



**City Council Questions and Answers for
Thursday, October 24, 2013**

These questions and answers are related to the
Austin City Council meeting that will convene at 10:00 AM on
Thursday, October 24, 2013 at Austin City Hall
301 W. Second Street, Austin, TX



**Mayor Lee Leffingwell
Mayor Pro Tem Sheryl Cole
Council Member Chris Riley, Place 1
Council Member Mike Martinez, Place 2
Council Member Kathie Tovo, Place 3
Council Member Laura Morrison, Place 4
Council Member William Spelman, Place 5**

The City Council Questions and Answers Report was derived from a need to provide City Council Members an opportunity to solicit clarifying information from City Departments as it relates to requests for council action. After a City Council Regular Meeting agenda has been published, Council Members will have the opportunity to ask questions of departments via the City Manager's Agenda Office. This process continues until 5:00 p.m. the Tuesday before the Council meeting. The final report is distributed at noon to City Council the Wednesday before the council meeting.

QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL

1. Agenda Items # 2 & # 3

- a. **QUESTION:** Resolution 20130523-069 directed an interdepartmental team to begin collecting data on September 1, 2013 measuring any effect that participation in multifamily energy efficiency rebates have on rental prices for properties receiving rebates (individual or cumulative) over \$50,000. When is it anticipated that data related to rental rates will be included in back-up for multifamily properties receiving rebates. **COUNCIL MEMBER TOVO**
- b. **ANSWER:** A question has been raised as to whether rental rates will be included in RCA back-up materials for multi-family properties receiving rebates that individually or cumulatively exceed \$50,000. The question relates to Resolution 20130523-069, which directed an interdepartmental team to begin collecting data on September 1, 2013 measuring any effect that participation in multifamily energy efficiency rebates has on rental prices for properties receiving rebates (individual or cumulative) over \$50,000. Based on the language of the resolution, there are to be two reports, one on December 1 and the other on June 1. In the data gathering and analysis plans provided by Austin Energy, data will be gathered from Investors Interest so that the rental data will be standardized and comparable. This data is gathered on a quarterly basis. The data gathering timing fits within the required reporting periods per the resolution. In order to maintain consistency of data and validity across data sets, Austin Energy recommended using one single, consistent data source with reporting that corresponded to the requirements of the resolution. The resolution also calls for specific rental data both for rebated properties and comparable properties within specific time frames, and over a period of years. It was believed, and reported in the process documentation, that the focus would be on the two reporting dates per the resolution to maintain reliability and accuracy of data. This recommended reporting process was presented to the Electric Utility Commission, the Community Development Commission, and the City Council. Data gathering began prior to September 1 and is on target for the first report to be released December 1. Though Investors Interest could collect ad hoc information on specific properties, as and when these customers apply for rebates, the cost of collecting this data would be significant and would impact the overall cost effectiveness of the program.

2. Agenda Items # 18 & # 19

- a. QUESTION: Please provide the total costs associated with both the 2012 and 2013 AFD hiring processes. Please include any recruiting costs, consultant fees, vender costs for implementation, and any other related costs such as staff time or venue rentals. COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ
 - b. ANSWER: See attachment
3. Agenda Item # 23
 - a. QUESTION: The RCA states funding for this purchase will be derived from parkland dedication fees and 2006 Prop 3 Bond funds. The CIP Budget Fiscal Note describes the funding source solely from the 2006 Bond Funds. Please clarify the discrepancy. COUNCIL MEMBER MORRISON
 - b. ANSWER: The fiscal note is correct; PARD is no longer proposing use of Parkland Dedication (PLD) funds for this proposed acquisition. ORES will work with the Agenda Office to ensure the appropriate corrections are reflected in the permanent record.
4. Agenda Item # 25
 - a. QUESTION: What city facilities, departments, or functions will be located at this site? COUNCIL MEMBER SPELMAN
 - b. ANSWER: The acquisition of this 5.179 acre tract along North IH-35 is a unique opportunity to address a key component of the City's Strategic Facility & Logistics Roadmap Plan, as it is adjacent to the 13.087 acre tract the City previously purchased for the planned New Municipal Court and Austin Police Northeast Substation. By combining the tracts, the City will have much more flexibility to site the New Municipal Court and Sub-Station, that will revitalize the 19 acres which is currently mostly asphalt, in a way that is consistent with Imagine Austin, including high-quality urban design. This proposed acquisition will also allow the City to potentially address other city administrative and space needs. In addition, this flexibility will also allow the City to create a gateway to the St Johns neighborhood. Upon successful acquisition of the property, staff will complete a land plan for the site. We would expect to return to City Council early in 2014 to provide an update on this plan, as well as financial considerations for build-out.
5. Agenda Items # 26 - # 35
 - a. QUESTION: For each of the items related to approving annexation ordinances (# 26-# 35, except # 33 which doesn't have a service plan attached), the attached service plans reference the level of public safety to be provided upon the effective date of the annexation. Staff stated that the effective dates are either in November or December of 2013 for the 3,800+ acres to be annexed. The service plans state APD will provide normal patrols and responses, handling of complaints and incident reports, and special units.

