

City Council Work Session Transcript – 04/15/2014

Title: ATXN2

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 4/15/2014 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 4/15/2014

Transcript Generated by SnapStream Enterprise TV Server

=====

[03:05:37]

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Good morning. I'm austin mayor lee leffingwell. A quorum is present. I'm going to call this work session to order on tuesday, april 15, 2014. The time is 9:05 a.m. We're meeting in the board and commissions room, austin city hall, 301 west second street, austin, texas. We'll begin with the preselected agenda items. First is item 12, pulled by councilmembers martinez and spelman. >>

Martinez: Mayor? >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember martinez? >> Martinez: Thank you, mayor. I wanted to ask staff -- fire staff if they could come up. This is something that I believe everyone on the council has been visited by the fire watch folks. We adopted an item asking staff to vet this technology to determine whether or not it's something that could be of substantial benefit in detecting wild fires. Kind of an early warning detection system. We have the item on. Staff is making a recommendation. I just wanted to ask staff if they would walk us through that recommendation and then I have follow-up questions. >> Yes, sir. Mayor, council. Harry evans, chief of staff, austin fire department. I have with me the assistant director over at wild fire. We're here to talk about the smoke sensor wild fire early detection systems that we've been looking at. We believe -- chief myers helped me with the details. We believe this concept and technology is something we should take a look at and something we should participate in. Very new, in the widely used in the united states, widely use in

[03:07:38]

the european countries. So we believe it's something we should avail ourselves to. We have strong partnerships with the county and the city of west lake. The city of west lake already owns one. So we can put a system in place with early detection. Evaluate over the course of time, a year or more, and if we need to change or expand or do something different, we'll know that from there. That's a quick overview. Happy to answer any detailed questions that you might have? >> Thank you, chief. In reaching out to partners, do you have the folks we talked to, perdenales energy, any other -- the wild fires started a few years ago by electric lines. I wonder if they would be allies technology in helping to protect those wild lives out there? >> You are correct. Those are the partners we're looking at. We haven't reached out to them yet. Primarily travis county is the primary partner. We're working to reach more partners. Those are the logical steps. Right now we focused our research on travis county and the city of west lake hills. >> Great. >> Chief, since the movement if you will of bringing this item forward, there's

another company that met with county commissioner's. I don't know if anyone on the council has met with them, my staff has talked with them. Did you vet that other company and determine whether or not it's similar in nature or better than what's being propose? >> That's the progress. We first became aware of them on

[03:09:39]

thursday of last week. Really early to say. But we have done our due diligence and done a significant amount of research. One reason or the other, primarily because they're based in sweden, we had no knowledge of them. So we're going to look at them to see if it is a -- if it is a viable competitor or not. If it's that kind of technology. We need a little time to sort through that. >> Will we have that by thursday's deis I gos? >> No, I don't think we'll have it finished by thursday. The time is so short. That would be less than a week. A couple of weeks to get through that. >> Okay. So you're still recommending, though, that we move forward with this partnership with travis county for the initial purchase of the city of austin buying one monitor and travis county buying another? >> Yes, sir, we believe in the concept. We're working with travis county. They're a very good partner. We're working with the city of westlake. So I think it would be appropriate for us to continue forward with that concept and what specifically the device is, that's still in question. >> Thank, mayor. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember spelman. >> Spelman: Let me make sure where we are. We know the system is a good idea. West lake hills is installed. They believe they've gotten good results from it. We don't know which system to buy. There's a couple of live auctions. We don't know the cost of the system we're going to be buying, we don't know if we saw it or the cost of installation is. Is that accurate? >> That's accurate, sir. There's some -- we know approximately where two of the devices would go. As far as costs go, the only thing we can reference is what the city of west lake paid for their total package which was about \$180,000.

[03:11:41]

Device, install. All of the other support stuff. A lot of numbers flying around. We're using that as a ballpark figure. >> Going back to council martinez' questions, that's the part we're vetting right now, councilman, those types of numbers. We do have ballparks, but that's where we're sitting right now. We're actually starting to look at existing towers, but the existing towers we're looking at we like to make adjustments to. We're getting down to the details. Best to look at the details before you come back to council. >> Spelman: I appreciate that. And given that you won't be able to nail down the details between now and thursday, seems to me, this may be -- I don't know if this is premature or not or whether the whole hog is premature. Giving you the authority to go looks to price this out, to talk to travis county, west lake hills and be sure whatever system you and travis county purchase are going to integrate with what west lake hills has in place right now seems like a very good idea. But it seems premature to authorize a recommendation to purchase the system if we don't know quite what the system is going to be or what it's going to go or what it's going to cost to purchase and install it. What is the hurry? Why do you need that recommendation? >> The urgency is created by our desire to meet the resolution council passed on february 13, directing the manager to have this in front of council by april

10. So we're trying to meet that guideline, sir. >> It's in front of council. That's good. >> Yes, sir. >> Spelman: Would it be possible from your point of view, would it hold you up too much that we authorized to negotiate, identify the proper system, come up with a firm fiscal no, and come back in a few weeks to purchase at a particular system, a particular price, and install it in a particular place? >> Yes, michael McDonald, deputy

[03:13:41]

city manager, yeah. That would be fine. The thing we want to reiterate too is even with the system that west lake has and if we were to potentially purchase one and travels county were to purchase one, those three would not be able to encompass everything we need in the region. We were approaching this as a pilot to take a look at it. So really what we're balancing out right now is approaching that, looking at that as a pilot versus the other vendor that has come forward. The other vendor is european as well. This is new technology. I mean, while we're trying to find the other options we have out there. It's difficult to find. The other vendor came up. So during this we would evaluate it. To go with the system we have now joining in with west lake, it would create some triangulation points to allow us to cover and we take that and test it as a pilot to see how we move forward. We want to make sure that we're staying ahead on the technology too. We're not purchasing something. And later there's better technology out there. That's why we wanted to approach this as a pilot. >> Spelman: I don't understand we may want to engage the county to buy some of the systems in their own hook. It will cost between \$100,000 and \$200,000 a year to monitor it. It's an expensive pilot and we ought to walk into it knowing what our costs are going to look like. If you have no objection, if it's not going to hold you up, I prefer only to authorize the negotiations and ask you to come back when you have a firm fiscal note on it. >> No objection. >> No, sir, no objection to that. >> Spelman: Terrific, thank

