

## City Council Work Session Transcript – 06/10/2014

Title: ATXN2

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 6/10/2014 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 6/10/2014

Transcript Generated by SnapStream Enterprise TV Server

=====

[02:54:03]

>>> >>> >>> >>> >>

[03:03:55]

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Good morning. I'm austin mayor lee leffingwell. A quorum is present so I'll call this city council work session to order on tuesday, JUNE 10th, 2014. Time is 09:05 a.M. We have to skip around because some of the councilmembers are not here. Councilmember morrison is here on number 32. >> Morrison: Mayor, I think actually the updated list that's been passed out, the next item is number 28. >> Mayor Leffingwell: I don't have -- >> Morrison: It's an updated list there. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Well, as a matter of fact, councilmember tovo is here, so if you don't mind we'll just start with item number 13. >> Tovo: Thank you. I've submitted a few questions through the q and a process as well, but I thought that staff might be able to give us some preliminary answers about this today. If we've got staff here I thought we might start with those. I wonder if one of you could just help us through the series of decisions that are taking us to this thursday's proposed expenditure. I understand that probably about a year ago we approved -- maybe it was more recent than that, we approved staff going forward and looking at contracts, but there was no fiscal note attached. Can you talk to us about the strategic facility plan that we did and when that was done and whether it received

[03:05:56]

council approval? >> Yes. Kerry overton, deputy city manager, austin energy. I'll give you a high level overview to bring you up to date and we also have our facilities planning team here and if we have additional detail questions we'll answer those as well. We started well over about three years ago doing an analysis of our building, our lease versus build buy plan. And within that three years ago, because we were leasing the space and was approaching very quickly to have over \$20 million or so in lease costs, our analysis showed us that we needed to go down a quarter of evaluating whether we need to build or even renovate other properties in the city. And that exercise led us to come to council. 30 months ago we completed that analysis. About 12 months ago we came to council to approve a design build alternative delivery method for a new office building and a parking structure on land that we own at

riverside. Then two months ago we went to the electric utility commission and they provided the go-forward vote for us to come to council for action to have a consulting group finish the engineering part of it to come in and finish the design build method or the criteria workbook for it, for the project. And that's where we are today. But in doing that in our analysis we polled well over about 2700 firms for the project. We had 258 of those firms ask for packets. And 12 of them submitted proposals. And after interviews with the staff we are now in this action recommending that

[03:07:58]

council allow turner construction to go forward with the job in designing and supervising the construction of the new building. For the buildings itself back in our analysis, we looked at well over 26 buildings that were up for market at that time, 30 months ago. We looked at them very carefully. Some of them they did a detailed analysis that fit more of our business plan for the business use. Three of those buildings we did a detail evaluation. And as we came to a conclusion that none of them in the cost analysis proved up to be the best fit for our business operations than us building in the riverside corridor, according to the corridor plan which we're proposing for you today. So that's a broad overview of the steps. >> Tovo: Thank you. I appreciate that broad overview. I have a few questions about it. You talked about the strategic plan, the strategic facilities master plan that was completed 30 months ago. Did that come to council for approval? >> The plan came for a vote for council on the firm that did the analysis, yes. >> Tovo: That was the 13 months ago decision? >> Yes. >> Tovo: But 30 months ago strategic facilities master plan did not come before it. That was an internal analysis that was done by austin energy. >> That's correct. [Inaudible]. Pat alburn, austin energy. We came to council for the contract to hire the consultants. We didn't come back to council with the master plan that was developed for austin energy by the consultants. >> Tovo: Thank you. Because it sounds like that's really where the detailed analysis took place of looking at different -- at different alternatives.

[03:09:58]

As I understood your overview it was in the strategic facilities master plan where you looked at different options for renovating existing buildings versus purchasing a building and building from the ground up. So I guess my first question is can you make that available to us in our backup? >> Yes. A copy of the master plan? >> Tovo: I think it would be very especialliful in particular to see the different scenarios that you considered. >> Yes, we can do that. >> Tovo: The different cost benefit analysis that you did on purchasing an existing building versus building from the ground up. >> Okay. >> Tovo: And so just to be very clear, that did not receive -- that was not presented to council as far as we know. It did not receive an up or down vote from the council. That was an internal document. What we did vote on is the action 13 months ago, which was to pursue a design build contract, but again that I believe came to us with no fiscal note. It was indicated there was no fiscal note attached to that particular contract. >> Yes. And one point of clarity. But specifically in 2009 council did approve the creation and funding for the master plan and facilities for the assessment to take place, so that portion did come to council. >> That was before you undertook the strategic facilities master plan. >> This is sandra stark's joans with austin energy project management. We did joy the -- we went for an rfp and council did select -- approve the firm to

do the master plan. So that was back in august of -- >> it was 2009. >> Tovo: Thank you. So that was again to undertake the strategic plan. The reason I'm asking these questions is because I think we've all heard a lot from the public this week in terms of concerns about spending this amount of money to construct a building.