What is the anticipated level of coverage that APD plans to provide? Will operational adjustments to provide coverage affect current staffing in those or other APD regions/districts? Please provide a fiscal note as appropriate.
COUNCIL MEMBER RILEY

b. ANSWER: See attachment

6. Agenda Item # 46

a. QUESTION: What makes a Ford Explorer the best replacement for a Crown Victoria? COUNCIL MEMBER SPELMAN

b. ANSWER: See attachment

7. Agenda Item # 51

a. QUESTION: Please provide responses to each of the Austin Music Commission's recommendations. COUNCIL MEMBER MORRISON

b. ANSWER: See attachment

8. Agenda Item # 56

a. QUESTION: Please provide the following information for all previously executed Chapter 380 agreements: 1) Regarding construction workers – commitment to pay prevailing wage or living wage or both, 2) Regarding full-time or contract workers for the company involved in the Ch. 380 agreement - commitment to pay living wage, 3) Please specify whether the agreements were job based or property tax abatements, and the percentage given in each case.
COUNCIL MEMBER RILEY

b. ANSWER: See attachment

c. QUESTION: Please provide the data from pages 35-36 of the economic development incentive report for prior projects. COUNCIL MEMBER SPELMAN

d. ANSWER: See attachment

9. Agenda Item # 58

a. QUESTION: 1) Council has passed ordinances that have generally reduced parking requirement and provided credit for on street parking. Please provide an outline of the work that has been codified and initiated relating to changes to parking code requirements in the past two years. 2) Are there legal considerations to be made in allowing businesses to identify certain public parking spaces as meeting their parking requirements while neighboring businesses may not share comparable benefit? 3) How does the city avoid conflict of needs between neighboring businesses and track parking

designations through changes of business and time for a property? COUNCIL MEMBER MORRISON

b. ANSWER: See attachment

10. Agenda Item # 61


a. QUESTION: Please provide a written report on APD research on national 24-hr bike trails curfew and policing practices discussed at Oct 16 worksession. COUNCIL MEMBER TOVO


b. ANSWER: See attachment.

c. QUESTION: It is my understanding that curfews may not be imposed on trails constructed with any federal funds. Could PWD verify this? If true, could PWD provide information on whether any federal funds have been utilized in the construction of any trails in the pilot program. COUNCIL MEMBER TOVO

d. ANSWER: PARD and PWD have confirmed that there are no requirements to keep trails open 24 hours per day under the federal funding programs the City has used/is using to construct trail projects. PARD and PWD have also confirmed that no federal funds were used on the trails in the pilot program (Butler, Johnston, and Shoal Creek).

END OF REPORT - ATTACHMENTS TO FOLLOW

 *The City of Austin is committed to compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Reasonable modifications and equal access to communications will be provided upon request.*

 *For assistance please call (512) 974-2210 OR (512) 974-2445 TDD.*



Council Question and Answer

Related To	Agenda Items # 18 & # 19	Meeting Date	October 24, 2013
------------	--------------------------	--------------	------------------

Additional Answer Information

QUESTION: Please provide the total costs associated with both the 2012 and 2013 AFD hiring processes. Please include any recruiting costs, consultant fees, vender costs for implementation, and any other related costs such as staff time or venue rentals. COUNCIL MEMBER MARTINEZ

ESTIMATED AFD Recruiting and Hiring Costs: 2012 and 2013 Hiring Cycles*

Recruiting Process	2012	2013
Personnel	\$489,766	\$345,980
Services Other	\$18,987	\$17,987
Ads/Printing/Promotional	\$60,457	\$64,868
Memberships/Subscriptions	\$1,387	\$7,589
Recruiting Travel & Fleet	\$36,091	\$25,290
Other	\$3,433	\$5,354
Recruiting Total	\$610,121	\$467,068

