

We would expect to get them
started in november assuming
both bodies approve the
timing.

In that way we would be back
at an initial retouch with
the public in january.

The alternative analysis we
would hope to finish by the
end of this coming summer
which would then allow us to
continue the environmental
process perhaps on a -- you
know, on the first
investment as opposed to the
prior route and that is

direct feedback from the
[inaudible] going to be able
to do all of this at once
and no we really need to
contemplate a first
investment as part of that.

That is the intent,
councilmember, to reengage
the public probably in the
january time frame given
[inaudible].

>> Morrison: And you
mentioned earlier that we
need to redo some things
because some of the
information is dated.

Can you talk a little about
that?

>> Well, you know, we had a

long and ongoing

conversation about urban

[09:40:00]

[inaudible] specifically in

this corridor.

We start this process about

six years ago.

One of the things we need to

do is reacquaint the public

with the discussion and six

years ago with capital metro

and auspices of capital

metro, the city picked it up

four years ago.

For good measure we need to

remind the public of those

conversations, check back in
with them.

Remind the public why it's
important to connect three
major activity centers along
mueller.

It's not just about a
maintenance facility at
mueller, it's also about
mueller being an important
community within the city.

There's some economic
opportunity for the city as
we increase the density
there to better meet imagine
austin.

Imagine austin clearly
[inaudible] activity so we
want to remind the public of

that.

But then also initiate more
focus discussions about the
characteristics of the
system.

We heard much from the
business community that they
want this to be very fast
and dedicated lane.

That certainly [inaudible]
environmental and
neighborhood repercussions
that placement of stations
[inaudible] those are the
items we want to have a
discussion with.

>> Morrison: And you --
you mentioned we've been at
this for six years.

>> Yes, ma'am.

>> Morrison: I mean the
community has.

And several times during
those six years there was a
discussion out about
potentially going to the
voters and that never --
that hasn't come together
yet.

And I think there are a lot
of pieces that go into
deciding when and if we go
to the voters, would you
have a guess as to what kind
of time line this could put
us on for consideration?

>> I'm not sure I want to

guess a date.

I would tell you that i
think the council as well as
the region would have the
information necessary within
12 to 14 months to make a
decision as to when they
want to go to a vote.

The environmental will not
be complete at that point,
but, again, local funding is

[09:42:01]

a separate issue than the
environmental issue.

I can hazard a guess to
believe there will be few

environmental issues of
concern within the corridors
because we're within the
existing transportation
corridor more or less.

Certainly there will
be-neighborhood concerns,
but I think we can alay
those pretty effectively as
we get further into the
discussion process.

I would hope that we would
be in a position under the
new federal funding law
called map 21 to have a
conversation with the
federal transit
administration about getting
[inaudible] for federal
funds.

That may play a role in
helping council decide when
to discuss that with the
electorate.

>> Morrison: One final
issue.

You were talking with
councilmember spelman about
where this money is going to
go.

>> Yes, ma'am.

>> Morrison: Did i
understand properly some of
it may be managed and
overseen by cap metro and
some by the city?

>> Yes, ma'am.

They are the fiscal agent so they have the right to take administrative costs out of that.

>> Morrison: That's in the backup and I had seen that.

>> There will be an administrative role.

>> Morrison: But that's the extent of what we foresee the rest of it is going to be.

>> The majority of it goes directly to the project.

It will roughly be divided into three basic areas.

One would be the completion

or the restart of the
alternative analysis.

The bulk of it will go for
environmental, and a little
bit of it will go for
engineering support.

We call it preliminary
engineering.

The federal government
attaches very specific
definition of preliminary
engineering, but there is
some engineering support
that's needed for the
environmental.

Those are the three primary
categories.

I can show you break down of

year of expenditure and so

[09:44:01]

forth, but I kind of want to
create a handout that rolls
it out and present you the
details.

>> Morrison: Thanks.

I appreciate that
clarification.

I had heard something
different.

>> Cole: Let me ask you a
couple of questions.

>> Yes, ma'am.

>> Cole: First I recall --
tell me I'm correct in
recalling the federal
government wants to see the
city or local dollars put in
before they will commit to
federal dollars.

Is that -- and that was part
of our discussions about the
250 million.

>> Right.

>> Cole: Is that correct?

>> Well, when we go for the
proposal to ask the federal
government to participate in
a funding scenario for the
construction and deployment
of the system, they want --

they will only fund 50% of
the investment.

And so they need to know
that there is a local
commitment for the other
50%.

Whether you actually have to
go for a vote or commit it
and have a vote scheduled
given the mechanism that we
have previously scud for
funding, it all goes into
how strategic your proposal
is to the federal
government.

I would tell you that we've
been advised that if you
passed a local funding vote
and have money committed in
a sense by the voters,

that's a much stronger
position to be in when you
go to the federal government
to ask for match as opposed
to city council committing
to do a vote at a certain
date, still needing voter
approval.

>> Cole: Okay.

So -- but regardless of if
the voters have approved the
dollars, it still
[inaudible].

>> Absolutely, yes, ma'am.

>> Cole: So is there any
information from the studies
that we are performing with
this item that will help us
determine the likelihood of

the [inaudible]?

[09:46:00]

>> As I said previously to councilmember morrison, i believe in 12 to 14 months we will be in a position for council to have the information necessary to make that decision and yes, I believe that we will have an idea about how competitive our proposal will be.

We won't have any feedback.

We'll be able to give you information.

>> Cole: When you say that decision, you mean putting it on the ballot for voters?

>> Yes, ma'am.

Whether you actually decide to put it on the ballot at that point or say, okay, we're going to do it, you will have enough information to decide how competitive or estimate how competitive our probably [inaudible]

>> Cole: Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I appreciate this discussion.

