

City Council Work Session Transcript – 03/25/2014

Title: ATXN2

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 3/25/2014 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 3/25/2014

Transcript Generated by SnapStream Enterprise TV Server

=====

[03:04:46]

>> Cole: Y'all ready? All right. I'd like to call this to order the meeting of the work session. Mayor leffingwell is out sick today. So we're going to have to do this work session all on our own. And I think we'll be okay. The first item that we have to discuss is our preselected agenda items. And we have an item full. Councilmember spelman of the office of real estate services. Councilmember spelman. >> Spelman: Thank you mayor pro tem. This is an item to wave lots and LOTS OF Cs FROM THE BOARD OF Regents from the UT system presumably for -- to assist in realigning red river street and building another school. And I'd like to get -- your staff sent me a breakdown of the fees the use of right away which I think of as being rent. If we waive rent, we're doing a professional courtesy for the university of Texas and the state system in a way and not incurring additional costs associated with that. Is that correct? >> Right. A couple of nuances there. It's the rent of the right of way. But in this case, they're building a new road. So it's a bit of a unique project as well. We normally rent right of way for overhang of a structure when they build a private development. In this case, with the red river realignment, they're building an entirely different road. So it's a bit of a different animal than in the past with the right of way fees things. >> I understand how it would make sense for someone building a

[03:06:50]

road for us. I understand when we're going to incur costs for construction. Looking at the fees waived, I get a score of \$1 million to \$1.4 million for things that we're going to have to do for which we're reimbursed. We're going to lose \$1.4 million on this transaction. If not, how not? >> Depends on how you balance the books. With could have approached it differently. We could approach it that it's our own infrastructure that UT is building in this case. We could split the costs that way like a normal C.I.P. Project. We don't charge our own departments for those sort of fees. So in lieu of sharing the cost that way, waiving the fee seemed like the appropriate financial partnership step that we take. Not sure if I explained that right. But UT. And the city could have come together and said for the \$11 million it would take to build this road, the city will pay -- spend \$5.5 million and UT would spend \$5.5 million. We didn't approach it that way. They're spending -- they're incurring all the costs and we're just waiving our fees as our part of that partnership. >> Spelman: I understand that they're building a new road. We're going to have a road at the end of all of this. On the other hand, the city had no plans to move the road itself.

This is not a road which is being moved because the city is asking for it or that the city is going to particularly at least directly benefitted by it. The benefit of the city seems to be from the ut system and they will be able to build a medical school on straight roads rather than the bendy road. >> Initiated by ut. >> Spelman: We're going to inspect, street lights, traffic signals, crosswalk signals. That's going to be about \$1.4 million is our cost. That's our participation in the

[03:08:53]

ut medical school, \$1.4 million plus, however you score, \$3.5 million plus with right away fees waived. >> Correct. >> Spelman: What do we get back to that. >> For one, the partnership in the medical school. Perhaps u.T. Could answer all of the benefits that we've been discussing as a community on the medical school. And so I think it's really the benefits of the medical school that we get back. We get a new facility. It takes place in the old facility. It's a wash. More of a key benefit from the creation of the medical school. >> Spelman: We ought to think about this is this is the city's contribution to the state's development in medical school. >> True. >> Councilman spelman. Tim taylor, president of ut. I would like to get back and give an overview of what's involved in this. There are two parts, one's the medical school. But it's the overall partnership that we have with u.T., Both u.T. Austin and u.T. System with central health and with seton and the replacement with brackenridge. The start of this in the local agreement and the city, excuse me, was specifically related to the building of the new teaching hospital which was supported with the passage of prop 1 and with the 1115 waiver and with the partnership and the collaborative care partnership with that new process they have in place. So what this is going to allow all of us to do, and I say all of us, city, ut, the community itself is to replace the safety net hospital that's presently brackenridge. And so that is the first piece of this. We're going to replace and build a safety net hospital for the hospital in austin. The second part is it will

[03:10:54]

create an entire new area of campus, medical office buildings doing medical school itself. And the seton teaching hospital which is being constructed in partnership with central health. And eventually as you're all aware, the medical innovation district developing south of there. So a lot of the work being done that's contemplated here involves benefitting all of those projects. And so what we're really looking for from the city is what I view as a small participation in the partnership financially for just by -- to give you a small example, the commitment for the ut system for the medical school is \$30 million for the first eight years from the board of regents and \$25 million a year there after. So the commitment from the universities in the hundreds of millions that we're looking at. And we're looking for a little less than \$6 million in fee waiver participation from the city to help support that. >> Spelman: 100 million project. And I understand waiving the right of way fees is -- it's not quite funny money. It's a different situation in a usual case in which we exact a right of way fee. But if you're asking us to incur \$1 million in expenses or waive the fees associated with the millions of dollars in expenses on a \$100 million project. Make it a \$101 million project and we could continue to spend the money on what we usually spend it on, parks, libraries, stuff like that. This is cash. We have to pay this. It's bonding out. >> There's no cash. It's staff time involved. The concept is they wouldn't be on another project. We're not staffing up for this project.

>> Spelman: A million dollars of cost is a million dollars in cost. >> It's budgeted costs for the staff time.
>> Spelman: It's budgeted costs. All right, so there's \$1 million of value that our staff would be doing that they're not able to

[03:12:54]

do because they're working on this project in which they're not being reimbursed. Accurate? >> It adds up over the entire budget for the year for the what they're tasked to do. This is work they'll be doing that I suppose you could say they're going to be doing another project. We anticipate work coming onboard this, is planning review staff. We anticipate that work. That's what they're staffed up to do. >> Spelman: One more issue. One more question about this. This is I got the list in front of me. I don't know if you've seen it. There's less items right of ways fees for state parking. >> That's coming out. Yeah. We can't waive the state's fees. >> Spelman: I was wondering -- >> you're welcome to try, councilmember. >> Spelman: Okay, not just between \$1 million and \$1.4 million, depending on how you score it, it's just \$1 million. >> Thanks very much. To clarify, the u.T. Project estimate in this initial face is \$330 million. The seton teaching hospital budget varies -- that number is around \$300 million. >> Spelman: Add those numbers or a subset of the other? >> Add them together. 600 million in this initial phase, stage one of the medical district. >> Spelman: Seems like a big project. Look forward to seeing it. >> Cole: Thank you. >> Riley: Mayor pro tem. >> Cole: Councilmember riley? >> Riley: I appreciate you being here to answer the questions. I fully support the partnership. I see I which it makes sense to waive the fees in this case. I have one question about the city's interest in the road upon the conclusion of all of this work. There are roads that go through u.T. That u.T. Has control over and the city does not have control over. But what can you tell us about the future of red river street in terms of who will have control over future improvements to that road?