[03:15:41]

you. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Council anybody martinez. >> Martinez: For me, it costs \$100,000 to \$200,000 a year to monitor it? That particular estimate is based on if we staffed it with FTEs OR IF WE STAFFED IT WITH Overtime. >> At the interest of giving you full disclosure, that would probably be the higher end of it. I can tell you now that we have a partnership with travis county when it comes to the wild fire helicopter. We share staffing during high has hard days with other county folks. So that's a very economical and efficient way to do that. We envision this going the other way. In the interest of full disclosure would be to do it in overtime. >> When we met about this the last time, we talked about using EXISTING FTEs FOR THE PILOT Program and not necessarily HIRING NEW FTEs TO MONITOR IT? >> Correct, sir. That's exactly correct. Existing it for the pilot. Absolutely. >> Wouldn't have the fiscal impact necessarily during the test phase, if you will. >> Probably not. We don't have a number of high hazard day, then the costs would go down. >> Martinez: So if we moved forward with authorization to negotiate, what is the time frame that you think you would be back with us with an executed action item? >> Martinez: I think I'd need two week, sir. I think I would. >> So a minimum of that. But that would be appropriate. >> Martinez: A week? >> Thank you. >> Martinez: Thank, mayor. >> Morrison: Mayor? >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember morrison. >> Morrison: I want to see what we're looking

here. The posting said approve the recommendations. I'm trying to read the recommendations and understand

[03:17:41]

what the approval was. The approval is going to negotiate the purchase for a pilot project, is that correct? >> Yes, ma'am, that's how I understand it. We're working with Travis County on the interlocal agreement, how we collaborate on that. What I'm hearing is we need to continue to do that and work through that. We need to continue to work with the City of Westlake and that partnership as well. And we need to continue to vet these vendors and to work through that piece of it as well. So we have those items in front of us. That's what I understand. >> Morrison: Those are the questions I did submit that I'm not sure they would come back yet. When else is this going to be in front of council? We're hearing it will be back in front of council for execution of the contract so one arises, and the other question that I submitted is what about the staffing requirements. You said you don't foresee in the pilot project any budget impact for staffing? >> Again, that would be negligible. We use the existing staff, we'll staff it on high hazard days to monitor it. If it erodes to nights, weekends, things like that, we supplement that. That will be the small amount -- I will call it negligible and something we can manage. >> Morrison: Would you envision the budget proposal in a year will come in front of us for 14-15 will have staffing impacts for a budget? Or you're going to assume we'll go forward with the negligible? >> Yes, ma'am. I don't anticipate you'll see anything about this. We're in the pilot stage. The earliest would be the '15-'16 budget, so at least a year from now. Got to look at it to see if it's relevant. >> Morrison: Thank you very much. I see the answer as miraculously impaired.

[03:19:49]

>> Spelman: Mayor? >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember Spelman? >> Spelman: Your staffing for the memo last month, two to four total staff members on extreme days, makes good sense. Seems like the right way to staff this thing. But even if you're drawing people from elsewhere, not hiring people to do the staffing, you are moving \$232,000 a year worth of value out of other stations or other jobs being done in the fire department to staff this. So although it may be a negligible out of pocket expense, I don't think it's a negligible opportunity cost. You're giving up \$100,000, \$200,000 of value elsewhere in the system to be able to staff this? >> That's correct, sir. As we mentioned with Councilmember Martinez, it was probably the largest number. We picked that as pure overtime. But we have existing wild fire staff that Council and Mayor has been very appropriate in allowing us to put on. And that wild fire staff in the regular business day would be part of that -- part of that monitoring group. So there's the opportunities there. I predict we can do it in a much more economical fashion. However, I wanted to again give you the biggest numbers that it could possibly be. I just don't foresee it there >> Spelman: I appreciate your conservative estimate. That's helpful. How many fire extreme danger days did we have last year? >> Extreme and very high are the indices we use there. It's like Smokey the Bear says, we'll see more of that. 3% to 5% of your total days are extreme. Very high, the handful of years, 2011, a horrible year for fire, you're looking at 70 to 90, probably, the maximum. 90 days. 70 to 90 on the max end. So pick a mean there of 70 to 80

[03:21:50]

is the number. Depends on how you split it out. But we're looking at 70 to 80 days on a bad year. You can have a good year when you have a lot of rain and the rain is spread out and you may be looking at 40 to 50. >> Spelman: Sounds like for the whole fire season, for something like all summer more or less, that's going to be the primary job of our -- I can't remember the name of the -- >> the wild fire -- >> Spelman: The wild fire group, someone will work on that the whole summer? >> Someone will be tasked to that, yes, sir. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember tovo? >> Tovo: It gets back to the questions councilmember spelman had. We've heard communications from people who would like to see more towers. They suggest five. I assume you pick three because of the costs and balancing that against what we're trying to achieve here. But I would just like to put it on the table that that's been a suggestion. I hope you have the flexibility and what we approved on thursday to consider that? >> Yes, ma'am, we do. The -- there's been many discussions with the expert, chief morris is part of that group. But given the newness of it, given the fact that it's not widely used in the united states at all, we wanted to be conservative in our approach and make sure that we're -- we're getting the right technology and the right place. Which is why as an overview, we chose three. And, chief, you want to talk about it further? >> Tovo: In your continued investigations, five you think is most effective. You have the flexibility to what's before us today to make that recommendation to council? >> Yes, ma'am, absolutely. >> Mayor Leffingwell: So when you come back with negotiations, you'll come back with cost estimates for the next fiscal year budget?

[03:23:53]

Because that will be key in helping us make a decision on this? >> Yes, sir. Any costs for this year, any estimates for this year and simply for next fiscal year. >> Mayor Leffingwell: I assume there's no -- I thought I heard you say there's no budget impact for this fiscal year? >> No, sir, there isn't unless the decision is made to make that purchase. Then we'll have to work with the budget office on identifying appropriate funds. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Requiring a budget amendment, potentially? >> Potentially, sir. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Okay. Councilmember morrison. >> Morrison: I wonder -- okay, I get a little confused now. Because I thought I heard you say in the answer to my question is that you wouldn't force the staffing involved increased staffing involved in a budget proposal? >> Yes, ma'am, that's correct. But to purchase the dwils. Oh >> Morrison: To purchase the device. >> Yes, ma'am, that's correct. >> Morrison: To help us all be clear, there might be additional backup provided to explain what we're really approving today, on a thursday. Because the backup just said -- the post just approved the recommendations and we're just getting it clear today exactly what it is we're approving and basically what we're approving is negotiate a contract. So just to make that clear, I think that would be helpful. Just to be clear, I appreciate all of the work on this. And councilmember martinez's leadership in getting this going. I think everybody is trying to get a little due diligence and understanding what we're doing. It's not a great thing. >> We'll give as much information as we can to get clarity. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember martinez? >> Martinez: Sorry, mayor. I'll close is in saying that the council chose to allow the budget surplus to go to the reservings which, by policy, we can only use that policy on one-

timex pe-- one-time

[03:25:56]