Thanks.

You know, you've covered
this to some extent with
councilmember spelman in
answering his questions, but
I just want to be clear
about something.

We've gotten some concerns
and councilmember spelman
referred to a few of them.

The ones I've heard have
dealt primarily with the
route, and I thought I heard
you answer that there is --
that that is not a set --
there is not a set plan at
this point.

But then a few minutes ago
you talked about the
selected route.

So for those members of our community who have concerns about -- who would like to see more exploration on that front and, you know, one of them, for example, cited the recent campo transit working group talking about the group of expert that's going to be brought in to do an expert review of the current rail [inaudible] and why would we settle on a route [inaudible] why wouldn't we use some of the money that's being contemplated to look at alternatives.

My question in a nutshell to

[09:48:03]

what extent is the
discussion of route
[inaudible]?

>> Well, councilmember, as i
said, for the entire six
years that we've been
talking about this, we
talked about our purpose and
need or a need for a system
that links the city's
investment in mueller with
the three areas of the core.

We have previously looked at
three routes between
downtown and the core.

Namely being mlk, manor road
and red river.

We actually went to look at

red river after the initial
feedback from the
environmental scoping
network.

Capital metro one of our
partners, indicated now they
are up and running with the
red line they were concerned
about trying to connect
[inaudible] station at manor
road and looked at all the
different con straights.

Red river provided the third
corridor.

There has been a wider
discussion though, and let
me acknowledge that, about
well, the twig has listed a
number of different
corridors to look at.

Those corridors are
different corridors from the
one that connects us to
mueller.

And I think those are very
good corridors.

You know, two of those
corridors I think are worth
talking about, the lamar
north central corridor,
which is now being served or
will be served by project
that capital metro is
deploying which is to be our
key that receive federal
funding.

When they receive federal
funding, they made a
commitment by providing the

cost estimate and the price
proposal in a sense to run
that service for the next
probably 20 years is
probably what the commitment
was for.

And so we think that
corridor is being well
served with the new
investment and we're trying
to spread the service of the

[09:50:01]

central corridor as widely
as possible, then it would
serve the community better
than the second corridor
that we looked at.

The other corridor which i
would mention is the
riverside corridor, which is
probably the second highest
ridership corridor behind
lamar, but the reason we're
not looking to serve the
riverside corridor with the
next investment is because
of the need to cross the
river, plus whether
tributaries flow major
structures in that corridor.

We think that discussion
will be longer to have and
better after we have some
initial first investment and
hence the recommendation
previous to you.

So I would say that those
other corridors other than

the riverside corridor don't
meet the stated purpose and
need.

The corridor we've been
looking at is a good one in
terms of ridership and
opportunity.

When we look at criteria for
making an investment, it
more than just ridership,
it's economic development.

Clearly there's an economic
opportunity in mueller for
the city because it -- it's
better for the city, it is
in keeping with imagine
austin and it is also the
shortest route, I believe,
between downtown and the red
line.

So we also have the north
connection with the red line
is important [inaudible]
between the north and the
university area.

So those are the -- that's
my answer.

We've been focused on that
corridor and plan to stay
focused on that corridor
because it meets our purpose
and need.

>> Tovo: I guess if we
have citizens who have
questions about the extent
to which public feedback can
help shape the corridor
discussion, it sounds like
it's a federal issue.

>> Yes, ma'am.

I feel like we've moved -- i
would argue that we've moved

[09:52:01]

beyond that point in the
study at we really have
focused in on a corridor
within here and mueller.

I think to look at a
different corridor would
dramatically change the time
line.

Over a period I think it
would affect the federal
partnership, the lamar

corridor, engaged in right
now, and I don't think it
would meet, you know, the
intent of deploying a
transit system to spread
transit over the largest set
of population possible.

I don't know how else to
stay it.

>> Tovo: I appreciate your
candor.

Thank you.

>> Riley: You mentioned a
mueller route that's the
shortest connection to the
red line.

I'm not sure exactly where
you --

>> from the north end of the
university because the red
line is [inaudible]
southeast.

From the north end of the
university --

>> Riley: You are talking
about going up roughly
guadalupe and lamar?

>> First is from the north
end of the university up red
river, yes.

>> Riley: Right.

Crestview would be the
terminus --

>> crestview would be --

yes.

>> Riley: That's the connection you are referring to?

>> The shortest route would be from approximately dean keaton and san jacinto to red river and the red line.

>> Riley: So a new stop at the hancock center.

>> That's actually a little bit shorter I think than the manor road route that originally we were looking at.

>> Riley: Okay.

And secondly, mentioned the

importance of considering
economic development out
near the -- along the
proposed line and I just
want to be sure that this
project would allow for
that.

And in particular for
consideration of things like
the possibility of some sort

[09:54:01]

of new research hospital or
medical school or something
like that within -- in
the -- in the northeast part
of downtown.

Would that be within the

scope of this project?

>> Yes, sir.

You know, one of the
corridor connections we've
looked at is coming across
the capitol complex on
17th street.

Actually the early feedback
we got from the capitol
complex development group is
that's very exciting for
them because that's a street
they had not brought up as
an active street so it
allows them to activate
that.

That touches san jacinto,
and, of course,
san jacinto -- another way

to get to the university is
have a cuplet, one track on
trinity and one on
san jacinto.

They both get on the same
point, the entrance of u.t.

Of course, the intersection
of trinity and 17th is
adjacent to at least one of
the primary locations that's
in discussion.

It's about as close as we
can get to the remainder of
the development that's
proposed there, but
certainly within easy walk
of that element.

I think the other exciting
thing is the corridor off

red river connects you
david's, and
david's
that they want to be part of
medical research and serve
as an outlet, one of the
hospitals where graduate
medical students might get
training.