[03:14:54]

>> Councilmember, austin transportation department. The agreement we worked out with u.T. Is that the city will maintain the road authorization to manage that road through the university. Because -- or through that piece of the new university because it connects to red river on either side, which is an important corridor. We've also made sure that there is pedestrian bicycle access through there as well as the auto. The street will change character as it becomes integrated within that piece of the campus and we've worked through that with the university and believe that we can manage it appropriately. >> Riley: In what respect will it change character? >> Well, it will still provide a through -- you know, the through capacity for through streets. But already that piece of red river is really a local access and is the campus surrounds it, it will be more local access. It will feel more like a local street. We're very aware we need to maintain the ability to have the through capacity there. So it's a balancing of that street. The actual design of the street is being worked out. The final design will make it feel like you want to go slower through that piece of the campus. So we're trying to slow the street down. Not make it that way one way or the other. Not give it the pedestrian environment. >> Riley: So the authority of making the decisions with the character of the street will remain with the city now and going forward? >> Yes, even though u.T. Will be building it, we worked out the concepts of how it can be done. But the street, the

pedestrian crossings and so forth, the signalization will remain the city's responsibility. >> Riley: Thanks. >> Cole: Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: A quick question. Thank you, it was good information to have. Would you mind making available the information you provided, councilmember spelman, in the

[03:16:55]

q&a process? >> Spelman: Sure. >> Tovo: Thanks. >> Cole: Any other questions I want to thank the university for being here. I'm glad we're waiving fees essentially and there's no cash involved. >> I want to thank everyone on behalf of the university. Everyone knows how important it is for the city. If you've been to any of the luncheons that we've hosted, we talk about the next big thing. Everybody repeats. This is the biggest thing that will happen in my lifetime. I'm amazed at what an impact it will have on our city and in particular our ability to care for the less fortunate with what we'll be doing with the med school. So thank you you for your participation and support in that. >> Cole: Thank you. The next item we have is also pulled by councilmember spelman. Item number 37. >> Spelman: This is a resolution to ensure that we're taking adequate care of housing and if I can read between the lines, make sure that our train does not create opportunities for gentrification and displace people living on the train route? Is that accurate? >> Cole: Councilmember morrison? Do you want to fill that in a little bit? >> Morrison: Yes. That's one of the issues, we're taking care to not inordinately displace people. It's in the framework of the new starts program and the valuation criteria that came out in last august. And I know we had staff here on robin. You want to speak to it. The new starts criteria for evaluating proposals that we're thinking will be part of the funding stream, hopefully as you know. The new starts criteria is very clear about wanting to ensure there are programs or policies in place and funding streams to make sure that what we end up with is -- is a diverse set of people that have access to rail.

[03:19:00]

So gentrification is one part of it. But being more proactive than that. >> Spelman: I know in the new starts program, there's a lot of criteria. I saw rob a moment ago. I wonever if he or someone on his staff can walk through how we are -- what we are doing as a staff to ensure we can get to all of the marks on the new start program, including this piece of it. >> Assistant director, transportation department. We -- the -- the project connect central corridor team has been talking with housing, economic development, planning development review and starting to discuss the factors involved. Half of the criteria, the weighting criteria for projects is related to plans and policies to implement density afford about, connectivity, all of those issues. So the discussions have begun with this resolution. I think we'll be making the report back to council shortly on where we're at and identify potential programs that could enhance. Because there's two components. One is what are we currently doing? What impact do we have in place. What impact did the poll spis have? One is putting those in funding to move towards the future. Both of those are important about the criteria. >> Spelman: Could you give us a sense about what to put in place that we don't currently have in order to support this? >> Well, I don't know. That may be where our expert folks here could talk about. But I think the main thing is that roughly 30% of the criterias related to stationary

[03:21:01]

of population density, about 30% is total employment served. 30% of proportion of legally binding affordable housing. And 10% pedestrian accessibility, the availability of parking. The cost of parking is involved with that also. >> Right, this is Robert Spiller, director. If I could add a couple of things. You know, when this region opened up the red line, of course, we looked at the major stations on the redline and the plans for those stations. And so I would suspect that that would be very appropriate as the alignment firms up. We'll be having a briefing here at this council meeting where we'll talk about the potential linement and another chance for council to weigh in. All based on recommendations coming from CKA and Mayor's subcommittee on that. That will be coming towards council. But the current alignment presented to Capital Metro yesterday certainly gives a nod towards some specific activities and densification and portability to transit needs to be discussed whether that's Highland East Riverside area or various places along the alignment, the central corridor. The particular alignment that's being looked at I think has interesting things. A lot of what that does is giving access to employment. If it reaches out to other elements of the transit system or the transit network, then it gives access to residential locations. So it moves into the next phase, not only looking at density policies and the policies along the alignment that are similar policies on the high capacity elements that it connects to,

[03:23:04]

metro rapid or metrorail. Can we strengthen the connectivity through the corridors. I think it's important through the current item in council, that are bus routes. Bus routes are there also to not just think of folks within a half mile of the investment but also within a half mile or a quarter mile of the major bus lines that will help feed the system. So that's important as well. Balancing that, speed and reliability, that's been the concern councilmember through the transit working group and the CKA process making sure we have a reliable one as well. >> Spelman: As I understand it, you're hitting all of the marks on the new start stuff now, you're hitting the meetings, finding what you have to put in place. Probably because new starts is head in the right direction. If we want to train to be successful, we need density around the train stations for employment and the feed. We need affordable housing. Pedestrians need to walk there. We're doing all that stuff. It seems to me we're focusing on CKA and to a lesser extent as a whole where the train goes and where the train operates or whether it's the train and VRT and so on. It's different aspects of the transportation. You need to do what you're doing which is focusing on everything else. In addition to fulfilling the new starts criteria and getting the rating from the FTA so we can qualify on it as we can get, we need to get through that other group first, which is a public vote. It seems to me that the public's vote is going to be determined less by the aspects of the transit alternative we choose, and more by the effects it's going to have on the quality of life which is exactly what you're talking about. The sooner we can bring forward the kind of results of the investigations you're having and