[03:11:59]

In trying to recover what the series of previous decisions have been, I've been trying to determine whether the council ever voted a 67-million-dollar expenditure for this new building was appropriate, warranted, made good sense. And it doesn't sound as if we've had that opportunity to do that at this point. There were a series of earlier decisions that have resulted in the proposal that's before us on thursday, but the council, this one or a previous one, never undertook to construct a building of that amount. That's my understanding. >> That is correct. >> Tovo: Okay. I appreciate that. Thanks. And my other question and probably my colleagues have some here too -- I really look forward to seeing that cost benefit analysis. I think that will be very helpful. I did wonder how this factored into the rate case. Was there -- was this accounted for in the rate case that went before the public and then the public utility commission? Because of course we were looking I think at a 70-million-dollar gap that we needed to recover through rates, and this is almost the same amount. >> Well, we have our cfo here as well. The high level answer is my understanding is that everything that was looked at and talked about in the rate case was benchmarked around 2009 looking backwards. So it was not specifically part of the analysis in the rate case. >> I see. That's right. Thank you for reminding me about the benchmark. So this was not accounted for in the rate case. I guess I will be interested in how this will effect rates going forward? Because we are -- one of the things that we of course want to do is minimize rates for our ratepayers, and there were signs that austin energy might be in a position to need to recover additional funds at some point, and this it would seem to me would exacerbate that amount. >> We can provide those materials in the backup as

[03:13:59]

you've asked for, but part of it is our analysis came that we're spending as much if our current environment in our budget on lease costs as it would be building a building. So the specific numbers in terms of how it might impact that we'll add that to the analysis as well. >> That would be great. >> We're looking for that to be very minimum because of the -- this is our cfo, anne little. >> Hello, anne little, cfo. I think one of the questions was was it in the budget. And it has been a line item in budget starting last year. >> >> Tovo: That was for -- that was for what, the design build? >> Yes. >> Tovo: Contract? Or was it for the whole 67 million? >> The whole 67 million has been in there starting in last year's cip plan. >> I guess the other question that we were just talking about is how it was accounted for in the rate case and is it accurate that it was not accounted for at all in the rate case? >> No, it was not in the rate case. That was based on 2009 test year. >> We can see hopefully by thursday how that might impact rates if at all. >> It will be difficult to tell because we don't have a cost of service yet and that test year will probably be in 2014 so we could probably estimate something for you. >> Tovo: I remember some of our work sessions we were talking about reducing the amount needed by three or four million

dollars and it was a pretty lengthy discussion. I could imagine that there would be an impact of a 67-million-dollar expenditure in terms of the impact on our ratepayers. >> Okay. We can provide that to you later. >> Tovo: Thank you. >> Martinez: I appreciate the questions from councilmember tovo and I want to make a couple of points. We approve facilities master

[03:16:00]

plans quite frequently in parks, and apparently we did 30 months ago in austin energy. Today that doesn't create an assumption that this is going to build whatever that facilities master plan says. We put it in a plan and we fund it as we go along. And I think it's very troublesome that we went through a very difficult rate case knowing that the facilities master plan was coming and here we are a little over a year after the rate case we see that our finances are finally straightening out to I believe the tune of a 60-million-dollar plus reserve this year and now we're already going out and planning to build a building for \$70 million. And I know you say that we have lease space that is almost identical to the cost of building a new building, but during that construction period we'll be doing both. So there is an added impact in terms of finances moving forward with this. And eventually I hope there is a savings and I think that's the goal is when you have your own facility and you own it, eventually you start creating savings. But I have to say I'm very uncomfortable moving forward this thursday because we don't have the facilities master plan and we don't have the detailed analysis that did you on the 26 buildings that you reviewed. I know you didn't do detailed analysis on all 26, but the 26 that you chose and then you whittled it down some more, that type of information is the information that I think we need to have in the public realm so that we can either justify this expenditure or not. And so I would hope -- I just want to ask what kind of timeline we're under and is there a potential for us to take this information and -- take a little more time than three days to try to review it, let the public take a look at it and bring it back to council. >> I don't think it will take us much time at all

[03:18:01]

because the analysis is already done. I would like to have facilities manager for the benefit of the council give you an idea of what the market prices are for our analysis and how we came to a logical conclusion that the building the building, particularly on the land that we already own, that analysis will show that the city is going to save money over time given fact that again the building that we were occupying we are probably 65 to 75% of the tenants paying the lease and as we start to approach \$20 million. If we were to renew that, we would obviously have another six-million-dollar plus lease again. And so I think I have our facilities manager maybe just give you a high level overview of what that analysis is so that you can look at the build cost per square foot versus what we saw in continuing leasing or reno evacuating. And those numbers we can give those to you pretty readily because those analysis are already done. >> It will be good for you to do that, but before you do that, I want to go back to the issue of the rate case and why this was not contemplated within the rate case. And can certainly be more technical about -- anne can certainly be more technical about it than I and there are things that you can include and that you cannot. One that you could not be things that you anticipate happening in the future could not be -- are not included in that methodology, but anne, do you want to speak to that? And I think you had

another point perhaps that you were going to make, but speak to what I just said, please. >> He's correct. In 2009 we did not anticipate this building. We were leasing quite a bit of space, as Kerry explained. And we have done a lot of studies on this and I think we haven't looked at the rate impact specifically, but we know that there will be some savings because the lease space has been so expensive. And the debt service on this