Hiring Process	2012	2013	2013 changes**
Test Vendor (I/O & Morris McDaniel)	\$93,735	\$233,190	Videotaping interviews & paying assessors
City Paid Assessors	\$58,260	\$0	2012 City paid 76 assessors reviewed 1280 interviews over 5 days
Testing Supplies/Copies	\$7,805	\$965	
Venue	\$5,313	\$35,657	2013 - interviews done at Bowie HS and assessments done at Palmer
Assessor Support	\$7,231	\$33,023	2013 - 67 assessors reviewed 2018 interviews over 9 days
Candidate Screening	\$56,788	\$5,501	
Hiring Total	\$229,131	\$308,336	

*Cost estimate does NOT include hours worked by AFD employees from other areas of the department.

**Test Vendor requirements changed significantly from 2012 to 2013, including...

In 2012 - IO Solutions did not participate in test administration including copying materials and hiring assessors. In 2013 - Morris & McDaniel delivered the written test and was onsite during its administration. M&M also videotaped 2018 candidate interviews and hired/paid local assessors to score interviews.



Council Question and Answer

Related To	Agenda Items # 26-# 35	Meeting Date	October 24, 2013
------------	------------------------	--------------	------------------

Additional Answer Information

QUESTION: For each of the items related to approving annexation ordinances (# 26-# 35, except # 33 which doesn't have a service plan attached), the attached service plans reference the level of public safety to be provided upon the effective date of the annexation. Staff stated that the effective dates are either in November or December of 2013 for the 3,800+ acres to be annexed. The service plans state APD will provide normal patrols and responses, handling of complaints and incident reports, and special units. What is the anticipated level of coverage that APD plans to provide? Will operational adjustments to provide coverage affect current staffing in those or other APD regions/districts? Please provide a fiscal note as appropriate. COUNCIL MEMBER RILEY

ANSWER: As with all our annexations, we will provide the same level of police presence we provide throughout the entire city. At this time, the newly annexed areas will be included in their surrounding or abutting district and the district officers will include these new areas in their patrols as appropriate. Our uncommitted time is currently at 19% so our officers have limited time to provide random patrols, but these areas will be equitably included in those patrols. It does appear that most of the annexed areas are undeveloped at this time and should not create a significant increase in calls for service.

Incidents that do occur in the newly annexed areas that require follow-up investigations will be assigned to the area detective unit that handles cases for that area. Likewise, incidents or crime trends that require follow-up from a specialized unit will be handled by the area units (Metro Tactical unit, District Representative unit, etc.) or centralized specialized units (SWAT, Organized Crime, etc.) as appropriate.

APD continuously monitors the alignment of our sector boundaries through metrics such as response times, caseloads, and calls for service. Realignment the boundaries is a significant task that we undertake once the data shows it is necessary to correct an imbalance.

Planning and Development Review staff states that in terms of a fiscal note, this year's annexation areas include no residents.



Council Question and Answer

Related To	Agenda Items #46	Meeting Date	October 24, 2013
-------------------	------------------	---------------------	------------------

Additional Answer Information

QUESTION: What makes a Ford Explorer the best replacement for a Crown Victoria? COUNCIL MEMBER SPELMAN

ANSWER: APD worked with Fleet, Purchasing, and the Sustainability office in 2012/13 to determine what was the most appropriate replacement vehicle for the Ford Crown Victoria. Selection criteria included miles per gallon, emissions, interior space (rear for prisoner transport and front for computer, shotgun, camera, and other space needs). We evaluated the 6 and 8 cylinder Dodge Charger, the 6 and 8 cylinder Chevy Caprice, Ford Interceptor, and Chevrolet Tahoe. The Interceptor UV (Explorer platform) was selected as a result of the study findings, specifically:

- Adequate room for electronic and other equipment.
- Adequate room for safely and securely transporting prisoners.
- All-wheel drive for improved handling, especially in adverse weather conditions.
- Higher ground clearance is expected to reduce maintenance costs associated with undercarriage damage.
- Fuel economy estimates that exceed the current generation of Crown Victoria and is comparable to or better than the other current options.
- Uses E85 fuel.
- Cost was better than all current options except the smaller Ford Police Interceptor Sedan.
- The vehicle has an increased ground clearance but is still stable in emergency driving situations.
- Some existing equipment in the existing Crown Victoria will fit and can be utilized in the Ford Police Interceptor Utility Vehicle.