And then also that route
going on to mueller that you
see dell children's, which,
of course, is the other
major destination
[inaudible]

>> Riley: There's also
been discussion about
potential redevelopment of
other property within the
capitol complex area.

>> Absolutely.

>> Riley: And that would
also be within the scope.

This project would allow for
consideration of that sort
of development?

>> Yes.

In fact, the university of
texas has also talked about
a major redevelopment of
their engineering school
which would happen to be out

[09:56:01]

dean keaton and san jacinto,
which would be very

important naturally to
discuss facilitating a more
direct connection that could
be there with a pedestrian
bridge over the --

>> Riley: There's all kind
of stuff going on in the
northeast quadrant and we
could consider opportunity
to connect that to this
development.

>> Absolutely.

I think another thing is the
depth of that development is
potentially pretty
[inaudible].

Again I'll go back up
supporting a [inaudible] and
st. david site.

That whole area between red
river and the freeway really
is a commercial environment
until you get north of about
38 1/2.

Right.

The depth there is quite
deep in terms of economic
redevelopment as well as --
at least as you are close to
on the west side as
opposed to other corridors
where it's only [inaudible].

It's a good stretch.

>> Riley: Meantime, in the
opposite corner of downtown,
in the southwest corner,
there's also a lot of stuff

going on including -- and
putting green, seaholm and
the county's development of
the new courthouse facility.

Would this project also be
looking at opportunities to
support development in that
area?

>> Yes.

Councilmember, in our first
presentation to you last
spring on a first
investment, we do not have a
connection to seaholm.

Remember I said that's only
because, you know, we want
to time that connection with
lone star.

I think between last spring
and now a number of
encouraging things have
occurred with lone star such
that that connection might
be added back in as part of
the discussion and then that
would give you a connection

[09:58:02]

from the southwest corner,
the innercity commuter rail
type service with direct
line with the red line north
of [inaudible].

So we will build on the
[inaudible]

>> Riley: Okay.

Great.

Thanks for all your work.

>> Cole: Thank you, rob.

I appreciate that overview
on this one item.

>> You like that?

>> Cole: Yes, we like that
very much.

Any other questions on this
item?

Okay.

Thank you, rob.

>> Thank you.

There was one other question
that --

>> Cole: Councilmember
spelman had to leave.

He had an appointment at the
capitol.

Do you have a question?

>> Morrison: I have
councilmember spelman's
question.

>> Cole: Oh, okay.

That sound great.

>> Morrison: He was
interested on item 69 on the
pedi cab and just wanted to

be clear is this doing
anything beyond extending --

>> I'd like to let the
assistant director talk
about that.

[One moment, please, for
change in captioners]
likely be a discussion that
we would have probably first
quarter of -- of next year.

>> Morrison: Great, we
will see other things in the
future.

>> Right.

>> Thank you.

As we continue to discuss
and move towards a con

sense, we can bring back to
you a -- consensus, we can
bring back to you a --

>> as long as we're on this
topic, can you briefly
summarize where we are on
the treatment of trailer
pedicabs versus the
[indiscernible]

>> at this point, the
ordinance would say if a
trailer was damaged, we
would not -- we would not
replace that with another
trailer.

The discussions about
phasing out trailer again is
a big item of discussion,
which probably needs more
discussion, safety has been

brought up as an issue.

I think there's further
discussion there.

So -- so I think the big
thing is that there's been a
recent request to have a
five-year phase out.

We looked previously to the
monday reports suggesting
shorter phase out, so i
think those are some things
that we just need to
negotiate and continue
discussion.

>> Riley: Okay, we will be
continuing discussions on
that.

>> Yes.

>> Riley: Great, thanks.

>> Councilmember tovo has a question.

Just a quick question with regard to the valet services on our agenda that's been postponed.

>> Correct, till november 18th.

>> Cole: What item is that, councilmember tovo?

>> Tovo: I --

>> I think at one point it was on the november 11th proposed agenda.

And it's -- it's been --

>> Morrison: Actually, it
was on the draft agenda for
this week.

>> Right.

>> Morrison: Then it
disappeared when we got the
final.

>> We postponed it.

We've heard that -- that we
have a fee issue --

>> Cole: Let's give
everybody a chance to know
what number it is.

[Multiple voices]

>> it is not on here.

>> Cole: Not on the
agenda.

>> Tovo: That was
mistake.

>> Tovo: For sure it's
postponed?

>> Yes, councilmember.

There is another item
regarding fees with regards
to that, two items that
we're going to bring them
all at the same time.

>> Cole: Okay.

Any other questions?

Thank you, mr. spiller.

Okay.

Councilmember tovo, your
last item is item 27.

>> Tovo: It's actually --
yes, that's right.

27.

>> Cole: Renaming the park
facilities.

>> Tovo:.

>> I guess I want to start
off about getting background
about why the staff brought
this forward, why you felt
it was necessary to revise
the process.

>> Kim mcneely, assistant
director of parks and
recreation department.

The parks and recreation
department has experienced
individuals that will come
representing companies or
for example one of those
examples is the block
foundation who came with a
proposal to the parks and
recreation department for a
naming rights sort of a --
opportunity where they had a
proposal saying that they
wanted to provide us certain
amount of money and in
return we would name a park
or name a portion of the
park after that particular
entity.

We've also experienced individuals who come forward to request that certain parts of our park be renamed or named after a particular individual.

And in one particular instance, we had up to 21 nominations for the same piece of property.

Individuals wanting to name it after 21 different individuals.

And we were trying to be proactive.

Those things coming forward, we don't have any processes in place at this particular

time that would allow us to
fairly evaluate.

We would be evaluating on a
case-by-case basis.