[03:20:03]

new building will probably be much less than that. So it should have a positive effect on the rate increase, the next rate increase rather than a negative impact. >> Martinez: And I appreciate that. What I'd like to do is have that come through a public process and up to the council. I'm not disputing what you're saying, I just don't know that and it's not been presented to the public or to us. We haven't made that case. >> I think we can take a step back and provide the information that's been requested here this morning. I know that the team that's in front of you are prepared to answer some of those questions, but I think what I'm hearing is a desire for a step back and the delivery of some information in advance of a subsequent discussion, if I think I've heard the sentiment here correctly. So for the time being we're certainly happy to answer the questions you've put on the table today the best we can with the understanding that we'll provide additional information. >> Martinez: And I appreciate that, city manager. I think that would be very helpful. I'm not saying we don't need this facility, but I just don't know and I can't answer the questions that are coming from the public because of the way it's been presented -- put on the agenda and presented. >> I think that's exactly right. We're happy to do it. >> Martinez: Thank you. >> Mayor Leffingwell: I think it would be good to take a step back because the impression is out there in the public from what I'm reading that this is a gold-plated facility with all kinds of luxurious amenities attached to it. I heard one comment why does this building cost so much? Because it has solar panels and walking trails. To me that's not a good answer. So I think we need to justify the cost of this facility and make sure it meets your needs, but it's not at the same time the Taj Mahal of energy headquarters buildings. Mayor pro tem has been waiting for awhile. >> Cole: I think it's

[03:22:04]

important as we take a step back and I do support taking a step back, that we show two things to the public because of course they are concerned about affordability with rates and overall affordability. And that is that we're clear on the short-term versus the long-term. And if professional staff is looking at the long-term, which I believe that you are, we still need to know the short-term impact because people are concerned about these issues right now, not just for the long-term. And then the second issue I have is that it has been in the -- has also been in the public realm is what properties were available. I understand you went through the process and determined that since we owned this land, but there have been criticisms that there are other properties that were available or adjacent that were actually at a market value less than this. So that process of determining that this was the waying to has also not been put out in the public realm. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember Morrison. >> Morrison: Thank you. First I'll second the mayor's comments because what came across from the media interviews was that we're spending this much money because we want to make it as the mayor said gold plated, but

we want to highlight the great efficiency and renewable energy and all of that. And I wanted to -- I'm particularly interested in the cost benefit analysis of renovating or rehabilitating a building. I know it can be very expensive, not as expensive as building a new building, but to me that's just as important a point to make to the public as featuring the great work that austin energy does in green building and all. So I think that that will be hopefully interesting information that comes out

[03:24:04]

in the cost benefit analysis. And then one other different point I wanted to bring up that you might be able to help us understand in the further information you're providing, we've seen this chart before. Most recently it was part of an answer to budget question number 19 that I submitted. And what it is is a chart of austin energy f.T.E.'S versus customers. And the amazing thing about this work is that it shows how efficient austin energy has been with their labor force because it's basically in 2014 about the same number of f.T.E.'S as we had in 1992. And it's been flat, it's dipped down, it's gone up. So what I don't understand is the the driver for having a new building because we're bursting speak seams because it seems like we have the same number of employees and I don't know why we need a new building for the same number of employees. It's fine if you don't have an answer for that right now, but maybe it could be part of the information that you provide for us. Did you want -- it looks like you have a comment. >> Sandra straus johns, austin energy project manager. The reason to build this building, and as identified in the master plan, is to release reliability leased space. We have that problem. Our lease expires on 2017 and our process was to be able -- we presented to council a request to move forward with a design build back in may of 2013, last year, to allow us to move forward with the process of beginning the design build

[03:26:06]

project to be able to begin this design and construction process for austin energy to be able to release some of the issues that we're having with leases. >> Morrison: I understand. And that is completely understandable that it makes sense sometime to decide to invest in your own building instead of leasing. And that's something that makes sense to everybody. >> [Indiscernible]. >> Morrison: Part was problem what came out to the problem is we want a gold plated facility and we're bursting at the seams. Well, the gold platedness we need to look at. If we're not bursting at the seams. If it's not expanding the space, then we need to make that clear also. And maybe we've got plans to significantly increase the number of our employees and you could help us understand that too, but I'm just saying that's part of the information that came out in the public. And we need to have a better understanding. >> You made the analysis that the mayor and the city manager has asked us to take a step back. We will put forth the answers. It's a pretty straightforward building. It is not -- I don't know exactly where those rumors have started, but part of our analysis is to provide the data to you so that you can have the facts and make that determination on your own in terms of how the size fits the business need for what we're trying to achieve. >> That would be great. And the other part of that is that the building would be larger than the building we have now so are we planning -- what are we planning to do -- >> we will address those issues. >> Morrison: That's great. >> One of the things we can provide to you is the design criteria

menu that was created based on what you guys allow us to do on hiring the -- to begin this process for design build. And in there it identifies we're looking for a modest, clean, crisp building. That's additional information that you guys can look at.