expenditures that are fixed. Not spending over time. This would be wholly appropriate for whatever recommendation might come out of the discussions that we used as one-time costs. Then the next budget year, obviously, if there's an impact TOWARDS MONITORING VIA FTEs THAT Would be the future council's decision. >> Yes, sir. We'll know more about how to make the decision coming back with details. >> Mayor Leffingwell: It will allow us to get more details involved. >> Yes, we're going to structure it so other partner, as councilmember martinez said earlier, lcra, energy, perdenales, those folks, have the opportunity to participate. We want to build it that way. >> Mayor Leffingwell: I look forward to hearing more about it. >> Thank you, sir. >> Next, I believe, we can take 13 and 14 together? >> Morrison: Absolutely. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember morrison? >> Morrison: Thank you. I wonder if we have staff here to answer questions. These are items related to green development. And you may recall that when we approved the master development agreement, it was a long night. We had the hearing. And one of the issues that we weren't really able to resolve was the fact that there are heritage trees on the site. And there was no requirement, no expectation when the whole master development agreement was being put together following the heritage tree ordinance. That left folks -- some among us, a little uncomfortable. I understand these items to be -- I wanted them to pull -- raise awareness to everyone that staff has done a great job working with a developer to help us save one or two of the heritage trees. And so I wonder if we could --

[03:27:57]

if I could start just by asking you all to describe what we're doing here with these items in terms of the heritage tree. >> I'm going to ask bret evans to make that description. He's worked with him on a regular daily basis almost. . >> Good morning, fred evans, economic development. At council's direction, we continued to work with the development team after the mda was approved to see if there's any way to design the building such that we could preserve some of the heritage trees. We were successful in working with trammell crowe to preserve for the heritage trees on block one, which is the first block under construction currently. Two of the trees are on front on cesar chavez and their critical root zones extend to cesar chavez right of way to an existing retaining wall that the city built as part of the green water treatment plant. The action before council this week would allow us to retain a portion of the retaining wall so we disturb the root zone of two of the heritage trees and better their chances for survival. >> Can we go back and review for us, we were able to preserve four of the heritage trees? >> Eight trees left on the side after deconstruction, seven heritage, one protected. Six of those fell on block one. On block one, we are preserving four heritage open place. We will remove the protected oak tree as well as one of the heritage oak trees for the mda and provide mitigation under the ordinance. >> That is a pretty good record, at least if you're in baseball, I guess. But given that -- given that unfortunately there was no requirement, I'm really happy

[03:29:58]

and appreciate the work that you've done. The issue that came up that we have questions about. I'm glad our arborist is here. In terms of the structures around the two heritage trees that are going to be the retaining wall, two questions arose. One was there are structural elements going to the ground. Second, there's going to be a deck over it. Both of those we're going to speak to concerns about exactly how we're going to ensure that those two elements don't impact the ability as the trees do flourish. >> Good morning. Michael. I'm the city arborist. Planning and development review. Thank you for the question. When we went back to work to incorporate the trees, we looked at the potential impacts not only to the canopies of the trees we're preserving, but also the root systems. During that discussion, we approved a plan that took the items into place. But because of the level of detail with the -- that's associated with the proposed deck, we're still looking at those potential impacts. We're currently assessing a deck system. It is going to be a deck. But we're looking at ways of minimizing the impacts of the root system that we preserved. That final plan has not been approved yet of what that may look like. But we're currently working through that. >> Morrison: Great, I appreciate that. Those trees, especially, are going to be enjoyed by anybody walking by. So I guess I would just like to -- I know there's going to be some judgment and your expertise that comes into all of that. But I'd just like to urge you to work for the best recommendation possible to ensure that the trees remain healthy and that the tree -- the root zones are

[03:31:58]

very -- very well protected. And I wonder if you might be able to send us a report once you get further along in this just to keep us all apprised of how that -- of how that work is going. >> I'd be happy to. >> Morrison: Okay. And can you tell us about the other two that are being saved? Where are they on the sites? >> One other heritage tree. We have one heritage tree on block 185 on the southwest corner of the site. It's the heritage oak and the intent is to transplant that under the obligations of the mda. Being responsible for transplanting that in the landing place for the tree we're proud to say is at the new central library to enhance the area between the central library and schole creek. And their landscape plan. The -- the last tree is the pecan tree on block 23. That's heritage pecan. That tree has initially indicated will be removed and mitigated in connection with the final phase of the environmental remediation prior to redevelopment of that site. >> Morrison: Okay. I thought you said there were four that were being saved. Did you say four? >> There are four on block one. >> Morrison: Okay. >> And one on block 185. A total of five out of the eight. Which when we executed the mda, there was only the obligation to save one of the eight. >> Morrison: Okay. So the four on block one -- >> were added so now we have a total of five that will be preserved. >> Morrison: Okay. We talked about the two on block one that are on cesar chavez, where are the other two? >> Two more on the san antonio street frontage. >> Morrison: How are they being saved? >> The building footprint has been pulled back from the trees to clear the critical root zone and, again, the designers are looking very carefully with michael and bze to ensure the

[03:34:00]

impacts to the root zone as well as the canopy will not compromise the trees. >> Morrison: Great, that's good news. I wasn't aware of that. Important to get the word out because people were obviously very concerned. People care about their heritage trees in this town. >> Councilmember, I wanted to say trammell crow on their own did go back and redesigned the entire building for the blocks to save the trees. >> Morrison: A beautiful example of being able to balance some of the values that we bring. So please extend my appreciation to them. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember tovo? >> Tovo: Thanks. I made my thoughts at the end of a long evening. This is more success than I expected to see. I want to thank the staff and also the community for add voe kalting for the trees and talking with all of us and making sure that we understood the importance and many thanks to trammell crow for making it -- for really working hard to make it possible. So thank you all. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Okay. Thank you. Going on to take items 15 and 16 related together by councilmember riley? >> Riley: Mayor. This won't take but a minute. I did have questions about these items. Not because of the merits of the proposal, but because of the fact that the budget -- this relates to developing plans for the plymouth park and the expo center. I want to applaud the folks at travis county for stepping out and working for the city to prepare a partnership to prepare a plan for that important area. My only question is whether they do that plan and providing for it in the budget would require -- would be subject to the budget amendment policy that we just approved for the last meeting, I believe it was. And the last answer I got for

[03:36:00]

the budget office and the parks department was, no, it does not require a -- a budget amendment that would be subject to that policy? Because this is not money that's coming out of the general fund. The parks department was able to identify \$50,000 in an existing budget. They are setting up a special reserve fund into which that money will go along with \$50,000 from travis county and \$25,000 from the rodeo. So we'll be able to fund this study out of that special reserve fund without drawing on the general fund. So we don't have to figure out how to accommodate this under the budget amendment policy that we just approved. I've gotten those answers and I'm satisfied and really applaud everybody involved. Because this is a -- this is a -- I think this will be very helpful and represents a great partnership with both the rodeo and travis county to plan a very important site. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Okay. Next, again, item 19 and 20 together, relating to the regional intelligence center. That's pulled by councilmember morrison. >> Morrison: Thank you, major. For those who are on the council, I'm sure that you remember that when we approve the austin regional intelligence center, there was some controversy. It was somewhat tumultuous because there were concerns about scope and privacy and we were able to get everyone together the aclu, the police department, and really get a -- a document and an agreement that everybody felt comfortable with. So this item as posted is an ip tell that says we're adding some additional partners to the intelligence center like pflugerville isd, texas state, things like that. And I have no problem with that.