[03:25:04]

the kind of things that we're going to have to do in order to support -- I'll call it a trade, I'm pretty sure it

won't be a train, we're going bring that forward and give the public some time to chew on it and get used to it and think about it. The more likely it is that when we go to november, the public will not be surprised, we'll understand what we're trying to do and we'll have a better sense that this is going to improve the quality of their lives. >> Absolutely. >> Spelman: The sooner we can get it in the open, the better off we're all going to be. >> Councilmember, thanks for that advice. You're absolutely right. One of the things we learned, at least from the consultant teams we're working on is almost, austin is right for high-capacity transit in terms of all of the necessary criteria, if you will, that the preceding criteria we had the density because of how we've grown. We had the major institutions, the multiple destinations. We had a lot of pluses, even now, focusing in on the alignment and particular stations, hopefully we'll start hearing us talk about the destination locations in terms of the communities, neighborhoods, major destinations. You hear us talking about acc high land, connected to u.T., the med school, connected to the very retail grocery shopping opportunities along the corridors. And the major districts like south river or river side or the pleasant valley area. Because it will help people, I think, focus in on what the benefits, the quality of life as you said. And now that we have alignments starting to crystallize, we're going to be able to start talking about specifics, about benefits of this connects to a lot of the affordable housing opportunities. Not just for the working folks here in austin, but also for future students at u.T. So that's exactly where I think we'll be going. >> Spelman: Okay. What timetable do we have for that? >> As soon as we can get started on it. >> Spelman: As soon as possible is not a number. >> No, inunderstand.

[03:27:06]

I believe the item from council describes in -- the end date when we need to come to council by mid june. I will tell you that that brings sweat to my brow thinking about how fast we need to get moving. And so we'll start talking this week about forming those groups and getting going. I think we tooef already been talking and we already have some of that infrastructure in place. So it's a matter of focusing and bringing that to the public. >> Spelman: June 14? >> Yeah, I believe scott has input. >> Actually, we've been working internally. Sorry, scott gross, austin connect and transportation department. We've been leading a t.O.D. Brainstorming group. It's been an opportunity for us to present new starts criteria. With the focus affordability and the effectiveness of the plans and policies that are in EFFECT FOR T.O.D.s, WE'RE Starting to take a look at those. A lot of this work is already under way. So it's nice to have a formal kick in the pants to get it out there. But we are headed in that direction and we really appreciate that you all recognize that it's more than just this service. It's a lot of other elements that need to be put in place >> Spelman: Right. When will the t.O.D. Policy be something we can talk about. >> I have to defer to christine. Right now we're looking at recommendations that we can make to the code team and whether or not there might be amendments to land development code. In advance to that, we don't have a timeline at this point. As I understand, the resolution, the item from council, though, is to come back in mid june with basically a work plan. So I don't see any problem at all with us needing that. We've got the foundation of that working group already in place. We've been talking to directors as well related to utilities and other, you know, the whole host

[03:29:08]

of issues concerning high capacity transit. So we're already heading that direction. And we have a couple of years before we'll be going to fta for a rating as well. >> I understand that too. But we don't have a couple of years before we go to public for a rating. >> Sure. >> Spelman: We might have a second chance with the sta but not with the public, at least for a few years. So we want to have a good rating if we can. That means having a rough cut sense of what the policy is going to look like. What we're going to do to make sure that affordable housing is available close by and so on. >> Right. >> Riley: Councilmember, again, I think going back to the redline, we have some examples here on t.O.D. Policies. We know where the poll spis have proven themselves out and done well. We know where some of the struggles are with the policies. We'll make sure to bring those back as part of the recommendation. >> Spelman: Look forward to seeing it. Thank you very much. >> Part of this is value waiting where the policies are. That's something we proceed forward with. Make recommendations with the council. But the brt, we've seen a lot of density go up on north lamar and south lamar probably related to the transit connectivity. But I think there's a real story we can tell. And I even go back to the shuttle bus routes, the shuttle bus routes on the last 50 years have done a lot to shape parts of our community. And that's a -- >> for better or worse. >> Yeah, for better or worse. But that's also to be a part of the high capacity transit system that historically has worked here and we can certainly see how that tells the story of what austin does to support transit. >> Spelman: It's really helpful to have three bites of the apple to talk about how to get this working and we've got policies in place to assist stuff. I have that mood today, I can't help but mention we have a de facto t.O.D. In the end of the

[03:31:08]

intermural fields bus line which is sometimes referred to as a bunch of stealth dorms. And this is one of those cases which we did nothing to try to create it. But the market decided that we needed the t.O.D. So we started to go with the T.O.D.s, DESPITE US. >> I think that is reflected in when the consultants came back in looking at the various corridor. Oh, my goodness, they've got a lot of great corridors. All good corridors. I think it's really reflective of the strong dependence of the community on transit. It's been driven by the university of the student shuttles. We really are dependent in terms of high capacity transit in this region. >> Spelman: In addition to having a public sector that gets it and understands the need for density along transit corridors, we have a private sector of developers, of multifamily dwellings who understand this is a valuable thing, they can make money off of providing a good service. >> Absolutely. >> Spelman: Thanks for vuch. >> Cole: Councilmember morrison? >> Morrison: Thank you. I appreciate the comments and I couldn't agree with you more that we do need to be able to go to the public in the successful -- hopefully the successful ballot. This will be a key part of the discussion to be able to say, we do have plans in place that are going to ensure that the transit and the new steps in the city of boston is going to resolve a diverse range in the city of austin. Absolutely critical. I just want to stress that I think that the good -- the really good news is that the fta criteria and where we're headed all really pull together and weaving together nicely. More like a tone, a resolution moving it alone. We wanted to say we didn't just want to pass it. We wanted to make it clear that this is really in our vision and

[03:33:10]

it works well together. Just a couple of things on the timing. Relax. We understand -- don't sweat. Scott has it absolutely right. We wanted to just make sure that we could get by the middle of June some kind of work plan but absolutely the discussion will need to be what can we get on the table in time for it to be part of the public discussion. The other thing is we also understand the need to have a diverse set of jobs in the job center. Some of that is developing. We look at the criterion that we started. For anyone interested, you can go on line and find it by googling new starts fta, and policy guidance. It's got interesting reading. I didn't see the specific criteria with regard to jobs that's quite as easy to capture. But we fully understand -- I know economic development has been a part of it. And lastly, obviously nacb is a part of this. As well as stakeholders. We did include wanting to have the housing and other folks do that part of the work. Interesting to see that with Erica here. I wonder if we can invite them to make a few comments and while you're sitting down, I have to make a comment about how great it is that Erica Leak, who was part of developing all of the T.O.D.s AND REGULATORY PLANS AND PDR is now going to work on implementing them as a staff member. >> Yes, we are thrilled that we stole her. >> Yes, congratulations on that. >> Sure. Director of neighborhood housing. For us, this is incredibly exceptional timing as we said several times for the consolidated plan were in