[03:28:07]

>> I'm going interrupt you. Suffice it to say there will be no gold plated building. [Laughter] let me just say that. I don't know where that came from. Call it a rumor or whatever you choose. We're not talking about a gold plated building. I think trying to be respectful of council's time and all the things you pulled off the agenda, we're happy to take all of your questions under advisement and we'll take all of those into account in preparing our response to you, but -- so if you have others we're happy to hear them. We'll take them under advisement and make sure that's part of what we provide in that. >> Riley:. I appreciate all that and looking forward to seeing the information that's provided. One aspect of the project that I hope you will focus on is the garage. We are talking about building a 600 space garage on a transit corridor and I hope you will -- in the response that you provide you will provide some brack down as to the cost of the garage as whether any analysis has gone into modeling best practices with regard to parking management. I know we've been talking about modeling solar manuals and walking trails and things like that, but there has been a lot of evolution on thought on parking management. I would en-- I would hope there would be some coordination with the parking enterprise who the staff of the parking enterprise are in contact with national consultants who are up to date on latest parking policies and how the parking spaces can be monetized in a way that would lower the cost of the parking garage. Instead of just building a very expensive structured parking facility on this transit corridor under the assumption that we will just be handing each employee a free parking space of their own, I hope that wealthy carefully about how -- that we will think carefully about how we can model best practices into the current thinking on parking. >> And councilmember riley, we will address that as well in the analysis we present back to council. >> Martinez:;,AS A LAST Comment, city manager, likewise if we would meet with the montopolis and eroc

[03:30:09]

neighborhood contact teams. If you already have, that's great. I want to make sure that what we're designing and potentially going to build is compatible with those plans and that they're aware of what's going on in their community as well. >> Spelman: I understand we're taking a step back. How long a step are we taking? >> Well, that's something I'll have to talk with staff about. Obviously in terms of the council's calendar we don't have very many meetings left. So -- I don't know how critical some of the time lines are they're working with. So I don't know that we'll necessarily be able to get back in front of the discussion with council by the 26th. It may be after that. >> Spelman: It sounded to me as if the case had already been made on paper and just hadn't been presented to the council and the public that it might be something that we could take up on the 26th. >> We're certainly willing to try to do that. I believe in the analysis that we're talking about for the most part provides answers to all of the questions pretty much that I've heard here today. There may be some additional work with respect to some of the issues that has been raised. We'll do our best to provide it in the next several days and if it's possible to

take it up again on the 26th, we would all be happy to do that and get it done. >> That sounds like a good plan. Thank you. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Okay. Item 28 pulled by councilmember morrison. >> Morrison: Thank you, mayor. This is an item to approve and encroachment agreement on -- at 1303 san antonio. Appeared there are two pieces to that encroachment agreement. One is an aerial encroachment and the other is an encroachment on to the sidewalk. And in the backup we had received one objection to the encroachment on to the sidewalk with a comment that there was limited sidewalk facilities there already and so we started looking at it

[03:32:10]

a little bit. And I guess it was a little hard to understand exactly how wide the sidewalk was going to end up being and then -- so hopefully we'll be able to get some answers on that. And secondly my question is what criteria would we be -- would the staff use in terms of recommending something like this because it's not clear to me that it's in the best interest of the public, but I see councilmember riley anxious to make a comment. >> Riley: I wanted to report to the mayor that I'll be recusing on this item since I live on property across the street so I will be stepping down from the dais on this discussion. >> Morrison: Okay. So thank you for being here and I wonder if you could talk a little bit particularly about the encroachment on to the sidewalk. >> Certainly. Good morning, eric 18ing, property management services. This was actually the first encroachment agreement to come through the process to the -- the application process sense council passed the ordinance to establish this the first place. As we saw, there's four pieces to the encroachment request, two of them are aerial, which include air conditioned space. One is aerial, which is overhead walkway cover. Of course there's the piece that is the steps and handicapped ramp that come off from the building itself. Site plan in -- well, the planning department actually as part of the site plan to be able to determine what is required in terms of that ingress egress feature, but from the encroachment part of having the features project into the right-of-way, it falls into the same set of regulations essentially as a vacation or any other sort of use, if you have the underlying [indiscernible] you can request that encroachment out into it. We sent it through the review to the entire roster of reviewers with all departments and utility franchise stakeholders. None objected to it. In fact, they approved it, at which point we go ahead

[03:34:12]

and phrase it and forward test test test and test on to you. You identified there was an objection from a neighboring can gentleman who had concerns about the extent that it would restrict the sidewalk width. I know that the applicant has spoken to the objector and as of this past week they had still yet to meet. They had been playing phone tag and then the objector was out sick. They're still trying to resolve this before council on thursday and have that objection retracted. Specifically to your question about the width of the sidewalk, I regret I don't have access to the site plan in its current form so I don't know how wide it actually is. But according to the applicant, it meets all of the site plan criteria for keeping the width of the sidewalk the way that it needs to be and that the ingress egress echoers do not impede use of the sidewalk. >> My staff did some calculations based on the backup and got to an assumption that the -- it would convert -- it would be up to nine feet into what might be a 20-foot sidewalk, which means



you're almost cutting it in half. So that is of concern to me. I can see why someone would object to that. And I -- and so if you wouldn't mind in the -- maybe taking that as a question and you could put it in backup for all of us to see. It's not so simple to see because there's ramps and there's projections and all of that. But really my question to all the staff that signed on to it is how do we know this is in the best interest of the public? Why is it okay to cut our sidewalk in half at the corner of 13th and San Antonio. And I don't know if there are other staff that can speak to that. This is a concern to me that even with alley vacations, but you know we have real concerns about alley vacations even though it can