I have attached a spreadsheet that highlights the findings of the study that led to the selection of the Ford UV as the appropriate patrol vehicle for APD. Let me know if you need any additional information.

Total Cost of Ownership Analysis - 7 Year / 70,000 Mile Lifecycle

MAKE	Dodge	Dodge	Ford	Ford	Chevy	Chevy	Chevy	Ford
VEHICLE MODEL	Charger V6	Charger V8	Interceptor Sedan	Interceptor SUV	Tahoe Police Pursuit	Caprice V6	Caprice V8	Crown Victoria
Miles Driven	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000
Acquisition Cost	\$29,668	\$31,653	\$26,958	\$28,821	\$33,177	\$31,302	\$31,302	\$28,500
Fuel Used Over Lifecycle of Vehicle (gallons)	7,353	6,579	7,813	8,333	8,929	7,353	8,929	8,929
Lifetime Fuel Cost	\$19,913	\$17,817	\$21,158	\$22,568	\$24,180	\$19,913	\$24,180	\$24,180
Total Maintenance Costs	\$10,833	\$10,833	\$10,833	\$10,833	\$10,833	\$10,833	\$10,833	\$10,833
End of Life Resale Value	-\$2,967	-\$3,165	-\$2,696	-\$2,882	-\$3,318	-\$3,130	-\$3,130	-\$2,850
Net Cost of Ownership (sum)	\$57,447	\$57,137	\$56,252	\$59,340	\$64,872	\$58,917	\$63,184	\$60,663
Net Cost of Ownership (NPV)	\$54,409	\$54,380	\$53,019	\$55,976	\$61,401	\$55,910	\$59,679	\$57,106
Environmental								
Lifecycle CO2 Equivalent (metric tons)	45.59	55.66	48.44	51.67	55.36	45.59	55.36	55.36

Vehicle Costs - LDT Sedan	Acquisition	Fuel	Maintenance	Resale	Total
Interceptor Sedan	\$26,958	\$21,158	\$10,833	-\$2,696	\$56,252
Charger V8	\$31,653	\$17,817	\$10,833	-\$3,165	\$57,137
Charger V6	\$29,668	\$19,913	\$10,833	-\$2,967	\$57,447
Caprice V6	\$31,302	\$19,913	\$10,833	-\$3,130	\$58,917
Interceptor SUV	\$28,821	\$22,568	\$10,833	-\$2,882	\$59,340
Crown Victoria	\$28,500	\$24,180	\$10,833	-\$2,850	\$60,663
Caprice V8	\$31,302	\$24,180	\$10,833	-\$3,130	\$63,184
Tahoe Police Pursuit	\$33,177	\$24,180	\$10,833	-\$3,318	\$64,872

Vehicle Emissions - LDT Sedan	CO2
Charger V6	45.59
Charger V8	55.66
Interceptor Sedan	48.44
Interceptor SUV	51.67
Tahoe Police Pursuit	55.36
Caprice V6	45.59
Caprice V8	55.36
Crown Victoria	55.36



Council Question and Answer

Related To	Agenda Items #51	Meeting Date	October 24, 2013
------------	------------------	--------------	------------------

Additional Answer Information

QUESTION: Please provide responses to each of the Austin Music Commission's recommendations. COUNCIL MEMBER MORRISON

Responses to Comments made by the Music Commission

The Music Commission did not make any recommendations, but made a list of concerns and then voted on the list.

Section 1-A clarify that ACE and appeal team are different people ☐ Section 4-15-1(1) (*Definitions*) of the ordinance defines "Appeal Team". Specifically, it is the inter-departmental team of directors of city departments that participate in the Austin Center for Events (ACE). Section 4-15-2 (Austin Center for Events) states that ACE will be comprised of the employees from City departments that regulate, permit, or host special events. Department Directors are not actively involved in the decisions made by staff related to specific special events.

Section 1-6 - Definition of Impact (too many things could be interpreted as Impacting); create definition for Normal ☐ Section 4-15-1(7) (*Definitions*) includes a definition of Impact.

"IMPACT means to impede, obstruct, impair, or interfere with normal vehicular or pedestrian traffic."

In this case the normal flow is the traffic that flows on the street or walks on the sidewalk; abnormal would be for the flow to be diverted or backed-up.