[03:35:11]

process with the needs assessment as well as the healthy market study and the analysis of impediments. So this is an opportune time for us to be able to take this information and we'll have data that we'll support. So we'll help support the application. I'm not a new start expert, but what little I've seen obviously to get a high criteria, you'll want to have solid policies in place to actually perform. So this will be important for us to be able to incorporate what we can into the consolidated plan which is our five-year road map with the federal funds as well as the capital investment from the general obligation bonds. This is perfect timing for us to incorporate this type of partnership into those documents and into our plan. >> Great, thank you. I appreciate that. And basically the resolution from Mayor Pro Tem and myself as was mentioned puts a formal structure on work that has already been in the works and it allows us to raise the visibility. So we as a council and the public can be talking about it. >> Thank you. >> Cole: I would just like to add that I'm very pleased to be a co-sponsor of this and one of the most exciting parts of it is the interdepartmental collaboration. To get us to focus not only on the density because we spend a lot of time talking about this. Because we're wanting to make sure that the transit is successful from that view. But also the affordable housing and the job centers. So I'm glad that economic development is also going to be a part of this discussion. And I'm glad that you are going to participate in making sure that we are planning affordable housing along our staff. Councilmember Riley? >> Riley: I understand and fully support the idea behind it which I gather is give a nudge to the T.O.D. Process with particular attention to housing and jobs issues. I did pause over some of the language in the resolution.

[03:37:12]

It's quite a tone as councilmember morrison indicated. And one line in particular caught my attention. The bottom of the first page, the resolution reads -- whereas compact and connected development if not managed properly can have unintended negative consequences. I wonder if we want to call out compact and connected development as being especially pernicious and threatening as compared with other types of development. Was that really the intent? >> Mayor pro tem, if I may? >> Cole: Of course. >> Morrison: Well, you should have seen the initial draft. No, we've worked on that. And if you'll look above, it's the -- the "whereas" above talks about how the development -- talks specifics about how it can have negative consequences. How we want to avoid gentrification and things like that. How to find a balanced resolution, we wanted to avoid negative issues >> Spelman: I stopped reading at "call me ishmael." >> Morrison: You got to the bottom of the first page, didn't you? >> Spelman: Yes, I did. >> Riley: Any development, if not managed properly could have unintended negative consequences or perhaps say compact and connected development if managed properly can offer significant community benefits. It seems -- I'm hesitant of singling out the connected comment. >> I tell you what, we can work on some language. You can say if any development could have negative -- I would like to take the two whereases because we were trying to say we needed to do both of them right.

[03:39:13]

On the other hand, if you want to suggest some language for the last one about exact and connected more delicately, or more specifically addresses pluses and minuses. A lot of this is all about compact and connected. The highlight -- imagine austin does too. It addresses the fact that we need to do it right. So if you can find a way to say that more positively without the word negative, I'm open to that. We can take them both out, we can merge them to one, we can try to recraft it. >> And any of those options would be -- would be -- could work for me. Just -- it seems peculiar to me to single out compact and connected development as being especially threatening. >> Morrison: It's not saying it's especially threatening. It's just saying we need to be realistic about I want. >> Riley: Compact and development can have unintended consequences. >> Morrison: You agree? >> Riley: Any development can have negative consequences. But as compared with other types of development, I don't see how that it is -- it's especially threatening. >> Morrison: We're talking about sprawl just above. So we're just trying to be realistic about we want to avoid sprawl, it's got negative consequences. We want to make sure that we're clear that we want to avoid negative consequences of compact and connected. That's why we're doing this in part. >> Riley: Okay. >> Morrison: I'll talk with my co-sponsor and see -->> cole: I think we can find some language. We can meet councilmember riley's concerns. Comments, questions? >> Morrison: Sure. >> Cole: Next item, item 40, pulled by councilmember morrison and the lead sponsor is councilmember riley. >> Riley: Oh, good. So this is great to follow this

[03:41:14]

previous discussion with this. So this is about microunits and looking at a code change to waive minimum site area requirements which are actually putting limits on our -- on this size, minimum limits on this size of apartments, our multifamily dwellings, and to address also parking requirements that are also seen as a barrier to being able to achieve that. And as I understand it, the resolution says to look at

doing those things on core transit core doris, future core transit CORRIDORS, AND C.O.D.s, AND I Wanted to talk particularly about and understand the intent and I want to express my concern about the intent for doing this. Because on transit corridors and core transit corridor, we have vertical mixed use, which does among other things provide a program for waiving the minimum site area requirements and reducing the parking. And, of course, that bmu overlay, councilmember riley, you and I were part of the brainstorming of that. And it resulted in the whole -- I hate to mention it, opt in-opt out process that involves thousands of hours of discussion and evaluation from hundreds and hundreds of citizens to determine where exactly that bmu should be recommended or not. A lot of people put a lot of thought and analysis into that. That eventually went to the council. Then the council, I guess, I was part of some of the last ones and mayor pro tem and councilmember martinez and the mayor were all part of the council that adopted those. So what I don't understand is how this resolution is meant to play with that. And I guess it's either to override the bmu process that we

[03:43:15]

have in place. Or if it's to only be done on -- the intent is to do it on nonbmu properties that don't have a waiver at this point, mechanism for a minimum site area. >> Councilmember riley. >> Riley: The intent was to take a fresh look at development opportunities in those locations that where -- that could -- that could offer potential as places for developments like microunits. And I -- as you know, the -- the vertical mixed use provisions do not allow for instance for the elimination of parking. There are significant parking requirements associated with bmu. There are other constraints on bmu that resulted on fairly limited applications of those provisions. We haven't seen as much bmu development as some people had expected. So this is simply an effort to take another look at the development regulations and see if we can allow something that's a little more innovative. Yes, that could be a little more at places that are at bmu sites. We have seen significant interest in units don't have any parking with the -- with the efficiencies in one bedrooms at the whitley, I mentioned the other day, a full 20% of tenants in that building have chosen to forego parking all together.