[03:36:15]

fit through all the internal hoops. So that's the real crux of my question. And I can understand that the designer of a building might want to maximize the ability to put square footage, and they are, they're hanging over the sidewalk from several floors up, adding square footage there. And maybe that doesn't make a difference if people don't mind being shaded by overhanging buildings. But this is a much different situation. And if it's a matter of giving them the encroachment or just saying, no, I'm sorry, you just can't have that much on your ground floor and you will have to redesign and pull it in, I need to know why we need to -- why it's not the public's best interest. >> Okay. >> Morrison: Thank you. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Okay. We'll go on to item 32. Councilmember Morrison. >> Morrison: That's mine too. This is the Burnet corridor and neighborhood plan items. I know we have several staff here that we've been working with and I appreciate all the work that they've done. If you will recall, this was

[03:38:18]

on our agenda just at our last meeting and we pulled it and staff hosted a meeting that had a pretty good turnout. Did we get a count of how many people were there? >> Not yet. >> Morrison: Okay. Well, I would say 50, 60. I wouldn't be surprised if there were even more. So there were a lot of good questions, a lot of good clarification. And I partly pulled this because I want you to know sort of where I'm headed with this and what I got out of the meeting and what I think folks got out of the meeting. So the first point is that the resolution is divided into two parts. It's about doing new neighborhood plans, updating existing names and then the -- neighborhood plans and then the second part is kicking off a corridor plan. One thing that became clear is on the neighborhood plan issue it's about three new neighborhood plan plans, North Shoal Creek, Allendale and Rose Dale. And then updates for the east side. What became clear is we've got some formal response from some of the neighborhoods as to whether they're interested in participating or not. But some of them we don't really know what kind of formal response we've got. It's not clear we've really gotten all the neighborhood associations or contact teams response, so I've talked to staff about that and I wonder if I could turn it over to you and you could talk a little bit about why might post, -- might potentially postpone the neighborhood plan parts and work that you might do in the interim to contact the neighborhoods. >> We'll be sending out -- Mark Walters, planning development and review comprehensive planning division. We intend to send out emails to get a formal response from all the neighborhood associations and contact teams that are within the area. And that's about eight or nine different organizations. So we're looking to send that out this afternoon to

[03:40:18]

solicit their responses. >> Morrison: That's great. I know we've heard positively from the board at north shoal creek that they do want to participate in a may plan. Negatively at allendale that they do not want to participate. I'm not sure if we've got a formal response as opposed to informal responses from rose dale. And the rose dale area also includes ridge lee and oakmont, which have different neighborhood associations, so it would be important to hear from them. And then of course highland, wooten, crestview and brentwood. >> And westminster manor senior living. >> I appreciate that and I understand that's not really going to get in our way if we delay that part of the action on thursday. Then with regard to the corridor plan, having heard the clarifications from staff about what a corridor plan is going to be -- this is new. We haven't done this kind of corridor plan before. It's not going to result in a regulating plan. It's going to result in, if I understand it correctly, a character analysis, defining the vision along the corridor, different areas, a cip plan. It will come up with perhaps code recommendations and other recommendations to implement, which could be really great for integrating with code next in terms of testing out codenex and probably some other things that I'm forgetting right now. >> The reason we chose burnet road at this time is this fall will be the rollout of the metro rapid bus line. We thought this would be a good opportunity to get ahead of it and plan around those station stopped, the pedestrian and bicycle improvements that would allow people to use the bus much easier. Easier. >> Morrison: So I was interested and I'll be preparing an amendment to add some language about what the corridor plan will

[03:42:19]

result in just because it's new and I think just for transparency purposes. And another thing is that I would like to -- clearly we've heard some priorities from the neighbors around there, certainly walkability, compactness, family friendly, all of that. And those are goals that align with imagine austin. So I was going to also add some language that gives a nod to those goals. In accordance with imagine austin we will be working on these goals, including, not necessarily limited to, but I think it's important to be able to indicate that we understand -- we have heard from some, not all necessarily. We want to be comprehensive. So we'll also be doing -- adding some of that. There were other concerns that also are dealt with in imagine austin like the fact that concern about making sure that the corridor plan reflects the neighborhood plan where we have language about that in imagine austin. They're very concerned about the edge between residential and commercial. So I know it will be a big effort, but I think that giving an acknowledgment to the issues that have been raised will help kick that effort off in a positive way. And then I want to -- let's see. There was also a request to ensure that we have other agencies, like cap metro and lone star. And I'm sure that that was part of the plan. So perhaps we'll add that. There are two other issues I wanted to add. And one is perhaps my co-committee members can recall, we had liz mueller come to comprehensive plan and transportation committee awhile back and she had -- she and sarah dualing had a paper published in the journal of urbanism about the east riverside corridor planning effort. It was sort of a hindsight