Section 2-A - Incorporate the description stated in the Findings into 2(A): ☐ Shall create Austin Center for Events as the interdepartmental special events team ☐ . ☐ – The current language in the draft ordinance creates an interdepartmental team. Section 4-15-2(A) (*Austin Center for Events*) states "[t]he City Manager shall create an Austin Center for Events (ACE) to carry out the responsibilities under this chapter. ACE will be comprised of employees from City departments that regulate, permit, or host special events."

Section 2-C - Make districts plural – Because City Code Section 1-1-4(B) states "[t]he singular includes the plural and the plural includes the singular", it is not necessary to make "district" plural. ACE will have the authority to create more than one district if needed.

Section 2-E-6 - Include reasonable number of days for interdepartmental review to take place. – Until the Council adopts the ordinance and staff determines the staff needed to implement, can a reasonable timeframe be determined. Staff would hope by the next budget cycle to be able to lay out for the Council, for example, with current resources we can provide a response in X days or with Y resources we can provide a response in 15 days.

Section 2 - Add a section (F) allowing the City to enter into a multi-year agreement with event producers. ☐ There is nothing in the proposed ordinance that would preclude the City Council from entering into a multi-year agreement. The City Attorney's office would then have to evaluate a specific agreement to determine whether legal issues exist.

Section 21 - Definition of tiers and numbers are inadequate (specifically Tier 2 which only has a number of people on public land, not private) – In response to these comments, staff modified the definition of Tier 2 to

add a 2,500 attendee limit to events on private property. The 2500 person limit is comparable to the mass gathering threshold. So any event that would have triggered a mass gathering permit, would then fall into Tier 3.

Section 22 - A Definition of Form needs some work. – This section has been rewritten based on the feedback from the music commission. It now reads:

“(A) A person shall obtain a special event permit issued by ACE before the person may conduct, manage, or operate a special event.”

Section 25(A) - May instead of Shall ☐ **number of Special Event Permits within the District MAY be limited** ☐ – The special event district will be created by ACE if there is a need to limit activity. If there is no need to limit activity, it will not be created.

Section 27 - Delete the word ☐ **written,** ☐ **so can be boilerplate on the permit application.** – The Music Commission asked that this word be taken out so that in the future the indemnification agreement could be done online. Staff recommends keeping for now, and if technology and the law allow such agreements in the future, that the issue can be revisited.

Section 31-B-1-D - Zoning of location – simplify to residential or commercial – The current zoning of a property determines what activities can occur by right and what might require additional permits. As a result, the actual zoning of the property needs to be provided to ACE. There are on-line resources to determine the zoning.

Section 31-B-9-b - Add ☐ **to the public, if any** ☐ – Staff will clarify in the rules that the statement of the fees applies to the people attending the event, and not to the contractual relationships between the event producer and the people who are paying them for booths or the like.

Section 34-E - Tier 2 getting only one day notice is not adequate – This is not intended to say that staff will hold up a permit until the last day, but reflects the fact that small events may not be setup until the last day.

Section 50 - A may instead of must, to allow scalability for smaller events – The ordinance provides the framework and the rules will address the specifics of a public safety plan based on the activities, number of attendees, and location of the special event. The public safety plan required for a block party will be significantly less than that for SXS.W.

Section 51-B-5 - Add: ☐ **in the event, on that day** ☐ – If an individual works a special event as private security for the special event, they cannot participate or consume alcohol while working the event. These prohibitions do not apply if the individual is not working the special event.

Concern about Notification process – Proposed section 4-15-33 states that the event organizer will provide notification consistent with Rules adopted in accordance with Chapter 1-2, which provides an opportunity for the public to comment. There was extensive discussion on this issue in the last rewrite of Code Section 14-8. Feedback received earlier this year was the process should be changed. Staff will begin the process of developing the new rules once this Ordinance is adopted.

Consolidate PARD and ACE timeline/deadlines/processes – PARD has been an active participant in the process to develop this ordinance. ACE will continue to work with PARD staff to coordinate activities and processes

How are rules set & approved? Discussed idea of a Rules Committee to vet. – Rules will be adopted in accordance with Chapter 1-2 (*Adoption of Rules*). The Rules process includes opportunities for internal review by all City Departments and for citizens to make comments concerning the proposed rules. The rules process requires a Director (or ACE) to provide a justification of the adopted rule, and the reasons why the department may disagree with written comments that it received. An individual can appeal an adopted rule to the City Manager. The Rules to support the Special Events Ordinance will cover a wide range of issues from security to trash diversion. The staff that deals with those issues on a daily basis must develop the tools needed to implement the ordinance.