[03:38:02]

But if you -- the reason it raised the flag for me, because if you read the backup, if you read the backup, it does more than that. What it also does is it adds a new capability to add nongovernmental entities to -

- as partner equivalent. One, I had a little issue with the fact that wasn't posted for that. And I spoke with legal and they, you know, advised that it did satisfy our posting requirements. But from my perspective being perhaps shared, we could have done a better job of posting it. So I wanted to pull this to raise awareness and it also has raised some questions for me. How this is all going to be handled. I wondered if we could have staff come and answer some questions. >> Troy gaye with the investigations bureau. >> Morrison: Could you describe what the additional amendment would do? How -- what kinds of entities we might be contemplating could be added? And then also there's a process and a procedure for adding those entities should we decide to do it? >> Absolutely. The amendment was only for the purpose that we have several universities. We have already -- we have partners such as the university of texas already. We are adding other universities. There are private universities that we have that unfortunately doesn't meet the governmental agreement that we can do an interlocal agreement. So that is the only way we can add them is through a -- is doing a contract. The one thing -- the original intent of the original interlocal agreement in 2010 clearly said any new partners will come back for final

[03:40:03]

approval of the -- of the council. As in just with the contracts is that these entities, the nongovernmental entities, have to have full service police departments. The only agencies that the legislator gives the authority is private universities. We have several of those. And those are our intent is just not to exclude some of our other full service agencies to be part of arik. At this point, there's several such as st. Edwards and concordia that would like to be a part of it and clearly understand that they have to fulfill and meet all of the same requirements in our privacy policies and interlocal agreement. But this allows us to enter those agreements and then come back to the council once we have those agreements made. >> That's helpful. >> Morrison: What wasn't clear to me because I don't know all of the state statutes is that the references here about any entity that thorlzed to have the police -- >> the police body. And the only entities to satisfy that in the state code are private universities. >> Yes, ma'am. >> Morrison: We're only talking about private universities. We're thinking st. Ed's and concordia and we have other colleges. Those are the only ones that have shown interest to date. >> Morrison: What about private for profit? >> No, ma'am. They don't have the legal authority. >> Morrison: State law limits it to nonprofit. >> There is legal here, but there is a statute that discusses private university, that discusses that.

[03:42:06]

>> Morrison: My question is we're thinking nonprofit, but does that statute, if they should get in the business of law enforcement, are they under state law allowed to set things up like st. Ed's have? >> Good morning. The provision that's in the education code does not quite make that distinction. It refers to peace officers of private institutions. I think in this case, the universities we're talking about are all nonprofit. The bottom line is they are private and the legislator would grant them the full authority. >> I'm concerned five years down the line, i.T.T. Tech or -- not that I have any problem with them, they provide a great service, others might be clamoring to be a part of it and it takes us to another realm beyond public service. >> Any entity in the future has to come before this body for final approval. >> Morrison: The other part of it mention in the amendment appropriately so is that any partner equivalent

that we call here, such as st. Ed's or concordia will be required to provide an open record such as our partners are. That's an important element of privacy and transparency. One of the things I'm a little concerned about is they probably aren't set up to do that right now. So what kind of effort will we go to to make sure that's a practical item they can adhere to as opposed to what we're going to attend to. >> There are -- there's training they have to attend which is in compliance with the federal codes, the 28 cfr in reference where they will be compliant with the rules and regulations of our interlocal agreement.

[03:44:07]

I guess with anything, I can't give absolutes. But clearly as with all of our partners, we go through annual training to make sure we adhere to civil liberties and civil rights and all of the codes that we have to abide with to make sure we're compliant with the privacy policy. Those universities will also be uploaded before they get on with arick and they have to continually go through the training on an annual basis >> Morrison: I appreciate that. I think what occurs to me is they might not have built into their system the ability to -- the capability, the functionality to even adhere to it. So I guess I just raltzed that as a flag that when you're talking with them, we need to know before you get too far down the road what they intend to do to be able to set up the system, to be able to comply with open records. Much more than just sailing, yeah, I know how to do it and I'll do it. >> Absolutely. >> Morrison: The last piece that occurred to me was the issue that we also -- one of the corollaries to the open records act, you could say, that makes it work is the retention act, records retention act. Because if you're not retaining your documents to turn over if somebody asks for them, the open records act is somewhat vacuous. So how does that play into all of this with the partner equivalent? >> In reference to the private entities that would come onboard? >> Morrison: Mm-hmm. >> That's a new area that I don't have all of the answers today. But clearly before we enter into any agreements, clearly we will have all of those answers for you when we come back if those agencies are brought before this council >> Morrison: I guess one thing that would make me more comfortable is that it seems to me that since we're mentioning in the amendment that they have to comply with open records, that we should also mention that

[03:46:08]

they should have complied with some kind of retention act, that -- that put meaning in to the open records. Do they have any comment on that? This just -- I would have brought this up to you before, but it just occurred to me this morning. >> Councilmember, certainly appropriate from legal perspective as far as amending slightly the language of the -- of the amendment if you'd like do that on thursday. We could -- we could incorporate new language easily. >> Morrison: I would have been more comfortable if it's a safety commission or a privacy policy committee. Which we finally appointed someone to recently. But at a minimum, I would -- I would want to make sure we get some retention act language in there. Because as I said, this has occurred to me this morning, I wonder anything else if there's anything else. Is it possible, if it is. Is there a -- what's the status of your discussions with st. Ed's and concordia, are they like champing at the bit that you guys are ready to sign? >> We're about 12 months out. We only try to come to council once a year to add new partners. It took 10 initial agencies in 2010. This is the first time

we're coming back to add new members. It took us a while to get the center up to full functioning capacity. I think at this point we will be coming back to council. We have over 40 different agencies in this particular regency. So but we know in our capacity, we can only add somewhere between two and six a year, somewhere in there, depending on the size of the agency. >> I want to mention one other thing that's a concern to me when we're talking about sort of needing to have the system in place for open records and