[03:44:20]

review and some suggestions that could -- in their view could have improved the process and the outcome. And it mainly focused on -- it mainly focused on the fact that -- that some folks were sort of left out of the process. We have a gem graphic -- we had a demographic in east riverside that was a lot of non-english speakers. We had some -- a big group of low income folks. And the proposal in the paper is that if we were to be clearer in the beginning and then with an assessment of the current conditions, especially with regard to folks that are vulnerable to the changes where they might experience displacement and all, that we might be able to be more proactive in coming up with a plan that really addresses all. And we do have some similar demographics and probably other challenges along the burnet corridor plan. So I think this aligns with the housing transit jobs work that we're doing and I'm not sure exactly how to fold that in and maybe we can talk more about it. I just sent the paper to staff yesterday. I think it could really help us move the ball forward in trying to deal with gentrification and displacement and trying to make sure that the future addresses serves that the people who live here in the future, not just the people living there now. And if you google mueller and -- actually, if you just look for liz mueller online you will see -- you will find the link to her paper if you're interested. And then the last point I wanted to make was one of the questions we have that was raised by steven fenter and I suspect he's talked to all of you, was the level of modeling that's going to be done. And I know that he in particular mentioned two

[03:46:20]

issues. One is are we going to be looking at modeling housing choices and how that -- housing types, future housing types and how that might impact age diversity. And then about modeling and transportation and infrastructure capacities. I'm wondering will we be able to use envision tomorrow to help answer some of those questions? >> Certainly it's available to us once we get in and start looking at all the different variables we could see if we could use that tool. We have used it in the past and I think it would be open to us using it in the future as well. >> Morrison: I think that would be great because we want the work to be founded on some reasonable assumptions and that could help us do that. >> I think also we can do some research and see what best practices other communities have done along these lines to get a sense of what's really possible and what other -- what's the best practice. So we'll look into that. >> Morrison: That will be great. And I think if we put all these pieces together, certainly my hope is that -- the plan is to come up with real world recommendations because when we talk about plans and visions, I think we've got enough plans that say -- that have a vision that is compact and connected and family friendly and multimodal and all that. And to use this as an opportunity to go to the next step so really brainstorm about some ideas of how to achieve that in this corridor could be a real step forward. So I think that it makes sense to move forward with the corridor plan on thursday and with your work hopefully move forward soon on the neighborhood plan.

[03:48:23]

>> >> Riley: You expect to be making changes to the resolution and having those before us on thursday?

If we're just sending out an email to the neighborhoods this afternoon is that going to be enough time to see who is on board? >> Morrison: Mayor, if I may? No, because we need to be able to get some formal action as opposed to just -- >> Riley: Right. >> Morrison: So we'll postpone -- so my amendment will strike all the refuse rents to neighborhood plans -- references to neighborhood plans. >> Riley: So we'll just move forward with the corridor plan. And you'll have that to us thursday morning? >> Morrison: The amendments. I guess I can't get it to you any earlier than that. >> Riley: Thanks. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: I appreciate that and I wanted to thank staff for organizing that meeting. I think it was very, very helpful and I appreciate councilmember morrison's suggestion that that happened because I -- there are -- we're all getting lots of questions about it and I think that was a helpful process. And I look forward to seeing the amendments. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember martinez. >> Martinez: I appreciate the additional comments about impacting folks who may not understand the impact. We saw that in the opting into no parking in your front lawn provisions of the code and that is exactly what happened to a large segment of our population who are mostly spanish speaking, not understanding fully what tools are in their neighborhood plan and having a dramatic impact on so many folks receiving citations for doing what they've been doing all along and not knowing that it was illegal or part of a sixth street within their neighborhood plan. That to me is one of the areas where I hope we continue to focus on so that we don't miss out on that large segment of our population that might not understand some of the things that we're implementing. >> Morrison: Mayor, I want to make one more comment. One issue that came up was

[03:50:26]

was -- in the meeting was -- clearly you had sent out the notice to all the folks in the community registry, so it didn't hit the business owners. We only had one burnet road business owner there. But as I understand it, there will be extensive outreach to the business owners and the property owners along burnet road. >> We'll put together a public participation plan that has strategies to outreach to these different communities with different methods that we might be able to reach out across the whole broad spectrum of all the stakeholders. >> Morrison: Great. Thank you very much for your work on this. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Okay. We'll go to item 37 by councilmember spelman. >> Spelman:. >> Thank you, mayor. I personally observed that the amount of money spent on -- that we're talking about changing for the ibm corporation's i.T. Program, customer building, is roughly the same amount as we're talking about spending on a new building for austin energy. But the public seems to be focused very much on the new building and not on this issue in large part because everybody understands new buildings. Nobody understands i.T. And customer building. I am with the public on that. I don't understand this either, but five million dollars and change and I would like to understand more about why it is that we need to have this particular change order. >> Elaine kelly diaz, vice-president of customer account management with austin energy. This rca is to cover annual expenditures for consumables. This is our it was cost for a mailed bill, electronic bill payment functions and things that are part of the hosted services contract. So we come to you every year for approval of the consumables. So that's a portion of this contract. Another portion of the contract covers some technology upgrades including increase of disk space required because of