[03:45:16]

Under the current bmu provisions, we don't really have that option. If you live in a bmu project, you're going to be paying for parking whether you want to have a car or not. That's whether we want to go a little further to address affordability in terms that go beyond what we've gone before. Parking can have a significant impact on afford about and there are significant benefits to be offered by environments that enable people to reduce the commitment on cars, that's part of the house hold living costs, then to be able to offer the potential for someone not only to have lower ongoing costs in terms of the transportation, and to avoid the up front costs to avoid paying for parking and most cases, this typically would be structured parking. The idea is we can get the afford about benefits by taking the cost out of the equation. That was not on the table at the time we put bmu in place. That's worth that considering where it should be. >> I understand where you get that. I guess my mine concern here is if you're going to relook at bmu, we need to acknowledge the fact something very important, especially in light of our previous conversation, that the increased entitlements with bmu come with responsibilities and

benefits. And that is affordable housing and consideration of adjacent neighborhoods and what decreasing the parking requirement, what impact that might have on the adjacent neighborhood. I don't understand any of that acknowledged. I didn't understand that any of that was going to be taken into

[03:47:17]

consideration through this effort. And so if what you're suggesting is that we relook at bmu in particular, I guess I would like to have that acknowledged and I would like to have it acknowledged that it was a carefully crafted compromise and that affordability is also an extremely important consideration. I get that parking -- I can acknowledge that parking is part of affordability, but when I read this, I sort of got that people were just going to -- what my takeaway was that it was being suggested that people were going to have another option. And that is potentially waive minimum area requirements and parking and not have the other side of it. There's analysis that was done that was looking at the different -- the different numbers. We looked at the potential pro formas to ensure that that affordability could work into it. I 50e78 very concerned about the potential of giving up that community benefit that comes with bmu. I would like to say that I think that we approved the commercial design standards or the council approved commercial design standards in 2007 which was right in the beginning of the crash. And anybody that is looking up and down burnett or lamar or any other places see a lot of bmu structures going up. We need to remember with that we get affordable housing. The other side of it is there's concerns about impacts on adjacent neighborhoods. That's why the expedited rpp was part of it. So I guess the third question is, why would we not integrate this discussion into the broader discussion of codenacs.

[03:49:18]

There's a mechanism now for achieving some of this anyway, why wouldn't we look at this at a broader way anyway. >> Riley: First neighborhood concerns would be those address in the code amendment process. This does not put a code amendment in place. This initiates a code amendment process that would allow for a thorough discussion about all of the concerns that you're raising, about how this would relate to bmu, how we deal with potential neighborhood issues involving spillover parking and other consequences. And that then would be -- I fully expect that to be part of any code amendment process touching these suspects and it certainly wasn't intended to bypass that. But to your other question about how this relates. I mentioned this the other night. I did not think that we should think of it as some black box that will take care of itself in a few years. That they will be some wonderful solution to all of our problems handed down from above at some point a few years from now. Because I think that's putting too much expectation on the process. And that's based in part on conversations with the consultant team involve in that process who have -- who have not been suggesting that we put a stop to any code amendments. They think it would be a good idea to continue the conversation, a thorough conversation about ways to address affordability. We have very significant and pressing concerns about how we accommodate a growing population in the central city. And I think we need to be doing everything we can to address that. Now, not put it off for a couple of years and figure it will all be worked out in with code next. In this is consistent with code next. It's aimed at achieving the goals of the

comprehensive plans

[03:51:19]

as is the rewrite process. But I fully expect that we will continue all of our efforts to do whatever we can to move in the direction of supporting imagine austin on our own even while the code next process is under way. >> I guess my main concern is that this not overwrite the hard work and carefully drafted compromised that came forward from bmu. Maybe I don't -- I didn't get your intent of building within that and taking bmu into account by reading this. I'll draft some additional whereases in language to propose as an amendment on the dais. >> Riley: Sure. Thank you. >> Spelman: Mayor pro tem? >> Cole: Councilmember spelman? >> Spelman: I acknowledge that this is a part of it that's missing. It should be included. I did want to mention we're talking about a different animal in a way. In the way you raise affordable housing, you raise the rents on 90% of the units to lower the rents on 10% of the units. You provide affordable units but there's a cost to it. This is a different way of providing affordable housing. People pay more per square foot for a smaller number of square feet. Instead of 800 square foot apartment, 300 and 400 square foot apartments, is there a market? In some cities, there has been. Another way to reduce the cost. The whole thing is about affordable housing. Part of the argument for microunits has been in other cities that bmu-like units because they require people to buy parking spaces are more difficult to afford and people don't need them. I taught my sprawl class yesterday a whole bunch of incoming entering students were showing up to see what it was going to be like at the lbj school, about 15 in the background. I asked how many of them had

[03:53:20]

cars. We were talking about sprawls. Two had cars, five didn't. These are not current students in austin, they were working for a living in wichita and other places getting by without a car. Living at bmu, they had to buy a parking space whether they needed it or not. This is an opportunity to have another housing product that is smaller, more efficient, and doesn't require parking space, at least not of all of the people living there. This is not about passing the code. This is entering the discussion. I look forward to having that discussion and seeing whether or not this is a deal we can make. >> Morrison: Great. I think to be able to look at the analyses, you're not suggesting rent cap, are you? >> Spelman: Not at all. Good heavens, know. >> Morrison: The assumption you're making is these are affordable because the market will be able to bear them at a more affordable level as opposed to the market bearing what they can get. >> Spelman: The market price is going to be well designed, very efficient 300 square foot apartment has got to be less than the market for an 800 square foot apartment. People are going to pay to some extent by the square foot. But people don't need that many square feet and are willing to pay less, get less square feet and do just >> Morrison: And I'll look forward to some analysis that helps us understand how the market is going to respond to that and what impact that will have on affordability. We need to build as much intense tip as we can. That has clearly not generated itself at this point in city of austin. That's another discussion. So I will I will look at -- I'm open to discussing. I want to make sure we put it in

[03:55:21]

the proper framework and understand the impacts that it could have on the current construct that we have and the -- the sort of the baseline understanding that people went into and we don't toss it out with the water. >> Spelman: Not an ordinance, just a proposal. >> Morrison: Exactly. And just talk about it. >> Spelman: I feel the need to respond. If you get demand increasing 2% to 3% and increase in supply is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the price to go down. Make sense? >> Morrison: I understand that piece of the argument. >> Spelman: So it could well be that we just need to -- we haven't done what we've done to increase density and increase the supply of housing, the price will go up further than it has. >> Spelman: The other question is what does the curve for the increasing supply have to look like? And is that practical to even impact affordability. >> Spelman: Unintended consequences if we don't. We could have this discussion for hours but we need not have it now. >> Spelman: Understand councilmember morrison on this issue. And I look forward to your amendment addressing this issue because I think of decoupling as helping with affordability. And I would like to receive more information about your concerns about bmu going in the opposite direction and not helping with that. >> Tovo: I do have a question. >> Cole: Councilmember tovo? >> Tovo: I think it is -- it's a very worthwhile discussion to have. And I look forward to you addressing it more as it moves to the process. I do want to point out one thing that -- in the memo that we received from staff. I don't know if he would like to speak to it. There's an assumption that anyone living in a microunit is not going to have a car. We received information in the memo that suggests for example in portland that wasn't the case. People were instead parking on