So we thought it was
important to put together
maybe some sort of criteria
where people would know
well, what is the criteria
for naming something?

We believe that parkland and
the naming of something is a
significant decision.

It's a forever decision.

And we don't want to take
that -- that decision
lightly.

But we also want to be able
to give individuals some
guidelines as to what would
it take because we
understand the importance
for community members to
want to -- to preserve
something in someone's name
because of their historical
significance or because of
their contributions to the
community and we also know
that there's this idea of
public/private partnerships
out there, but we don't want
to allow that to overshadow
the opportunity for the
community and so based on
some things that had
happened in the past in the
department, perhaps not
being as prepared as it
could because we didn't have

criteria, we thought it was appropriate for us to -- to set some criteria and also give the opportunity for council to always have the final or the -- maybe not the final, but -- well, you always have the final, but always to have the opportunity to take into consideration proposals that are not included here in the ordinance.

And so that's the background of it.

>> Tovo: Okay.

Well, that's helpful.

>> You know, I was looking at the old procedure for

naming a facility.

I guess I agree there may not be a specific criteria as may be useful, but there are guidelines in terms of asking if it's an individual that there be a biographical sketch, a description of the individual's involvement in the community, the individual's connection, if any, to the facility or the activity for which the facility is used, so there's

I guess implicit criteria that our structures and parks should be named for people who have significant roles, who have played significant roles in the community and have had significant connections,

either to the particular
facilities or to the
activities that take place
within those facilities.

So -- I just wants to put
that out there, that i
think -- you know, I think
we have been making
value-based decisions, while
it hasn't necessarily been
articulated in as clear of a
fashion as it might be.

And I know there was an
article that ran in today's
paper with some additional
information about it.

But I guess -- I guess what
concerns me is that the
current ordinance, you know,
the changes that have been

contemplated really seem to
put the priority instead on
those who can come forward
with a financial
contribution and it seems to
me there's a fundamental
difference between a
non-profit or another
organization that is looking
for naming opportunities and
sets a value of, you know,
\$50,000 to name this room or
25,000 to name this room and
our public facilities, which
are really -- really should
be named for people who have
had historically, culturally
significant roles in the
community and that does not
seem, in my reading of the
changes, that does not seem
to be the priority of -- and
the -- and the -- for one

thing, it's -- the process
has become quite arduous for
somebody who would be
proposing that a facility be
named after a community
member, the signature --

>> I'm sorry?

>> The intention is for
parks.

The intention of this
ordinance is for entire
parks.

Metropolitan parks, district
parks.

Amenities within that park,
rooms within those
particular facilities, is
always at the discretion of

the parks board or the
director to be able to allow
a particular amenity to be
named, a particular amenity
within that park.

So this is -- we're talking
the development of a park,
somewhere between, you know,
8 to \$9 million, so we're
talking about a significant
amount of money that
somebody would put forward.

About you that means their
name goes on the entire
park.

The amenities in the park
can certainly be named after
certain -- anybody who had
significant source of --
source of contributions to

the city or has historical
significance and that would
be a -- that would be at the
discretion of the director
and also at the discretion
of the council.

So we're talking about park
development and parks, so --
so there's also the
opportunity that if you
don't have that source of
money, you could put
together the entire
opportunity to have a park
named after you, if you had
the appropriate number of
signatures.

So it's -- we thought that
it was a good compromise.

It's both.

It's developers who are
going to come in and want to
have naming rights and we
have criteria.

It's significant opportunity
for individuals to nominate
community members or
historical figures to name a
park, but then amenities are
also its own category.

So there's the parks and
then amenities within the
parks.

>> Tovo: I have a few
questions about that.

Because that wasn't -- what
you are saying was not
immediately clear to me in

looking at the ordinance,
the defines facility as
building, park, pool, other
playground directly used by
the public, requirements for
naming or renaming the parks
facility.

All of those kinds of
facilities are contained
within this ordinance unless
I'm mistaken.

I think in terms of interior
buildings, it didn't seem to
me that that had council
discretion at all.

That was described as
being -- being left up to
the -- an administrative
function of the director,
which is another concern

that I have, because
sometimes the rooms within a
facility may be critical or
in the case of -- of butler
park, there were some
individual areas which, you
know, with those -- would
those fall into components
of a larger facility?

So those then become not a
public process or a -- up to
council discretion, those
are an administrative
function as well.

So I think that this is --
mcneely in
thinking that this naming
ordinance is really
capturing our facilities as
well as the big metropolitan
parks.

>> Councilmember, I believe that, you know, the -- the component, the major components, like pool or something, rec center that could be -- in a metropolitan park, for instance, then that's a significant facility that could have a name as well as the metropolitan park or the district park.

So I think those are two opportunities that -- that could -- that could happen.

So the administrative component that is in the current ordinance that gives the director the -- the authority of naming a room

or a gym or something like
that within the interior of
a facility and that's
currently in the ordinance
itself.

I wanted to just make one
comment about -- about a lot
of what's in the ordinance
today is kind of loose and
vague where -- where we
mcneely
indicated, that we've had
applications, 20, 21, 22
applications come in, with
really not demonstrating a
lot of the community support
for that naming or renaming.

So -- so we felt like the
signature component would --
would give us some, you
know, sense of -- of

indication that there is
quite a bit of -- of support
for that naming or renaming.

-- what was the
instance where we had 21
different suggestions or --
in that range?

>> It was butler park.

>> It was butler park.

But as I recall, I wasn't on
council at the time, it
seems to me that there was a
robust public discussion and
people did come and talk
about the different nominees
and probably brought
signatures as well.

Did anybody bring petitions

that you recall to show
support or they came and
voiced, came down with their
bodies to record --

>> I recall different
individuals or groups of
individuals visiting in my
office about it.