[03:48:10]

really records retention to be meaningful. The other important element in all of our discussions putting the arik together which I know you were a part of and are in charge of making sure we do it right. I appreciate that, was that we wanted to make sure that the partner agencies were very strict on data sharing, you know, because we needed to have things that stay within the bubble, be shared outside of the bubble, by a partner. To me that's a cultural thing to me that's important. If it's going to be 12 months before you come back, I wonder if you might contemplate taking this part of the action out of it and asking the public safety and/or our privacy policy folks to think about it just to think about whether or not there are other elements to consider here. With the timing on that be unruly for you? >> I don't believe it will be unruly, no. These are the members that have tried to come forward and being transparent with the process and bringing all of the members that want to come forth here in the near future. >> Morrison: Right. I'm not thinking that we need to postpone the portion of the action of adding the members that you've explicitly listed. I would contemplate maybe kicking the other part of the amendment that wasn't posted out for a little other consideration and make sure we've got everything. So, I'll have -- I don't know how my colleagues feel at about that. But I'll throw that out as a possibility. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember spelman? >> Spelman: Not sure how I feel about that either. But I have a couple of other questions. Why is this even necessary? Why can't concordia come in as a full partner? >> Councilmember, the -- the --

[03:50:13]

aric is created or set up via to sort of -- two interlocals that operate co-terminusly. And the interlocals will only work for agencies that the legislature has -- for public agencies in the private universities, the interlocal cooperation act doesn't apply to -- they don't have authority under that statute to contract. So we contemplated other ways to do it to bring the universities in and opted to do it this way. And we certainly consulted with some of the other agencies, counceled, just about bad ideas around and it came with this idea. >> Under chapter 7, 7.1, 7.91 in the government code, they're not eligible to cooperate, but we can make a side agreement with them? >> Absolutely. >> Side agreements -- I'm reading the amendment here. Chief gaye, I thought I heard you say that every partner would have to come before the city council for final approval. Is that accurate? >> Yes, it is, sir. >> Spelman: That's not in the amendment. It says ere partner agency must be agreed upon with final approval by the chair, upon final approval of the executive board of the chair, the agency should sign on with the same terms of understanding. The same format that works for me. I'm not sure I have a problem with execive board making a final approval, but I don't see the mention of the city council or the final approval of the board.

>> Reading the amendment to the amendment we're talking about here? >> Morrison: Reading 19 or 20? It's right here. >> Spelman: I'm reading -- >> it's buried in that long paragraph. The approved nongovernmental agencies recommend to the city council, city of austin city council must approve any agreement before any agency

[03:52:13]

seeking to become a partner may be offered an agreement if they become one. >> Spelman: Not sure what I'm looking at. I must be dealing with -- oh, I'm dealing with old -- the one from last week. So it's changed since last week? >> It actually hasn't. >> Spelman: Looking at item 12 from last year. Oh, this is interesting. This is going to come back to city council. It can't be put in the interlocal agreement because of the technicality of the two chapters? >> Correct. >> Spelman: I'm on it. Thank you. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Okay, we'll move on to item -- thank you, by the way. Move on to item 54 pulled by councilmember spelman. >> Spelman: Every week, we get new backup. On item 54, mayor, I'm interested in the items, the sidewalk signs and merchandise accessories. This is one of the rules that has not always been adhered to. This is one of the things that makes the rules more realistic than it has in the past. Making the downtown commission or urban transportation commission or others in our boards take a look at this too to make sure that we're putting the rules in the right place. >> I would be agreeable to that. We heard the concerns from the business owners that the rules have not been realistic. -- >> it's my guess that the downtown commission would be interested given the vast

[03:54:13]

majority of the potential violations of this ordinance are happening downtown. It's a city-wide phenomenon. The ordinance would apply citywide, wouldn't it? >> Yes. >> Spelman: If you have no objection, offer the amendment on thursday to add the commission, the downtown commission to take a look at this. >> Cole: Or I could change the language and pass out a yellow copy. >> Spelman: Much better. Happy to delegate that responsibility. >> Cole: Glad to do it. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Could you briefly describe the frob. >> Cole: Downtown business owners have expressed concerns with our regulations of fines and public safety. And people, the pedestrians not being able to see the merchandise or their displays in the business. And so we're asking staff to take a look at that and see if we can provide more flexibility. >> Mayor Leffingwell: So it's initiated by downtown business owners. Who feel access to their property is inhibited in some way? >> Cole: Yes. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember tovo? >> Tovo: Has the downtown business alliance weighed in? Are they supportive? >> Cole: Yes, they are supportive. Very supportive. >> Tovo: Thank you. >> Riley: Mayor? >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember riley? >> Riley: I understand the request, you would like to see that the -- the code amendment coming up through the downtown commission and the urban transportation commission in addition to if planning commission? >> Spelman: Whether it's the code amendment or the basic ideas before the code, not sure if they need to be involved early on in the process or only after the code amendment has been crafted. I'm agnostic on that issue. I want to make sure that the urban commission has a chance to weigh in before the ordinance comes back to us? >> Mayor Leffingwell: Okay. I understand we have a representative here who's instrumental in getting this

[03:56:15]

item moving in getting it moving forward. If you could comment on it, I think it might be helpful. Got to have a green there. >> Oh, there we go. Thank you. I should know this stuff. Molly alexander, downtown austin alliance. In 2009, you all passed an ordinance to allow for a-frame signage. But it takes a permit. But as a business owner, you have to go down to city hall, apply for a permit, and pay for it. And we just had people who didn't know that, didn't do it. Code violations, they're usually just essentially if someone is upset by the fact that you have one, they'll call it in. So south congress, downtown, and it's a retailer. You really need the ability to expose why people want to come in, great window displays, plants, a-frames, but only during business hours. So what we see is the need to have an expression in the independent business owner in a tasteful way that's hard to manage. It should be a right as opposed to a permit. So people are doing it unfortunately. And around south by, it gets quite confusing. >> It's all perfectly clear to me. I appreciate it. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Thank you. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Leffingwell: We'll go to 55, also pulled by councilmember spelman. >> Spelman: I just want to be sure what the limitations are on this task force in this item are. I subscribed to everything in the resolution, recognizing domestic violence is a human rights concern for you. Domestic violence is a fundamental human right. I'm on with all of that. My interest -- it's not a concern so much as an interest that the austin county family violence looked at not just the back end of this long saga and