[03:57:21]

adjacent neighborhood streets. They still have cars, but they have capacity to park them in their own unit. So I have seen that with my very own eyes. I lived around the corner from a work place that had incentive for parking not using the parking spot for a parking garage. And eyewitness people parking on my street so they can park by the work place, which I assume they received an incentive not to drive their car. We know that happens. There will be people living in these microunits who have no place to park. We're looking at areas of town throughout our cities. There are a lot of areas that rely on parking a lot of times they're working on driveways. So I wonder how much work the staff has done to assess how well it's worked, not just in portland but other places. If it's a valid assumption. If the evidence bears out that people living in microunits don't have cars for the most part. >> Well, first, we'll do additional research in order to do this memo. We'll do a little bit to make sure we actually inform the council of some of the issues that might arise. Density was one. Parking was another. We already have experience in the area where parking is paid for in addition to the unit. So this is something that's entirely unknown though the city. The parking space for a short period of time. And there are people who have cars that have other places to put them. But I think it's one that is of concern and that's not to say that when ever we go through and do our research and we come back for the proposal, there might be a reduced amount of parking that will be available on some of the

[03:59:22]

sites because there will be a mixture of units. They may not all be microunits. A mix of micro and nonmicro units. A case if you have micro only units, there might be a few places at least for the people who work on the site who might live on the property. And I think the market will drive the biggest demand on the number of spaces. So I'm headed in to tell you definitively it will have an impact or not. Transit corridors where you have the ability to have access to other forms of transit. Downtown where we already basically got rid of the parking requirement downtown. I can see where that might be an instance where those units might thrive. But you might actually have a lot more units, a lot more available housing. You get along some of the core transit corridors on both sides by a solid single family, there might be some issues that pop up. So I think we might have to take a look at those. We'll probably talk to atd staff, you know, as far as the neighborhood parking program and see what those instances are. >> It will be helpful. >> Okay. Thanks. >> Tovo: I said that I thought I heard mr. Guernsy say he might see the need for a parking spot even if that's not the requirement. And the fact that we haven't, we may not have achieved with regard to affordability in certain areas. >> On the mix, you might have people who might visit people at a microunit, even though the person that the microunit might not have a car, maybe the parents shows up or a friend shows up. There will be instances where

[04:01:23]

there will be parking -- may not be totally void of that. But I'm hesitant to give you one way or the other. >> Tovo: That's great. I'm pleased to hear that the staff are going to do some more research on that in terms of what other cities have done and what their occupants end up doing in terms of reliance on public transit versus having cars where they park elsewhere. Even in cities in new york, many, many who own cars. There are people who own cars and listen to the parking and where they need to move it to. There are certain number of people whether or not they're provided with a slot or not will continue to have a car. They're going to park it potentially on somebody else's street. >> We have other options. Car sharing, cars to go is immensely successful. That removed some of the stigma of having any parking. >> Tovo: Thank you. Councilmember riley? >> Riley: Going to emphasize there's no assumption that people in microunits don't have cars. Obviously that's not factually correct any more than it's factually correct to say all new yorkers do or don't have cars. There are going to be exceptions to every rule. We do know that there are studies suggesting that when you separate parking from housing costs, that many people will avail themselves of that option. Not all, but many. You will be opening the door to that location for many people who otherwise could not afford to live there and building in an incentive to reduce their reliance on cars which I think is consistent with the goals of imagine austin. So that is the the idea to

[04:03:23]

simply provide the opportunity for those who choose to not have a car to avoid the expense of having to pay for the parking of that car. Obviously, yes, there are potential negative consequences. You may have people parking on nearby streets. But there are ways to address the consequences. There are places outside downtown where they are managing parking on the street. That is one way or controlling it, either through parking benefit districts or residential permanent parking or some combination of these

things. They also -- we also -- austin has a fairly healthy supply of surface parking on many of its corridors, and there may well be places where if you simply leave it to the -- to the individual who's -- if you leave it to those for using the parking space to bear the cost of finding a -- of storing that vehicle, then they might be able to find other options, including making use of nearby surface parking lots. The point is simply getting away from the practice of proposing all residents the cost of paying for parking because we want to leave open the possibility that there may be those who do not need the parking and would be -- would benefit from the opportunity to avoid the cost of paying for parking. It's worked very well in those places where they have afforded the opportunity. This is an effort to continue that. I would say the resolution currently does not include express language expressing that issue of decoupling. So I would expect to offer some language on thursday and that's the intent to make sure that in

[04:05:23]

these housing developments that parking is offered separately from the unit. >> Tovo: Mayor? >> Cole: Councilmember tovo? >> Tovo: I appreciate your comment. But with regard to the assumption that I asked for more evidence, we do have a line in there, the microunit offers the potential for placing more within reach that you want to accompany the reduced car ownership, that's the assumption I was talking about. I'm appreciative that staff intend to look into whether that is actually the case. That those who are individuals were interested in microunits are more often by the reduced car ownership. Because I'm concerned that the last paragraph of their memo to us to just hasn't been the case in portland. So I want to more fully evaluate that is -- whether the evidence bears that out. >> The staff memo says that people living in microunits are more likely to have cars. When you offer these things, you see reduced rates of car ownership. It doesn't mean everyone gives up their cars, but you see reduced rates. The references you saw in portland, yes, they did confirm that not everyone gives up their cars but they didn't say people are more likely to have cars. I would suggest there's a wealth of information out there, both locally and places like victoria transportation policy institute as well as the shoot where there's been extensive study of parking policies and those have indicated -- have confirmed that, yes, when you separate the cost of parking from housing that you will see reduced rates

[04:07:23]

of car ownership. You don't -- no, you will not find evidence saying everybody gives up their car. And that -- I'm -- I've never meant to suggest that with any language in the resolution. I'm happy to tweak any language if necessary to make it clear. But the simple fact is that you do see reduced rates of car ownership when you impose on the actual owners, the cost of storing those vehicles rather than spreading them among the residents of the project. >> Thank you. Yeah, I appreciate they are going to expand the language is about separating to some degree, separating parking costs. This might be a question for you. But do you tell me, for instance, do we have a code that says you have to separate or are there ways you have to separate? And then another question I have is it will be interesting to me, I don't know if I have any way to gather this information. It will be interesting to know what sizes of apartments are being built in some of the newer projects along core transit corridors. Is that something that we might be able to get a feel for? >> Councilmember, yes. I think we can get some of that

information from the types of site plans that we have. Could we break them out for efficiencies in one bedrooms? >> Morrison: Mm-hmm. >> Units are 500 square feet or larger and they have a reduced parking requirement for those types of units of only one instead of being a one bedroom which has a slightly higher parking requirement. >> Morrison: Thank you. >> Cole: Councilwoman tovo? >> Tovo: To clarify my request, in case there's confusion. In addition to having information about the extent to