>> Also, isn't -- if I could
just add real quick, don't
we have -- I recall with --
I think it was
[indiscernible] oaks park,
which I was on the council
for, in that case there were
several suggestions and
there was an opportunity for
people to vote and register
their ideas even before and
so we could look at the
different numbers and take

the parks board
recommendation.

So you got a sense, but
that's a very different
situation than not even
being able to get a name
into the mix unless you have
a certain number of
signatures.

Which then that concerns me,
also, because I think
throwing out the ideas and
then having the discussion
is good [multiple voices]

>> Tovo: I agree that
shift in the process is
really important because it
does allow you to have a
discussion about who is
maybe the best

representative of a name for
that facility.

How would you have done it
with the instance that you
referenced -- I mean this
relies largely on households
within a certain geographic
distance, with regard to the
hoffman oaks.

>> Morrison: That's one of
the questions that i
submitted to staff, there
would be zero required
because within a quarter
mile there may have been
zero residents, so that's a
glitch.

>> I do want to point out
that e in the ordinance, on
the very last page, page 3

of 3, the council may by
resolution establish
different criteria and
procedures for the naming of
park facilities, you know,
et cetera, et cetera.

So again we try to craft
this in such a way that
there was criteria set.

We had a specific way in
which we would evaluate, but
council always has the
opportunity to say in this
particular instance, it's a
special case, we're not sure
that we -- that we feel as
though it's appropriate to
move in that direction and
so that's why we put letter
e in there to allow the
opportunity for -- for

council to always be able to
weigh in if there was
significant disagreement
about anything in
particular.

>> Tovo: I guess I just
want to say in terms of
looking at the ordinance, i
know, I read you some of the
language that was in the --
that is in our existing
process about biographical
sketch, the individual's
involvement, you know, in
looking at this ordinance,
I'm not sure, you know, we
have one a person or group
that deeds the land to a
person that contributes the
anticipated cost, three, a
person that provides an
endowment or four, a person

of significance.

I mean, just in the hierarchy of how these are listed it's very clear that, you know, if you bring money to the table at the parks department, that's your best opportunity for getting a facility named after you and I just -- I don't think -- i think our public parks and our municipal facilities ought to be -- ought to set forward names of people who are historically, culturally significant who will be role models for the next generation of people and that may not be the person that he -- who brings forward money to provide to the parks department.

I'm -- I'm very supportive
of the intent of trying to
increase private support for
our parks.

And our facilities.

Lord knows we need more
public support.

More financial support for
our parks and our
facilities.

But this -- this is -- this
ordinance right now is -- is
just of grave concern to me,
as it stands I'm not going
to be able to support it.

>> Cole: Councilmember
morrison, I will weigh in

here in a second, too.

>> Morrison: I just want
to -- based on what you
said, kathy, I think one of
the things that we have to
realize is that we could get
into a situation where
somebody brings the big
money to the table and we're
considering that name, but
at that point I would like
to know what the
alternatives are.

And once somebody has ponied
up the cash, then how do we
know what other alternatives
really might be loved by the
community and found
appropriate by the
community, so it's a little
bit backwards as opposed to

saying we're going to be
naming this park, what are
ideas about how -- about
what would be appropriate
for the community and at
that point somebody might
say, well, you know, we
would love to endow it and
by the way, we would like it
named this.

But it's sort of skews the
process so you don't --
there's sort of a
fundamental paradox and
logical problem here so that
you don't have the
opportunity for a robust
discussion about what is a
proper name.

You don't have all of the
alternatives on the table at

that point because if
somebody ponies up the money
and somebody else is going
to have to go out and find a
thousand signatures, you
know, how do you really make
sure that you are making the
right decision?

So I think that in terms
of -- of the criteria that
we have now in the
guidelines that we have now
are all important because i
don't want to be supporting
naming a metropolitan park
after someone that does not
have -- does not have
community significance or
historical significance.

So to me, we've got the tail
wagging the dog here with

the shift in the ordinance
and I wonder if there might
be some mechanism or
alternative approach where
maybe we clean up and -- and
put a little more teeth into
what we already have and
then have some guidelines
about, you know, it would
be -- it would be
significant, if there was an
endowment offered.

It would also be significant
if there were a thousand
signatures.

So sort of the -- to shift
the process order.

>> Cole: Let me ask a
question.

What parks have been
endowed?

Because that -- seems like
we are assuming a problem
that doesn't necessarily
exist.

>> I can't think of one that
we have.

A situation.

Yeah.

>> Cole: So I mean -- i
strongly feel that we need
more money for our parks.

And that we don't want to be
enemy of the good for the
best or the best for the
good.

The perfect enemy of the
good.

You know what I mean.

The concepts of not
adequately giving someone
who or even sending a
message that we're not
interested.

We want -- is -- especially
when we have none and
throughout the country, the
only way that the parks in a
metropolitan city have risen
to the level of any type of
excellence has been with
private support.

So I think we could think of
some mechanisms maybe we say

only our urban parks, 20% of them, or 30% of them, will be -- will be endowed and then the 70% are -- or i mean that's -- that's i think maybe one way to do it.

So we -- so we actually carve out, I mean, given that we have none, that percentage could be really -- really almost anything.

But we don't want to send that signal that when it's not even happening and we so desperately need the funding.

>> Tovo: I completely agree that we don't want to

send a message that we're
not open to endowments.

I guess the approach,
councilmember morrison or i
guess we're in a work
session, laura that you
mentioned, about, you know,
providing direction that
that is boy if you bring
forward an endowment, that's
significant something that
the council considers if you
have a large number of
signatures, that's something
that the council would
consider, seems to me maybe
the way to do it.