[03:58:15]

dealing with survivors and hoping to get the services and helping, but also to be sure to look at early intervention schemes to look at what the criminal justice system is doing and the backup before that and the look at the possibility of preventions. Are they engaged in prevention and in working with the criminal justice system and other service agencies in the midst of the problem? >> Morrison: I'm going to have to get back to you to get a better idea of the full expanse of the task force work. It was new. The task force was new information to me. And apparently it's gone on for quite a while. And it's rather an ad hoc task force. Anybody in the community is welcome to participate. And the university of texas clinic does a lot of work on it. And they sort of -- apparently the work is ongoing. And the idea of getting the city and the council is going on to support in particular with the data and the reports that are coming out. To get it done in time. I would be glad to go back and ask for the information, I agree with you, about the other elements of this spectrum that are with this picture and get more information back to you on that. Because if you do -- I did a little research looking into the un report that they mentioned in here, and that is definitely a part of that. And the suggestion is that considering freedom from domestic violence as the human right really brings up the issue of for instance causes even the prevention element. So if you said just wait and let me get back to you on that to understand currently what the broader perspective would be, in action, I would be happy to do that >> Spelman: Prevention and early intervention that battered women's advocates and

[04:00:16]

prosecutors have been talking about for at least 35 years. Having a new group of people to weigh in and to monitor what it is we're doing, make recommendations for what we might do better I think is a helpful thing. >> Spelman: That would be good, thank you. Thursday? >> Morrison: I will. >> Tovo: I think it was my last preselected item. I have a quick comment to make about item 50, if I may? >> Mayor Leffingwell: Go ahead. >> Tovo: Thank you to the sponsors for bringing this forward. It's timely. A related item on the agenda. I'm supportive about both of them. I wanted to make one suggestion. So there's been a lot of discussion in the news lately about this issue, obviously. One thing that's been pointed out that it is currently illegal to prohibit discussion among employers -- employees. And so, you know, there's a good piece the other day on npr about I want. I did provide -- I did print out some information talking about the national labor relations act which contains a provision that makes policies prohibiting the discussion of compensation that really those kinds of policies are generally in violation right now. And I thought it might, because there's some confusion object that, I thought it might be nice to add a where as saying. One place to do it might be after -- maybe after your fifth whereas talking about the national labor relations act, generally -- generally -- I'll quote, gives all employees the right to engage in concerted activities including the right to discuss the terms of the employment with one another to make it clear to anybody reading it that there's an executive order initiative issued and

[04:02:17]

another discussion in the news currently we have good federal provision. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Any expectation? >> Tovo: Get you a copy of it? >> Spelman: That would be great, thanks. >> Tovo: Thanks again to the sponsors. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember martinez? >> Martinez: I wanted to throw out there I've had multiple requests of potential postponement of item 80, the lake austin overlay. So at the appropriate time on thursday, I intend to make a motion to postpone it and just wanted to get a sense from the rest of the council if they received the same request and if they would be open to that idea so that we can let the public know our intentions today. >> Martinez: Any comments? >> Spelman: Sounds like a wonderful idea to me. We're going to be up to 2:00 in the morning as it is. >> Mayor Leffingwell: I have no objection to postponing to anything, really. So go on to item b-1. >> Tovo: Mayor? >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember tovo? >> Tovo: I apologize. I remember that councilmember morrison and I are requesting a time certain for the baylor house historic designation consideration and I believe the time we settled on is 7:00. Talking about the appropriate time we'll make that proposal. >> Mayor Leffingwell: All right, we will put that in baylor house at 7:00 p.M. Time certain. That will make it the last item on the agenda. >> Tovo: That's not the intention. I think we'll reconsider our time on that. >> Mayor Leffingwell: You let me know what the time is. >> Tovo: We maicon verse with you a bit on -- I think councilmember morrison had -- >> Morrison: We're having an agenda. >> Mayor Leffingwell: We're

[04:04:18]

taking these items out of order. I'm trying to go on to item b-1 and we can go back to council items of interest is kind of the catch-all. >> Morrison: So let's retract the 7:00 p.M. Statement, if that's all right. And we'll discuss the timing later. >> Tovo: Retracted. >> Mayor Leffingwell: E raced from my memory.

>> Morrison: Just like on a jury. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Now, item b-1. Item b-1 is to discuss potential appointees to the austin water resource planning task force created by resolution. Anyone have a comment on that? We can't -- if not, we can go to item c. >> Tovo: I have a comment if no one else has one. I am considering -- actually, I will if she agrees be appointed jennifer walker who currently serves on the environmental board and she's the water resources coordinator for the sierra club, the lone star chapter, and she's got a lot of experience in central texas and in the state and water planning. But I want to mention we've got good suggestions. Not sure if nay ear circulating to all of the offices or just particular offices. One was raymond slade. I have to say I don't know if these individuals are expressing an interest or others are expressing an interest for them. So that's one caveat. So that's one suggestion I received. I think we may have all received some other suggestions that came to us by way of neighborhoods council. I received an expression of interest from roger baker who I think would also bring a great

[04:06:18]

deal of expertise to the watterver. To this task. So I -- I posit those for consideration. >> Spelman: I didn't catch the last name? >> Tovo: Roger baker. >> Spelman: Roger baker, yeah. >> Mayor Leffingwell: No other discussion on this item? >> Spelman: The other name is lauren ross, who's a logical person to appoint. But I suspect my colleague to my left has first dibs. She wrote lauren ross's name down. I just spoke it. What's in writing supersedes whatever is spoken. >> Mayor Leffingwell: I'll say I haven't begun to think about this yet. But I may very soon. And I guess we can go on -- are there any other -- under items c, council items of interest that you want to bring up for item d-1. >> Tovo: I had the opportunity to talk to the water planning task force and that group convened and be able to be a resource to our staff as soon as possible. So I hope that we -- I hope that we can get those nominations moving here quickly. I think in terms of another council item ohs sbrels, I wanted to discuss the possibility of do we have any other thoughts on the time certain? I think councilmember morrison was talking about the timing of issues for thursday. >> Morrison: Yeah, I imagine the item is going to be a long one. I wonder if there is any way for us to make sure that folks can come after the break but to do -- but to do the baylor zoning case. But at the same time, be able to get in before the vested rights hearing, which I assume will be quite long?

[04:08:20]

The problem was that the people that were interested. >> Mayor Leffingwell: You could pose it for 4:00 p.M. >> Morrison:3:59. >> Mayor Leffingwell: I've never seen that before but -- >> Morrison: We know the folks can't show up until after 6:00, they will be at work. Some of the very important folks that need to be part of the conversation and the hearing. >> Tovo: I'll add a few of the family members who really want to be able to participate in the conversation. That does come up after this item on the agenda so we wonder if we had a time certain that we agreed it would come up before the vested rights. >> Morrison: I have an idea. We'll do a request that vested rights come at 7:01. >> Mayor Leffingwell: You could do that. >> Morrison: Or both at 6:00. >> Mayor Leffingwell: We'll note that the vested rights item is posed for a time certain of 7:00 p.M. >> Morrison: And then the baylor house for a time certain of

6:30? >> Morrison: Okay, great. >> Riley: Going back to the water task force, I got a few suggestions on that. Haven't made a decision yet. It will be helpful to know if everybody will be ready to make the appointments on thursday, aisle step up my efforts and make sure I'm ready to make a decision then. But if really, the most of the force -- task force isn't going to be in place until the next meeting, then I won't do that until the next meeting. It would be helpful to get a sense on where everybody is on that? >> Mayor Leffingwell: I may have somebody or may not.