[04:09:24]

which car ownership has tended to accompany occupants of microunits because I completely agree and was not making the point that I'm not going to address that again. But what I would like to know is that in the cities that have implemented it, are there others that have experienced what portland has? In terms of impacts on other residents where we're just shifting the cars, some of the cars, at least, from one place to the other? >> Cole: Councilmember martinez? >> Martinez: I wanted to ask the proposers of this resolution -- one of the things that we're looking at in our office as it relates to microhousing is taking advantage of areas that are underdeveloped because they're zoned limited industrial. And so we have large tracts of lands that are out there that we can actually create an mu of limited industrial where we have makers or artists or musicians combining microhousing with that live zoning so they can still do their work, you know, in a community environment, still sell their work in that same environment, but also live right there where they're making their products in a microhousing style component. And I was wondering if that was at all contemplated in this resolution? >> Cole: Councilmember riley? >> Riley: That actually was not contemplated in this resolution, it's a great idea and something you should look at. Either in this resolution or in a separate resolution. >> Cole: All right, thank you. Any further question, comments? Okay, we will go to a council discussion on potential appointments to the austin generation resource planning task force. These appointments will be made this thursday and the purpose of this discussion today is try to create a balanced approach to our appointees between the

[04:11:25]

emphasis on clean energy and affordability. Let me ask staff, I know that the resolutions called for an appointment by council of someone from the euc and also from the rmc. Is there anyone that can answer the question of whether there's been an appointment from the euc? >> Mayor pro tem -- the electric utility commission has not made an appointment, but they are scheduling a special meeting, believe this, thursday to discuss their appointment. There has been no activity on that issue from the resource management commission as far as I know. >> Also, my understanding that the resource management commission, I agree with you, has not made an appointment. If the euc is planning to make a recommendation, I guess that begs the question of whether we want to postpone our appointments until they make those recommendations or not because neither the euc or the rmc has made a recommendation yet. I was going to offer leo dylan who I've heard from who's the current chair of the rmc to sit in the positions of the rmc representatives. But let's just have a discussion about that issue? Councilman moreson in how about you? Okay. Councilmember tovo? >> I want to say it's my understanding. I was looking for the e-mail to confirm this. The electric utility commission scheduled a

special called meeting to vote on their membership on their recommendation. I sort of assumed that the rmc would do so as well. That -- and I do have -- I do have an applicant I'm considering, it's an individual who served on the previous

[04:13:27]

generation planning task force. >> Euc and rmc appointee according to the resolution is an all council appointee. So we all have to agree on that. We have to discuss that in a work session or in a council meeting. So it sounds like to me we are not ready to make this decision because they don't have the euc recommendation or the rmc recommendation. Is that correct? >> Tovo: It's my understanding that euc is meeting maybe before thursday. But I would say we move forward and we don't always have every single employee at every single meeting but it would be of some value to -- it should be a goal to have those bodies recommend among themselves and forward that recommendation to us for consideration. >> Cole: Mark, I thought I heard you say that the euc was actually meeting on thursday. >> On thursday. >> Cole: We won't have that recommendation. Perhaps we can move forward with our particular appointees and wait on the euc and rnc to make that recommendation. Councilmember martinez? >> Martinez: I'll just say that I was leading in the direction of putting someone on the commission. And still am, for that matter. Someone that is a very strong kind of protection proponent. But some of the big users and the building owners and managers associations have also made a compelling persuasion, if you will, to consider one of their stake holders as an appointee as we did in the rate case. And I think it proved to be very, very helpful having that other perspective. It was certainly extremely reasonable in the rate case and

[04:15:27]

worked well with all of the others. So we are considering that as well. We're taking both of those kind of sides of the consideration. We'll make a decision by thursday. That's what we're contemplating is. We think we're shifting towards a big user stake holder or a representative. >> Cole: Okay. Councilmember morrison? >> Morrison: Yeah, I guess I'd like to go ahead and throw out who I was considering and just to be clear, it was my impression, we were asking the commissions to pick somebody to represent them. And while I guess we need to rubber stamp that or not, I hear two different thoughts on this. One -- that's my thought is we would just take whoever they recommended. Or maybe what I heard from you, mayor pro tem is a different approach that we would have more involvement and inviting who from the commission. >> Cole: I wasn't sure if they would just make one recommendation? >> Morrison: Okay. I'm working under the assumption that each of the commissions is going to put forward one of their members should be on it. So I see some nods of heads. So maybe several of us are working on that recommendation. And clearly we need to have a broad spectrum perspective and the resolution, you know, list out residential commercial, industrial, and low income renewable energy and environmental compliance. I believe I saw last week that we already had one -- made one appointment. Can you tell us to who that represent s? >> Mayor leffingwell appointed barry expansion. >> Morrison: So we have large customers covered with that for sure. I just wanted to let you know

[04:17:28]

that I have been talking to smitty about appointing him. Certainly he's got a long history and a lot of expertise in consumer protection as well as renewables and all that. So that's who I'm thinking about. >> Councilmember riley. You're one of the sponsors on the resolution. Will you say exactly what your intentions were in terms of the council relationship to the appointees? Is it just to rubber stamp -- >> I have the same understanding that councilmember morrison described. That we were asking them to point their own representatives to the task force. And so I don't -- I don't really see a strong case for putting off our appointments until we hear from them. We're putting out there people we're talking with. I've talked with our own -- formally our own michael osborn about ways to fill up his time and his retirement. Making sure he doesn't stray too far. And because I think we have all benefitted from his -- his advice in the past. And benefit from that in the future. So that's what I had in mind. There are many qualified people who have expressed an interest in serving and I'm deeply grateful for that. So there are others that -- certainly no shortage of qualified applicants in the event that anyone doesn't work out. >> Cole: Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: I want to clarify that. We did work on that language to try to make it clear. I'm sorry that it wasn't.