Concerned about high-capacity venues permits. Does not really fit in this ordinance. – Staff has continued to work with the one venue that meets the definition of a high capacity venue. This proposed permit provides an opportunity for an annual permit that controls all types of events within a venue, without requiring that each event seek a special events permit. It would still require that the health and safety issues be addressed, scaled to the events, so the plan works for a 140,000 spectator race or a 14,000 spectator concert.

Company/Project Name	Commitment to pay prevailing wage, or living wage, or both to construction workers.	Commitment to pay living wage to Company full-time or contract workers.	Incentive Type	Incentive Amount
Advisory Board	No	No	Jobs-Based	\$190/job
ATDF	No	No	Property Tax	100%
Apple	No	No	Property Tax	100% Years 1-6; 80% Years 7-10 if only Phase I completed; 100% Years 7-10 if Phase II completed
Domain	No	No	Property Tax and Sales Tax	25% Property Tax; 80% Sales Tax Years 1-5, 50% Sales Tax Years 6-15
eBay	No	No	Jobs-Based	\$250/job*
Facebook	No	No	Jobs-Based	\$100/job
Friday Night Lights	No	No	Jobs-Based and Sales Tax	\$40,000/year Years 1-2; All Other Years, 50% of Sales Taxes and City Fees Paid plus \$95/employee
Hanger Ortho	No	No	Performance-Based	\$50,000/year
HelioVolt	No	No	Property Tax	60%
Hewlett Packard	No	No	Property Tax	40%
HID Global	No	No	Property Tax	60%
Home Depot	No	No	Property Tax	100%
LegalZoom	No	No	Performance-Based	\$20,000/year
National Instruments	Company agreed to pay the higher of prevailing wage or \$11 per hour.	Yes	Property Tax	50%
Samsung	No	No	Property Tax	100% Years 1-10, 75% Years 11-20
Sunpower	No	No	Jobs-Based	\$233/job*
US Farathane	No	No	Property Tax	40%
Visa	Company agreed to pay the higher of prevailing wage or \$11 per hour.	No	Jobs-Based	\$250/job*

*Please note that this amount per-job exceeds the maximum per-job incentive of \$200/job in the proposed revision of the Firm-Based Incentive Matrix.

Exhibit D Council Meeting: October 24, 2013
Evaluations of Incentivized Companies

Agenda Item #56

Company	Home Depot	Samsung Advanced	HP	Hanger	Facebook	LegalZoom	SunPower	eBay	The Advisory Board Software / Convergence Technology
Target Sector	Technology	Manufacturing	Technology	Life Sciences, Back-Office, HQ	Technology	Back-Office, Regional HQ	Back-Office	Technology	
Project Description	Data Center	300 MM Wafer Manufacturing Plant	Data Center	HQ and back- office operations	Regional office	Back-office operations	Back-office operations	Technical engineering support office	Software design center
Matrix Scores									
Economic and Fiscal Impact	30	30	21	20	20	20	20	20	20
Linkages to the Local Economy	15	25	20	25	15	25	25	25	15
Infrastructure Impact	10	5	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Character of Jobs	25	25	20	25	15	15	15	25	25
Quality of Life	5	10	10	5	5	5	10	10	10
Total	85	95	81	85	65	75	80	90	80
WebLOCI Analysis									
Total Benefits				6,020,220	3,365,990	8,117,246	8,499,298	12,422,407	6,486,095
Total Costs (Excluding Incentive)				(4,595,442)	(2,853,759)	(7,354,146)	(6,790,262)	(8,108,612)	(4,706,534)
Gross Benefit				1,424,778	512,231	763,100	1,709,036	4,313,795	1,779,561
Less: Economic Incentive	(7,187,535)	(62,875,194)	(3,186,191)	(500,000)	(199,500)	(200,000)	(901,710)	(1,206,250)	(372,590)
Net Benefits	**	**	**	924,778	312,731	563,100	807,326	3,107,545	1,406,971
Jobs Information									
Total Jobs Created	500	700	140	250	200	600	450	1,000	239
Average Salary of New Positions	59,000	60,111	60,000	97,343	54,000	42,000	70,000	122,576	90,000
Capital Investment Information									
Real Property	198,000,000	2,500,000,000		-	-	-	-	-	-
Leasehold Improvements	17,000,000			2,114,252	2,250,000	1,000,000	7,500,000	429,822	8,100,000
Machinery and Equipment	189,000,000	1,000,000,000		1,691,401	900,000	750,000	-	4,410,625	-
Furniture and Fixtures				2,938,682		-	2,500,000	104,204	-
Inventory				-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	404,000,000	3,500,000,000	300,000,000	6,744,335	3,150,000	1,750,000	10,000,000	4,944,651	8,100,000
Other Information									
State Enterprise Fund Grant	8,500,000	10,800,000	5,000,000	1,500,000	1,400,000	1,000,000	2,500,000	2,800,000	500,000