To find other ways to
encourage endowments and
provide guidance about --
about what sort of

endowments would be most
useful would be very
helpful, would send a
helpful message, but I'm
thinking about some of the
facilities that we have,
zilker park, roy guerrero
park, you know, these are --
these are people who have
played a significant role in
our community and I think
that it means something
to -- with or without
endowments, I think those
names are meaningful --
[multiple voices]

>> it's not our intention to
change what would be
existing via the endowment
process.

Maybe that's something

that's fundamentally wrong
with the way that we
presented this is that this
is for future development.

So this is for the future,
the metropolitan parks that
have yet to be developed.

Or the -- or the district
parks that have yet to be
developed.

So that might be a
fundamental problem with the
way we presented this is
that it would be awful, a
tragedy if we accept
something that would have
community significance, i
could absolutely see people
coming out in droves to
protest that.

Certainly the parks
department would not want to
put themselves in that
position.

So the intention of this is
for the future.

>> Councilmember morrison.

>> Morrison: I got that.

I realized that it's not
retroactive.

I think that the point is
that if we were back naming
roy guerrero park, what
would it have taken to name
it roy guerrero park,
sheffield northwest park.

All of these great folks and
I think that was the point
of would it have really
shifted our ability, the
community's ability to
recognize folks who are so
important to our parks.

I think that's the concern
to try to get it back, find
a way to get it on to a more
even keel, to encourage
endowments but not lay it
out in such a way that
there's a sense that you can
go by a park name.

Go buy a park name.

>> I certainly understand
what you say, we can go back
to the drawing board if
that's the wish of the

council.

But I do want to tell you,
just so that we know.

We did try to do our due
diligence, we researched
this and took this from best
practices from other cities
like portland and also --
also -- also -- also we did
have the opportunity to --
where if somebody wanted to
bring money forward but
because we weren't
necessarily in a position to
be able to evaluate it, we
didn't have the right
criteria.

>> Cole: Do we still have
that opportunity?

>> No.

It was in 2009.

We weren't able to --

>> we did actually -- I can
think of -- I can think of
in 2008 which I was first on
the council -- when I was
first on the council, there
were -- I think that it's
just -- there were -- when
we named the theater, zach
scott, and I don't think
that it was necessarily
written down, you know, this
is -- we're naming this
theater because of the
donation.

But it was taken into
account and that donation

was clearly made and
important and it all worked.

>> Cole: So it has worked
under the existing
ordinance.

>> Morrison: It has, yeah.

>> Cole: So you think that
would further -- do you guys
feel like you have a sense
of direction to kind of
tighten it up?

>> We certainly do.

I just wanted to clarify one
thing.

The -- the existing
ordinance that -- the backup
for significance, the

individual that is
significant to the park, is
still in place.

The 90-day period would
still be in place in the
sense in that if we had an x
company or corporation come
in with a name, for
instance, we would -- we
would let the community know
and there would be a 90 day
period saying that, you
know, this is a proposal
that we've received.

Just like if it was an
individual.

But the -- but the
application would still
require, you know, some --
some information about the

individual about the --
about the proposal.

To be submitted.

With the application.

During that 90 day period,
we would let the community
know that we have received
this.

And -- and just to -- just
to allow for -- for other
names or other processes
that -- that folks would
want to enter like going out
and getting signatures and
that type of a thing.

So -- so yeah I just wanted
to clarify that.

That that component would
not be lost from the
ordinance.

>> We are looking at section
14-1-31, 32 and 36, you are
saying there's other parts
to the ordinance that
aren't --

>> existing -- exactly,
exactly.

>> Morrison: That's where
it says for instance the
council --

>> the 90 day period would
still be in place, exactly.

So we would still let.

Whether it's an individual

application coming in, and
that's how we -- that's how
we get other interests
because -- because they were
aware of -- of -- a proposal
was submitted to name
guerrero park and --

>> Morrison: Can you
remind me, so there were a
couple of namings since I've
been on the council that i
saw the process.

One was little zilker, one
was hoffman.

In both cases it was my
impression that the city
went and said we're looking
for a name, please give us
your ideas.

Is that correct?

I remember some robust
discussion about all of them
and there was not unanimity
in the -- in the community
about what those names
should be and the council --
the parks board worked on it
and the council had a
discussion and came -- so
that seems a little
different than having the
naming prompted than someone
coming to the city and
saying I want to name this
park this.

>> I think in both
instances, like you've
stated, we've had
solicitations for an
opportunity for naming.

And then -- but the majority
of the -- of the requests
that we get are -- are --
we're going to -- the parks
department is going to
finish up a skate park for
instance or a rec center and
we're interested in -- in
naming.

So what's the process?

So, you know, that -- so we
get a lot of names through
that.

When they know that there's
an amenity that's just about
to be completed.

>> An example of that most
recently is that formerly

called the chestnut house,
which is on the corner of --
it's in the rosewood park,
it was a building and it's
named after four
individuals, durst, howard
and forgive me for not
remembering the other two,
but there are two.

That was brought forward as
a suggestion to us because
individuals in that
community wanted to honor
those four people.

That's just an example of a
time when we didn't solicit,
but it was brought to us as
a desire.

>> I do see the parks board
at times when we submit all

of the names that we
received, where it becomes a
daunting task for the board
to kind of see well how do
we judge one from the other.

All of these are -- are
outstanding citizens,
it's -- it's difficult for
them to -- to -- to work
with at times.

>> Right.

I -- we had that challenge
on the council, too.

That doesn't necessarily go
away unless some focus sort
of solidifies their --
there.

But -- but end -- and if

someone is offering an
endowment, we would
certainly want to take that
into consideration, but if
it's more appropriate to
name it after somebody else,
you know, I want to make it
clear that we should do
that.