[04:10:21]

I don't know. I just note that I voted against this item in the first place. But since the task force has been created, I'll be looking for somebody. If I find them before thursday, I'll make that appointment. >> Martinez: Likewise, we received multiple requests for appointments. Could be ready by thursday. Just might be ready to have a staff meeting this weekend. >> Mayor Leffingwell: So I think the answer is unknown at this point. >> Morrison: Mayor? To reiterate the point that councilmember tovo made, the water utility is on the fast track on this work. And I think the resolution asks that a task force come back with their report in june. So if we don't make the appointments until our may 1 meeting, that does cause some issues. So I think that in terms of really leveraging the work of this task force, easy for me to say, because I already know the name. That I'm appointing since I wrestled lauren away from bill. But I think in terms of usefulness, it would be great if we could -- if folks do have the time to look into it. >> Mayor Leffingwell: That's a good point. Councilmember spelman? >> Spelman: The rules I understand them are once the majority of the task force or any other board commission has been appointed, they can begin meeting, is that accurate? So as long as there are four appointments, they can get started? >> Riley: Okay. >> Mayor Leffingwell: With that, we go to item d-1. Discussion of saturday citizen's meeting. Any comments on that? I'm kind of agnostic on it. Councilmember martinez.

[04:12:25]

>> Martinez: We did a forum last year, sparsely attended, cost impacts. We want to review that again this year to see if there was some utility in providing that forum for citizens that can't come down on thursday. So that's what the presentation is. And it will have the fiscal impact if we so choose to do so with the recommended date of june 7. >> Riley: That's correct, that's correct. >> Good morning, mayor, council. Ray bury, assistant to the city manager. Joining me on this presentation is our city clerk, janae goodall and barbara thomas from the law department. To give you some history, if you remember back on march 6 this year, the city council adopted a resolution to hold a citizen's forum on a saturday in 2014. At that time, you directed the city manager to look at the city clerk and the city attorney, which we've done, and you wanted the city manager to report back on the cost of holding that meeting in the event that you might want to schedule more citizen forums in the near future. That cost information is provided later in this presentation. In responding to council's resolution, a working group was assembled that included staff from various departments that we'll see listed in the bottom of this slide. Right there. Go. I want to remind council the last time we had a saturday citizen's forum was back in 2012 and we're using the same meeting framework to construct this year's forum. We incorporated some of what we learned in 2012 to make some improvements. For example, we made sure to vet the meeting date so

that it doesn't conflict with downtown events or street closures that might make it difficult for citizens to access city hall. We'll be improving the outreach to citizens about the importance of posting clearly defined topics if they want to engage in a discussion with council.

[04:14:26]

We're making sure to have proper signage available for those parking in the city hall parking garage, clarifying that the parking is only available to those attending the forum. And we're considering having a representative from the law department available at the meeting to give a direction to the council when ever questions arise about when council can engage in a discussion with citizens. The direction we received from council to date about the citizen's forum is if you want a meeting that has the fall lowelling elements. Basically that allows for posted and opened communications from citizens which we refer to as general citizen communications and open citizen communications and city clerk, we'll speak to in a few moments. You want citizens to have an opportunity to engage council in the discussion in the forum. You want to ensure that staff adequately promotes the forum through the city's various communication channels. Ask that the forum be recorded so it can be access on atxn or on the city's website,f and you direct that the costs be limited. I'll mention the cost estimate later in the presentation. In keeping with the direction we received from council, we're proposing a date, a meeting date of saturday, june 7, beginning at 9:00 a.M. In city council chambers. At this point, I want to turn it over to city clerk to talk about the format of the meeting. >> Good morning, mayor, and council. Jeanette good all. Just as a reminder, this is the format that you -- that the last form followed. We had kind of the introductory remarks by the mayor pro tem in 2012, either the mayor or mayor pro tem could make opening remarks followed by general citizen communication which we

[04:16:26]

had slots for 20 individuals to register in advance followed by open citizen communications and then we adjourned after the last speaker had finished. So we would recommend basically the same format with the exception of last time we actually posted the end date of the agenda at noon. And so we would recommend that we not actually impose an actual end date or end time on the agenda and just leave it like any other council meeting that the last speaker is done, there's no question that the last meeting could be adjourned. There appeared to be some question whether or not you all had to stay to noon in case someone showed up at 11:45. And then we know that's not the intent. So -- >> got it? >> Councilmember riley has a question? >> Riley: How did weland on the date of june 7? >> It was selected because if you remember last -- in 2012, there was -- I don't remember what special event, but there was a major event going on downtown that had pretty much all of the streets closed around city hall. So we looked at a couple of things. Any special events currently scheduled on the calendar with the special events office, we looked at -- we took into consideration the renovation occurring here at city hall beginning in july. And we looked at whether or not there was a council meeting that week. And so came up with june 7 as the best possible date between now and when construction starts here in the building. >> Riley: I will just note that the reason there's no council meeting that week because we adjusted the schedule to avoid a conflict with a conference that

[04:18:29]

week. But it's meeting that week from the fourth through the eighth. Last year both councilmember martinez and myself did as well as the city staff. I had been planning on attending this year. >> We do have an alternative date of may 31 that we looked at which, of course, may not be perfect either because it's after memorial day weekend. But that saturday also that didn't have a lot of conflict with special events. May 31? >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember martinez? >> Martinez: Did you say that is memorial day or the saturday after? >> The saturday after memorial day? >> Mayor Leffingwell: Is it a holiday weekend? >> Not a holiday weekend. >> Martinez: I would note, preferencewise, that seems like without having to look at the details of the calendar, it seems like a better date, because june 7 is also potentially the saturday after school gets out for all school kids and if -- if we're going out of town -- >> right. >> Martinez: Seemings like the 31st might be a better day. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember morrison? >> Morrison: The -- one of the reasons we might have had an end time last time was in case there were 1,000 people that showed up to speak during the oep open citizen communication. I would be more comfortable if we knew there was going to be -- is there any way to indicate that there might be even if 1,000 people show up with the meeting that we would stay through the night. >> I would defer to law. >> Morrison: I doubt that 1,000 people are going to show up.