Exhibit D Council Meeting: October 24, 2013
Evaluations of Incentivize

Agenda Item #56

Company	US Farathane	Apple	HID Global	Visa	Nat'l Instruments
Target Sector	Automotive / Advanced Manufacturing	Software / Convergence Technology	Advanced Manufacturing / Distribution	Software / Technology	Technology / Research & Development
Project Description	Manufacturing facility	North American Headquarters	Manufacturing and distribution facilities	Global information technology center	Research and development facility
Matrix Scores					
Economic and Fiscal Impact	20	30	20	30	20
Linkages to the Local Economy	15	25	15	15	25
Infrastructure Impact	10	10	10	10	10
Character of Jobs	15	25	15	25	25
Quality of Life	5	10	5	10	10
Total	65	100	65	90	90
WebLOCI Analysis					
Total Benefits	11,568,222	89,774,021	7,721,064	21,828,939	25,577,531
Total Costs (Excluding Incentive)	(10,896,051)	(66,587,592)	(4,543,318)	(13,408,274)	(16,814,122)
Gross Benefit	672,171	23,186,429	3,177,746	8,420,665	8,763,409
Less: Economic Incentive	(212,696)	(8,612,725)	(920,576)	(1,560,000)	(1,667,575)
Net Benefits	459,475	14,573,704	2,257,170	6,860,665	7,095,834
Jobs Information					
Total Jobs Created	228	3,635	276	794	1,000
Average Salary of New Positions	27,159	63,950	51,569	121,107	72,222
Capital Investment Information					
Real Property	-	250,000,000	30,000,000	-	47,000,000
Leasehold Improvements	2,400,000	-	-	18,653,217	-
Machinery and Equipment	24,500,000	32,500,000	6,000,000	-	23,000,000
Furniture and Fixtures	-	-	-	8,659,701	10,000,000
Inventory	-	-	-	-	-
Total	26,900,000	282,500,000	36,000,000	27,312,918	80,000,000
Other Information					
State Enterprise Fund Grant	-	21,000,000	1,900,000	7,900,000	4,400,000



Council Question and Answer

Related To	Agenda Item # 58	Meeting Date	October 24, 2013
------------	------------------	--------------	------------------

Additional Answer Information

QUESTION: 1) Council has passed ordinances that have generally reduced parking requirement and provided credit for on street parking. Please provide an outline of the work that has been codified and initiated relating to changes to parking code requirements in the past two years. 2) Are there legal considerations to be made in allowing businesses to identify certain public parking spaces as meeting their parking requirements while neighboring businesses may not share comparable benefit? 3) How does the city avoid conflict of needs between neighboring businesses and track parking designations through changes of business and time for a property? COUNCIL MEMBER MORRISON

ANSWER 1):

TIMELINE OF ADOPTED PARKING REDUCTIONS

October 2011 □ Ordinance No. 20111006-079 to allow parking reductions in P (Public) zoning districts. The reductions allowed are similar to CBD/DMU parking reductions.

March 2013 - Ordinance No. 20130328-017 to establish a Pilot Program to reduce parking requirements for businesses utilizing trip-reduction strategies. The program was limited to 5 businesses located outside CBD and DMU zoning districts. This ordinance expires on November 3, 2014.

April 2013 - Ordinance No. 20130411-061 amending Chapter 25-6 to include that Off-street motor vehicle parking is not required within the CBD or DMU.

May 2013 □ Ordinance No. 20130523-104 to move parking reductions from Chapter 25-2, Subchapter E to Chapter 25-6 (Transportation).

May 2013 – Regulating Plan for the East Riverside Corridor Zoning District goes into effect based on the East Riverside Corridor Master Plan. Sub-section 4.4.4(A) allows for reductions in the minimum off-street parking requirements in Sub-section 4.4.2 “by one space for each on-street parking space located adjacent to the site. On-street parking utilized to meet minimum parking requirements may at any time be removed or modified by the City of Austin.”