[03:52:26]

the growth of data in our customer base. Additional reporting environment to allow us to run some reports and a separate environment that doesn't affect our day-to-day operations. And additional test environment which we have found very necessary with things like changes such as our annual rate changes and things like that. >> Spelman: This is the fifth year of an eight-year contract. We're still on for the eight-year contract. At some point we have to have it. And the concern I've got -- not really a concern, just a question. When we started this eight year foray into a new customer building system, we presumably had some -- we saw that we were going to need a certain amount of disk space, we would need a certain type of testing environment. Our bills would change so we would have to try them out in a safe place. And this represents a change from what we thought we were going to need five years ago. And I'm a little concerned that could we have reasonably foreseen that we would be where we are today five years ago? What materially has changed in the austin energy environment to cause us to need something different than we thought we were going to need? >> I don't think this is different. This is just our annual cost for the consumable products. So we will have -- >> Spelman: I got that. So do we need to spend two million bucks on paper. I get that. It's the other three million dollars and change for the changes in the system itself that I'm concerned about. >> And other than the question about the annualized update of the paper products, the only one major change here from the original requirements of the specs is the fact that we need an additional environment for testing. And that could not have been forecasted back when we started this program. And what that means is when the programmers are -- when the rate case change or any program that's changing to move a change in the program

[03:54:27]

since we bought it out of the box it was not a customized system, the changes go through a delivery production process and in the testing that is the -- a variable that causes a lot of delays because when they take our environment down we're subject to more errors or challenges because they're trying to get a snapshot at that date and time when they test all programming against e does the new added program work? By adding two environments we're able to stabilize the system a little better and have less effect on our current production on realtime while we make /add/( ed)aives to the program -- additives throughout the program. >> We knew in 2009 we would be making changes to the billing system, so the rate structure, to stuff going on in water and solid waste and so on. We didn't feel a need in 2009 to require parallel systems. That's what we're talking about here is two parallel systems. We could test on one and bill on the other, is that right? >> It is in some ways. It's an environment created within the system. We need our cio to come and talk about those differences, but the way they -- this technology, the way they've done it in these days, you still use a lot of your productive data at the time that you're doing the testing just because of the sensitivity to it. So we took a pathway that we're not going to have a completely parallel program. There were environments built within those environments. So it goes simultaneously, should I say. >> Spelman: How did we expect we were going to do this back in 2009? >> The current way that we're doing it now. >> Professor: Okay. It wasn't built into the contract in 2009. This is the change order. >> No, what we didn't want to do is we didn't want to overanticipate

activity that would be so far out in our

[03:56:28]

forecast that we would anticipate dollars that would not have been necessary at the time to build into the contract. Otherwise we would have been coming to you with a san angelo that would have been well over -- contingency that would have been build out. And we would have been asking council for maybe 35 or 40% more just in case something occurs. And we chose not to overly try to build it out, but only wait until we got to the point where a new add-on had to be taken on that we do it realtime and not try to overanticipate it. >> Spelman: So for example, on the disk space issue you might have thought we're probably going to need more disk space in five years. We would build that into the contract, but if we don't need it we won't have to pay for it if we don't build it into the contract. >> That's correct. >> Spelman: Would we pay more for it now than if we had built it into the contract five years ago? >> Not much, but all of this equipment is proprietary equipment and so the prices is really their systems' operation. So we don't have a way of looking at a quote on this back in 2009 and then compare it to what they would give us today. >> Spelman: Right. So what happens when you deal with a corporate structure which remains secretive and proprietary and doesn't let much out about what it's up to, but never mind that right now. I find it a little bit ironic. I don't know if you do or not. We can't get out of the ibm contract at this point we have so much sunk into it. >> Councilmember spelman, I'll be guarded with some of the words because I don't want to implicate the contract differences. Even with the additional add ons, the cost of the program in the last five years with all of the amendments that you have approved, we're

[03:58:29]

still operating this system at a cost far below what we have done in the last 15 years with the previous system. So we've had new functionality, we've added on new rates that were not anywhere near the kind of structure that we had before. It's much more complicated with water, the electric services and the other non-metered services that we have. The building complexity and the level of data that customers demand today compared to where we were 15 years ago is just -- there is no comparison. But the cost associated with it today is far over -- I would say 25 or 30% less than what we were spending 15 years ago, we're not anywhere near the function that we have today. >> Spelman: This is -- I guess it's a recurring theme for the day. I have noticed it as a recurring theme for which I'm grateful, but it has happened twice today. The best argument for a new building for ae is it will save us money because we will be able to get out of expensive and escalating leases by building our own building. The biggest argument for having gone to ibm in the first place is because it's reducing our cost per bill you're saying 25 or 30%, and I believe you. And the reason for doing this particular change order is because it's cheaper for us to do a change order than to build it into the contract in advance even if it's reasonably foreseeable because we might not actually need to make the change. Do I follow you? >> I understand, but I would say there's a little bit of difference and we promise we'll get there on the lease. I think there's one big difference. I think what we see is the rate in which changes are occurring to the city, whether it's generated by austin energy or it's customer generated and we're asked for an example, can

we get that same data on our cell phone and you push the notification to us? New functions that were not derived back when we built the system five or six years ago and the requirements

[04:00:29]

were two years before that system was built. [One moment, please, for change in captioners]

[04:06:05]