It's all a discretionary --

>> okay.

>> Councilmember tovo?

>> Yeah, I just want to be
clear on what.

So the definition looking at
the existing code and the
proposed code, the
definitions have been

reworked and they are -- the changes are indicated on our version.

The naming policy that's in our existing code would be replaced by what is here.

Is that correct?

So the -- so the don't see a provision that a facility named for an individual may not be renamed.

>> I'm trying to follow you there.

>> I'm sorry, I had trouble following it, too.

>> I believe on page 2 e, on the proposed ordinance,

136 will

continue.

>> Tovo: I'm sorry, i

missed the last thing that

you said.

Part 2 e.

>> Page 2 e, it talked about

in the proposed ordinance,

in addition to the other

requirements of this article

naming or renaming of the

park facility must also

comply with the requirements

of section 14.136.

>> Okay.

I don't have that section in

front of me.

>> When I had was the old
132 part c, which says an
individual named for a -- a
facility named for an
individual may not be
renamed, which I don't see
in the proposed.

>> Okay.

>> I see, okay.

Thank you, ms. thomas.

>> Are you suggesting that
133 would continue, that
would remain in place?

>> That's correct.

>> The substantial changes
are the modification of
131, the -- the addition

of 14.136?

>> Correct.

>> And so -- neither here
nor there, I'm just trying
to figure it out.

I think the main concerns
that I have raised are with
14.136.

>> I appreciate parks staff
bringing this forward.

I think this is a -- this is
a good first effort at -- at
addressing an issue that has
been lingering out there.

Also I want to also note
that -- that we're not
breaking new ground by

suggesting that parks could
be named after individuals
who have made them possible
through their contributions.

There is a fairly long
history of that sort of a
thing here in austin.

One of our most prominent
parks, zilker park is named
after andrew jackson zilker
who made the park possible
by donating the land for it
in 1917.

So it's not exactly a new
thing to suggest that a park
might be named after the
person who gives the land
for it.

I do think that we could --

we could make some
refinements in the language
that's been proposed.

It's -- in -- in just by way
of example, in paragraph b,
136, we're --
we're saying that
suggestions made on the
basis of community
significance shall be
accompanied by the
following.

There's a bunch of signature
requirements and so on.

Well, in any public process,
we're going to get
additional suggestions that
aren't accompanied by
signatures and people are
free to make those

suggestions.

And -- and so we might just
have some language
suggesting that -- that
priority -- priorities shall
be given to -- to see -- to
suggestions that are
accompanied by signatures
and so on.

Just to make clear that
we're not going to close our
eyes to suggestions, if they
are not -- if they are not
accompanied by the indicated
number of signatures.

But I think -- I think, you
know, as -- as the mayor pro
tem has pointed out, there
is a -- there is a very
valuable role to be played

by -- by private
contributions of the type
that are contemplated by
this ordinance.

I -- and I really appreciate
staff's effort in that, in
encouraging discussions
towards -- towards the end
of -- of maximizing our
opportunity to -- to -- to
make use of those -- of
those sorts of possibilities
when they arise.

So I'll -- I think -- i
think this is a good start
and I think we can get there
with some adjustments to the
ordinance.

Adjustments to language
that's been proposed.

>> Councilmember morrison?

>> Morrison: I think those
are really good points,
chris, I appreciate that.

The -- the -- I guess one
question is what else are
we -- so this is sort of a
way to encourage or
recognize endowments, I get
that.

We want to encourage
endowments and
public/private partnerships
in ways, whatever ways that
we can.

I can think of a lot of
examples that we are doing
that with waller creek, for

instance, one of the more
robust ones going on right
now.

To put this in context, can
you in a nutshell say what
other programs, what other
priorities, what other
things do we do?

I know we work in
partnership with the trail
foundation, the parks
foundation, do we have any
other specifics in terms of
here's what we're doing to
encourage endowments?

Maybe just want to think
about that, come back.

Come back to -- to me on it
because I think --

>> I would appreciate the opportunity to put some thought into that and look through our entire -- actually, I have with me an entire list of all of our agreements.

>> Right.

>> So I could give you a better answer given that opportunity.

>> I'm thinking that if we could have that discussion, that could help raise it up a little bit in terms of how how can we as the council work on other policies that will really promote partnerships and endowment

if there's a framework to
put that in.

So we are not thinking in
terms of -- I know we are
not, we do a lot more, but
just in terms of naming
rights.

>> Cole: So I'm trying to
figure out if we are giving
staff direction or
suggesting direction that
this item is good go to be
postponed or will it be --
will it be ready for
tomorrow for us to vote on
it?

I hate to put staff under
that kind of -- that kind of
pressure.

>> If I could suggest, i
would suggest that we
postpone it, give us an
opportunity to go back and
take all of your suggestions
and reconfigure this so that
it can come back in a way
that can be supported by the
majority.

>> Okay.

>> Morrison: If you can do
give it thought, come back
to us on that bigger
picture, if we want to put
it on for discussion at a
work session or if you think
it could be captured,
discussion started in a memo
first, I think that would be
interesting.

>> Okay.

>> Cole: Thank you,
councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Thanks, I just
want to thank laura, I think
that's an interesting
suggestion.

I know for example the issue
has come up about
scholarships for some of the
parks programs, that seems
to me a potential endowment
opportunity and I don't know
if that's something that you
are considering.

But I hope we'll be able to
have that discussion soon
because I think it's an
interesting one of all of

the ways we can encourage
the community to support our
parks programs and our parks
facilities as well.

But sometimes that's easier
for people to take advantage
of if they've got specific
ideas about how to be
helpful.

Or, you know, where their
money would go.