June 2013 – Ordinance No. 20130523-104 goes into effect which amends LDC 25-6-478 to incorporate the parking reductions in the Urban Core previously located in Subchapter E of LDC 25-2. The Code revision 25-6-478(E)(1) states that the minimum off-street parking requirement shall be reduced by “one space for each on-street parking space located adjacent to the site on a public street, including spaces on Internal Circulation Routes that meet public street standards.” LDC 25-6-478(B) identifies the five situations that the parking reductions within the Urban Core do not apply.

August 2013 □ Ordinance No 20130829-105 amending Chapter 25-6 to add the 20% Urban Core parking reduction which was accidentally deleted in the previous code amendment

2) Council cannot act in an arbitrary or capricious manner. In establishing a minimum number of parking spaces for particular uses, however, Council can legitimately consider both its own land use planning objectives and the parking demand that a particular use, or category of uses, is believed to generate.

Establishing reduced parking requirements based on proximity to metered parking is not, on its face, an arbitrary or capricious action, even though there may be policy disagreements regarding whether or to what extent a reduction is appropriate.

Currently, when a site plan comes in for review, they can count all adjacent (to the site) on-street parking spaces (cumulative reduction cannot exceed 40%) to meet their parking requirements. On-street parking spaces are subject to the approval of the Austin Transportation Department Director and the use of the space for parking may be changed as needed to accommodate changes in operations of the street. The metered parking spaces must meet TCM standards regarding dimensions and paving materials.

3) If the spaces are not adjacent to the site, they are not eligible for this reduction. Required parking is tracked through either a site plan, change of use or site plan exemption. Required parking is tracked through either a site plan, change of use or site plan exemption.



Council Question and Answer

Related To

Agenda Items #61

Meeting Date

October 24, 2013

Additional Answer Information

QUESTION: Please provide a written report on APD research on national 24-hr bike trails curfew and policing practices discussed at Oct 16 work session. COUNCIL MEMBER TOVO

ANSWER: Please see the report below.

CITY	POPULATION	MILES OF BIKE TRAILS	HOURS OF OPERATION	POLICE STAFFING MODEL	CONTACT PERSON	EMAIL OR PHONE		
New York, NY	8,175,133	Over 300 miles of off road bike paths	Park closing times are listed individually; ordinance under New York	Police presence in the larger parks, but curfews are decided and enforced on an individual and bureau-wide basis New York City Parks Enforcement Patrol	Hayes Lord of NY DOT	212-839-7205		
San Francisco, CA	900,000		No curfew	No dedicated officers, responds to calls only. They do have certified bike officers.	Sergeant Danielle Newman	415-553-1651		
Seattle, WA	608,660	450 mile (estimate)	No curfew	No dedicated officers - Seattle PD responds to calls only	Detective Mark Jamieson,	(206) 684-5520		
Denver	600,158	Unknown but very large	No curfew	There are random patrols by PD in the urban parks. The much larger parks are patrolled by non-commissioned Park Rangers who utilize PD as needed.	Adminstrator Bob Toll	720-913-0606		
Boston (Enviromental Police)	625,000				Officer Aaron Gross	617-626-1651		
PORTLAND	583776	79	5AM-MIDNIGHT	7 FULL TIME PARK RANGERS (NO POLICE)	SAM SACHS (Rangers)	503-823-1637	Lt. Krueger	503-823-0279
MINNEAPOLIS	382578	58	6AM-MIDNIGHT (Ordinance allows for active transportation and paved and lighted paths 24hrs)	6-8 Park Police Officers on duty from 7a-Midnight	Lt. Robert Goodsell	612-230-6553		
CHICAGO	2.7 MILLION		6AM-11PM	Patrolled by Off-Duty police officers and each of the 25 districts assign one car to park patrol. Patrolled 24 hrs (Ex: 3 cars patrol 27 miles of lake front with bike paths)	Mike Brazel	312-747-2193		
TUCSON	520,116		6AM-10PM	No dedicated patrol. Tucson PD responds to calls for service a	Sgt. Maria Hawke	791-4852		
SAN ANTONIO	1.4 MILLION	72	6AM-11PM	SA has a park police that handles the parks. There are 6 districts and 1 officers assigned to that district who proactively patrol the parks.	Sgt Alam Ryan	210-877-1741		
HOUSTON	2.5 MILLION				Sgt. James Wood	713-308-1500		
DALLAS	1.2 MILLION	?	7AM-12AM	No dedicated officers. Each area of command will dictate how to utilize their resources. Respond to calls for services.	Sgt John Bynum	214-671-4381		