[04:19:28]

It was the intent it would be handled like the austin task force and some of the others like the parks board and the environmental board made an appointee recommendation to us and we affirmed it as a council. I believe in the case of the lake austin task force, the council had the appointees ready to go. In fact, the group may have met a couple of times before those appointees came forward from those two bodies. It's not ideal. We hope they can all meet together at the same point. They have such a time frame -- a short time frame for the generation planned task force update team to do its work. I think it's great if we can move forward. It's my understanding that the mayor may have made an appointment. I'm sorry, we were having a side conversation. I apologize for missing that point. And who -- >> mayor leffingwell reported barry drying, representing expansion. >> Tovo: Thank you. >> Cole: Councilmember spelman. >> Spelman: Interested in making sure all of the animals get in the ark. I was going to go last. Under the assumption that none of us have been talking to each other. We have an idea after having worked together for several years where y'all are going. I got some guesses and so far, my guesses have been accurate. Although, we have a guess for you, kathy, I don't know if you're going to confirm -- if I feel still be batting 100% or not after you make an appointment. The easiest meeting on thursday, they're going to be in the position of identifying who we're going to recommend to us. We have to wave our hands over it by the resolution. It seems that -- help me understand this. If we had meetings before -- after the euc made the appointment but before we had confirmed that appointment, could they start going to the meetings. Is there any reason they could do that? >> Cole: I don't know of any reason. Mark? >> I'm going to defer to council on that. >> Spelman: Let me make the statement. It would be a fine idea. We do have a short time frame. I'm cognizant of the fact that we want to get this done.

[04:21:29]

And the sooner we can get started, the easier it's going to be. If the euc is going to have an appointment on thursday. But after we wait where we confirm appointments, we shouldn't wait two weeks before we have the first meeting. We have the conversation if not today but on thursday who to appoint people. >> Martinez: Mayor pro tem? >> Cole: Councilmember martinez? >> Martinez: What time is the euc meeting on thursday? >> I could find out and get back to you in a couple of minutes. >> Martinez: Evening or day? >> I think it's afternoon. >> Martinez: Potential to do a time certain for 4:00, 5:00 p.M. We have a short agenda. It sounds like we could get out of here so mayor pro tem could go watch "scandal." >> Cole: The priorities. >> Martinez: That's what she asked me last week, am I going to be able to get out of here and watch "scandal" or not? >> Spelman: Between the two of them looking at their watches. >> Martinez: A great episode, by the way. >> Staff is apparently listening to our conversation. It's 3:30 on thursday. >> Martinez: Maybe they can take that agenda item first and get that over to us so we can get this done on thursday? We're going to be here for 5:30 for sure for live music and proclamations. It's the only agenda item. Right? It will come up first. >> Cole: Councilmember morrison? >> Morrison: I'm looking at the language for the resolution. It's not clear to me that we even - that the council is even in the position to appoint them. To have to wave their hands and the resolution says the austin generation resource planning task force is created consisting of nine members in total, including one representative each from the euc and the rmc, and one member appointed by each councilmember. So that's different from not even b -- first of all, the

[04:23:30]

councilmembers are not even nominating, they're appointing. >> Tovo: Pardon me? >> Morrison: This is a previous one. Yeah, you didn't bring all of them? This is a resolution 20140306024 which is sitting in front of you right now. Looking at number one from the be it resolve. The language to me is the euc and the ruc gets to identify their images. Those need to come back to the council. >> That's the way it looks like it's written. >> Morrison: It's not clear to me in this example. >> I don't know if you voted on this item if there's a discussion on what the intent was? >> Morrison: I don't think so. >> No distinction -- >> Morrison: My intent -- my intent -- I think it was a co-sponsor and my intent might differ from councilmember tovo's intent. I thought that when we did the lake austin task force, those board appointees didn't come through council. I think they were the appointees. >> Cole: Councilmember tovo? >> Tovo: I thought we affirmed them. I don't have a strong feeling one way or the other, it should be a vote of the body. A vote of the euc and the vote of the rmc to give drives to their appointee. But I don't have a strong feeling. I hesitate to say this. But I don't think we had a full -- I know we didn't have a full discussion of council about the intent of that and probably us sponsors didn't talk about what we meant from that line. We borrowed it to some extent by the generation task force.

[04:25:30]

So I know we tinkered with it a little bit to be clear. But it's really -- I don't have a strong feeling one way or the other whether we affirmed the appointments or not. It's my understanding, typically we did. But I do have a strong feeling that the body should have a vote to identify their appointee, whether it is or not. >> Spelman: Mayor pro tem? >> Cole: I think it's a follow-up comment. >> I think as a general rule, you

created the task force. You created it. It gives each of you the opportunity to appoint someone to the task force. But if it's on your agenda and it's the council doing it, you know, you act as the body. So on thursday, I would think that you would get the representative from one of the two people and then the body would then vote on whoever I guess councilmember spelman had or whoever you -- as a body to say this is going to make up our committee, our task force. >> Cole: Sewn sill member tovo? >> Tovo: Absolutely. When I used the bodies -- I was talking about the bodies of the euc and the rnc and whether or not we would affirm those. >> Cole: Councilmember spelman? >> Spelman: Maybe we resolved the conflict and I'm making it worse. How do we do it from the first generation task force. We're making the language from the first generation task force, how we do it the first time ought to be the second time, right? >> Cole: Right. >> Spelman: Tell us how we do it. >> Assistant city attorney. The way that -- I think some of the ambiguity arises from the fact that in the previous task force, it's the chair of each commission that was appointed automatically. And this was sort of a last-minute change just to give each body the flexibility to appoint a member that wasn't necessarily the chair of each commission. >> Spelman: Okay. >> So this -- but I agree, there's some ambiguity there.

[04:27:32]

I think the intent when I was assisting councilmember tovo's office was -- my understanding was each commission would be able to appoint its own without council then acting to then a rubber stamp that recommendation but rather the -- each of the other seven appointees would come along during the normal commissions appointments at a council meeting. >> Spelman: Seems to be the most expeditious way of getting it done. They could be -- they could start meeting as soon -- they could join the meeting as soon as they got appointed. That's what it was to handle it. Mayor pro tem, are we going to make appointments then on thursday. >> Cole: The plan is to make appointments on thursday. And then my understanding is that this discussion, the rnc and recommendations and they will sit on the task force. But that would be an individual item and we would have our appointments on thursday. >> Spelman: I don't think we need to make the appointment before I make my appointment. We can take this up in the morning. From my point of view, we could take this up in the first of the morning, we don't have to wait until 3:30 in the afternoon. >> Cole: I'm fine with that. Anybody have any opposition to that? Okay, I will let the mayor know that. Okay. Do we have -- we don't have any other preselected items from council. Do we have any other items that council would like to address on the agenda? Hearing none. Without objection, this meeting of the austin city council work session is hereby adjourned.