So thank you for -- for
taking another look at this.

I think -- I think that will
be real valuable.

>> Cole: Thank you, any
other items?

Wait, we have a briefing?

Yeah.

Okay.

Rather ready for the
citizens forum meeting
recommendation briefing.

>> Okay.

Mayor pro tem and council,
ray [indiscernible] with
city manager's office,
assisting me with this
presentation will be deborah
thomas of the law department
and shirley gentry, our city
clerk.

What we would like to do
this morning is to outline

staff's recommended -- thank
you -- is to outline staff's
recommended format for the
citizens forum that will be
held on saturday, october
THE 27th.

If you will remember,
earlier in the year, council
adopted a resolution
directing the city manager
to work with the city
attorney and the city clerk
to conduct a three-hour
citizens forum on a saturday
in 2012.

The resolution also directed
staff to report back to
council on the actual costs
of holding the forum and
later in the presentation
I'll have an itemized cost

of holding that forum.

At your work session on
AUGUST THE 21st, IF YOU
Will remember, council had a
discussion about the forum
and gave staff the following
you wanted a
forum that would allow for
posted and open
communications from
citizens, you wanted a forum
that would arow for
discussion with citizens
during the forum, you wanted
to ensure that there was
adequate public promotion of
the events, you wanted the
forum to be recorded, you
said that you wanted the
cost impact to be limited
and it was agreed that the
forum should be held on

saturday, october

27th, FROM 9:00 A.M. TO 12

Noon in the council chamber.

On this next slide is the

proposed agenda format

starting with -- with

introductory remarks by the

mayor and council are those

members that will be in

attendance.

We're going to have two

citizens communication

segments.

We're going to have a

general citizens

communication segment and an

open citizens communication

segment and on the next

slide, I'll go into greater

detail.

And then we'll adjourn at or
before 12 noon.

Under the general citizens
communication, this is
pretty much going to be
identical to what occurs
during a regular council
meeting.

However, during a regular
council meeting we allow for
a maximum of 10 speakers.

For the citizens forum,
however, we're going to
allow for a maximum of 20
individuals who can sign up
to speak.

You will have to reg -- they
will have to register in

advance and the sign-up
period will last for
approximately a week from
october the 13th to
OCTOBER THE 20th.

Speakers will be able to
speak or testify before
council for up to three
minutes and there will be no
donation of time.

One of the things that i
just wants to remind council
is that council can engage
in a discussion on topics
that citizens sign up to
speak on, since they were
posted in advance.

On the following citizens
communication segment, we
will allow a -- the number

of speakers will be limited
by the length of the
meeting.

Speakers will not have to
register in advance.

They will be able to sign up
on the day of the forum, up
to 30 minutes to speak and
there will be no donation of
time.

The way we intend to get the
word out about the forum is
residents will be notified
through announcements on the
city's website at
gov, certainly
the city's facebook and
twitter accounts, on channel
6 and staff is going to
recommend having the mayor

mention the forum at
upcoming work sessions and
council meetings.

On this slide, this is a
updated cost estimate to
hold the forum.

I think initially we had
provided the council with an
initial cost of \$630, you
will see a much different
figure here.

You will itemized
listing that includes media
support, channel 6
production staffing,
utilities, services, closed
captioning for a grant total
of 1,658.

So the time line from today,

assuming council approval of
the format that I have
outlined in this
presentation is beginning
tomorrow, we would like to
have the first release of
media announcements.

AND THEN ON OCTOBER 13th,
That will begin our speaker
signup.

Which will last for a week.

All the way through october
20 to end of speaker signup
and then conducting the
FORUM ON OCTOBER THE 27th.

And as I mentioned
previously, the mayor, we're
going to encourage him to
mention forum at

upcoming meetings and work sessions.

That being cans my presentation, staff is available to answer any questions that you might have?

Questions, colleagues?

Councilmember tovo?

>> Tovo: One quick question.

Mostly I just wanted to say thank you.

I think this really balances the -- what we were -- the feedback that we were giving you about having an

opportunity for people to
sign up in advance so that
there might be an
opportunity to ask questions
from the dais.

But also to allow people who
just come down that day
to -- to participate and i
think that you have done a
great job of laying out
really describing the forum.

And thinking through those
concerns.

So I think that it's going
to be a really interesting
meeting and I'm excited
about it.

So thank you for working
through the logistics.

I wonder if you could just quickly tell us how to -- how the costs increased, where are the costs increases.

>> Initially what we included in the cost estimate, which was \$630, we had communicated to council originally, included or did not include security staffing and did not include utilities and did not include building services staffing.

We worked with the various departments and appropriate staff to get that, that increased the amount to roughly from 630 maybe

about -- about I guess a
little over a thousand
dollars.

>> Tovo: So typically,
are -- we do have some
security staffing here over
the weekend, but the needs
are greater for this
saturday?

Event?

>> Well, correct.

I think what we're trying to
sort of guesstimate as to
how many people will be
attending this forum.

In the chamber.

So just to make sure because

we certainly don't want to
be in a position where we're
having to call people at the
last moment because we get
more people than we
anticipated so we included
a -- a security officer who
is on contract, a security
officer who is already on
staff, but also a security
supervisor as well.

>> Tovo: I see.

Okay.

And then I guess the same
would be true of the
utilities.

I know when I come by on the
weekends usually the lights
are off.

So --

>> that's correct.

>> Tovo: We will have an
increased utility cost for
sure on a saturday.

>> That's correct.

>> Tovo: Well, thanks very
much.

Again, I'm really looking
forward to it, I appreciate
all of the work that you
have done on it.

>> Cole: Any other
questions?

Okay.

Then without objection, we
will adjourn this special
called meeting of the austin
city council.

Work session.