[04:20:30]

You never know. >> Mayor Leffingwell: There's a maximum -- on this slide, it shows a maximum of 20 individuals. I don't know if that's the intent for this year. >> Morrison: Not on the open. >> Martinez: That's general citizen communication. >> Morrison: There's no limit to the open. >> Martinez: Correct, correct. >> Councilmember, I think we could provide something to indicate that the council on the agenda that you're going from 9:00 to 12:00 but you will take into account if there are reasonable number of additional speakers. I mean, we can think of some language that would try to limit the time -- >> Morrison: We wanted to end earlier last time. I doubt you could say something that it would end no later than noon? >> We could figure out language to give you the flexibility to end earlier and then to account for if say extras came. If everybody spoke by 11:00, it would adjourn. If you wanted to hear some additional folks in the open session. But I think we can find a way to give you the flexibility. >> Morrison: That sounds great. Thank you. >> The process for general citizen communication. We're recoming like we did in 2012 have 20 individuals who can sign up in advance. We have established roughly a two-week period which is similar to what they used now for registering to allow them to contact the clerk's office, either by phone or e-mail, to register. They can speak for three minutes and they cannot donate time. The one thing that we did not do last time that we may want to

[04:22:33]

consider is follow the meeting that was left in advance and follow registering. If that allowed the 20 people who had not spoken in one of the previous three meetings, they get first priority. If you don't receive 20 and you have a handful of our folks who register on a regular basis, then we could fill in those

slots with those individuals like we do any other council meeting. And then your open citizen communication is really limited to the number of speakers who sign up and how long you want to meet. It's not a council meeting week, we'll be able to use the speaker signup system for open citizen communication which should make it easier for using cards to register the people. They do not have to register in advance. But since we're using the speaker signup system, we can open up the system on monday afternoon like we do for council meetings. So they could start registering monday afternoon. And that would give us a good idea by saturday how many people may actually show up to the meeting. And then they can also sign up on saturday. They can speak for three minutes and a donation of time would be allowed. Which is similar to the process we used at the last meeting. Any questions on that? >> Mayor Leffingwell: Not posted for action for recommendation, but we can get direction. So I would suggest for starters we go with the recommendations outlined with slides except for when you want to differ from that. So is there any comment -- I think the date was somewhat in contention. Does the council want to give direction on the date?

[04:24:35]

Councilmember spelman? >> Spelman: I have no direction on the date. But I have a question about the rules that you're signing up. Will you ask people to sign up for a name or also a subject? >> The ones under general communication, it would be just like the noon citizen communication, we would ask them to provide a topic. We would include the -- the value of including a topic in all of our marketing material. And when they call to register, if they don't want to provide a topic, we will notify them at that time that that means council cannot engage in discussion with them at the meeting. The open citizen communication would not have a topic. >> Spelman: Is there a way we could get people in open communication to be posted in advance? They can't post in advance if they show up the day of. The terms of engagement, we can't discuss the issue among ourselves but we can ask questions of somebody who does specify a topic in advance, is that right? >> Right. >> Spelman: So long as the questions do not have the ting of deliberation and not rhetorical purposes. If somebody says something and I want to know more about what they're saying, I can ask it, right? >> If a topic comes up that's not posted, you can state a policy, you can state a fact, you can post it on a future agenda. You cannot have discussion about that topic. >> Spelman: I understand -- help me with the discussion. The definition of discussion? >> Either with the person attending the meeting or among yourselves. >> Spelman: So if somebody signs up for the -- not the first 20 -- they therefore cannot specify a topic in advance. They say something ambiguous and I want to know what they just said -- >> you can ask that. You can clarify, yes.

[04:26:35]

You can clarify. You can't engage in discussion. There will be a lawyer there that will assist on that. >> Spelman: I want to know in advance what the lawyer is going to say to see whether or not it's going have a -- it's going to impinge on my ability to understand what people say. >> Clearly, you can ask for clarification. >> Mayor Leffingwell: The same rules we have on regular council meetings in citizens' communications, the same criteria apply. >> Spelman: Need a reminder, ie raced it from my memory by accident. >> Cole: I have at a question. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Mayor pro tem? >> Cole: What staff will be

on hand? >> Just an attorney. Originally when it was set up, council said they didn't need professional staff available. That was consulting down the costs also. >> Cole: I understand. I agree with that. I just wanted to make sure we were talking, having discussions about the limits on the deliberation or discussion that you made that clear also. >> We are having technical difficulties with the power point. But just to highlight the next slide that you can pretend that you're seeing is that we would try to do hopefully a more advanced marketing of this so that we could get a larger turnout, including -- including it on the website, facebook, twitter. We would send it out to the board commission, chairs, ask them to make announcements at the board and commission meetings. We're going to work on a process of getting it out to all of the neighborhood associations, etc., for them to share. Of course, we'll be on atxn, channel 6. And then you all could announce it at the meetings between now and may 31. And if you have other suggestions on how else to better market it, please let me

[04:28:36]

know. >> All right, so the next slide would talk about the fiscal impact. Everyone has a copy of the presentation. So what you see in this slide is that the cost to hold the assistance forum is \$1900, compares to a little over \$1600 from the 2012 meeting which is a difference of about \$256. The only costs that has gone up is the one for ctm media support. Everything else has either remained the same or has gone down a little bit. In talking to ctm staff, they believe their costs will probably go down. They're anticipating needing three individuals who will staff the event. It's possible that we can do it in two. If we do it in two, we'll bring it in line with what we did in 2012. And you can see some of the other itemized costs from closed captioning, atxn production staffing, building services security and utilities, all for a cost of a little over \$1900. So with that, I'll kind of hand it over again to the city clerk to hand over the timeline between now and the meeting date, if it remains at june 7, which is our recommendation. >> If we move it to the may 31 date, you can see pretty much everything would -- as far as the registration, we would just bump that up earlier one week. Which I don't have the date right in front of me. But we would adjust that and I could send you out an adjusted time line on when things would start. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Any other comments. Councilmember tovo? >> Tovo: Thank you. I think it reflects the level of planning you all did to provide us with this spread sheet -- not spread sheet, power point, thank you. I know after we did this two

[04:30:36]

years ago, I believe. 2012, the staff sat down and did an after action report and came up with some of the challenges that we had the first time through and ways to meet them. I appreciate that work. >> So to the extent that we can assist in getting the word out, I'd certainly like to do that. And I thank you, to my co-sponsors, mayor pro tem cole and council member martinez, I'm really happy to see this moving forward again. >>> Council member morrison. >> I appreciate the mention that june 7 is the first day after school is out, and I personally think it would really make sense to avoid that day. So if -- I would be in favor of another day, because hopefully all the kids will be at the swimming pool, june 7 is the first day that the swimming pools will be open. >> So I believe the direction we're hearing is may 31? Okay.

>>> May 31 seems to be the direction. Okay. No further business, we're adjourned at 10:32. >> Thank you.