>> what we've found is that ibm -- as elaine mentioned, ibm has to be the only company who can move it to production. What we've also done when we have new items we're going to continue to use third party vendors to do the programming. And often times we're getting that at a cost, much less costly than what ibm would do in the programming and the only costs associated would be the costs for ibm to move it to production. But if you add both of them together you would see the total cost of what it would take to run the system. >> Morrison: So it's much more efficient costwise to do it that way. >> It's much more efficient and also from our perspective, ibm is in the operation maintenance mode as opposed to the preimplementation mode. And we have a set of issues that we have them to focus on all of their attention to continue to allow ongoing operations of the system and some of the new development we want to bring on thursday parties so that also it's the speed of delivery so that both programs are working at the same time, operations and new development. >> Morrison: That makes a lot of sense. And one last question, can you remind me how long this contract is? I think which councilmember spelman mentioned that? >> It goes to october of 2017. >> Morrison: Are you thinking about past october 2017 at this point? >> We're already starting to look at our options and lessons learned from the first time around. >> Morrison: Great. >> And as soon as we get data we will definitely make sure we get it to you. >> Morrison: That would be great. Thank you very much. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Okay. So we'll go to item 58. Councilmember martinez is not here, so we'll go to item 60, pulled by councilmember spelman. >> Spelman: Mayor, because councilmember martinez is the main sponsor of this resolution I would prefer to wait for him to come back in the room. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Okay. I guess we can go to item

[04:08:07]

62, pulled by councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: Thank you. I believe we have -- here is councilmember martinez. Do you want me to launch into it? >> Mayor Leffingwell: If it's okay with you, we'll go back to item 58. >> Thanks, mayor. I wanted to ask staff on this item. I was able to speak with the trail foundation on saturday. Susan, thank you. I wanted to ask staff on this item if we -- if this moratorium is contemplating any -- any projects that are currently going through the process. As you know, house the homeless has some artwork that they're trying to contribute on the other hand the trail.No carrierringconnect 57600 >> because the other would have required an ordinance change. In terms of the way this resolution is written, it's my understanding that it would apply to all projects, both c.I.P. Public arts projects as well as art work donations. From the staff level we are continuing the review process and -- and what would be suspended would be notification to proceed for any installation. >> I

understand. And thank you for that. And I -- I get why we need to do this, that there's just an inordinate amount of

[04:10:09]

offers, if you will, of folks wanting to have dedicated benches and memorials to loved ones that have passed and we just don't have a really fine-tuned system, if you will. I think that we have a good process, but we're looking to improve that. And to have a better understanding. We do have a request from mr. Troxell on that specific item as it relates to this item. I may make an amendment on thursday to allow to that continue through the process. It doesn't necessarily mean that it would be sited, just moving through the process. To achieve the necessary approvals. Then once this is complete that would allow that to proceed forward. If it's not friendly, I completely understand. But this is something that he feels very strongly about as he's been working on it for some time and, you know, has worked with a lot of staff members on this project. So just throwing that out there that may be an amendment on thursday, it may not. We're going to revisit the subject with him this afternoon based on staff's response. Thank you, mayor. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Mayor pro tem. >> Cole: I also noticed that susan rankin is here, I wanted to say I brought this item because there is no -- [indiscernible] on the butler trail, the trail foundation is working with the city of austin to try to create that. But I wanted to ask susan to come forward a little bit and explain that need so that everybody is clear on that. Why don't you sit right there, susan. Susan, will you explain from the trail foundation's perspective why this item is needed? >> Yeah. And I think the opening of the boardwalk and the huge crowds and throngs there really highlight the unique role of the trail in austin.

[04:12:09]

It's where everyone goes, it's our central environmental place, it's where we go to touch and feel and sense nature and I think that the reason that this is needed is because so many people, both individuals and organizations, want to have something that is special to them out there. But there's no overall master plan of how to assess this and the way that the city has to -- and the trail foundation looks at these is really on a one off case-by-case basis and ends up putting you guys on the hot seat because these -- these groups such as the homeless groups come forward and they want to do something that's really important to memorialize them, but there's many, many important public issues and groups that would want to have their thing out there, too. And I think that that's what we need to do is just take a pause and get a handle on this and yet be respectful of the role that the butler trail plays in austin. You know, I think that if you look at the fabulous temporary art installation that happened I don't know maybe six months ago, that was wonderful. And then it went away. So then wasn't the satellite of -- there wasn't the assessment of putting something out there in perpetuity and putting that out there on our children and grandchildren. >> Mayor Leffingwell: I will just say I don't think it makes sense to have a master plan or a more tomorrow in place and make exceptions to it. So I would not be supportive of anybody having a special case to put before and go ahead with their project until the master plan is completed. Councilmember morrison? >> Morrison: Thank you. I appreciate you all being here. With regard to councilmember martinez's point I would be supportive of an amendment that allowed that to



go forward because it's been under discussion for a long time and it's not clear how

[04:14:09]

long this process could take. And I think that's a very reasonable consideration to add. I have a couple of other questions. I was concerned about the moratorium or suspension in general because we don't know how long it's going to take. Especially because we have a very well defined process for public art. We have the panels and the arts commissions and it's very objectively done and we ensure that it is done in a manner that respects the expertise and all. So I'm concerned about suspending that, for instance. I wonder if staff can or if anyone has an idea of how long this might take and what other public art projects might we be suspending because of that? >> Right. So we did look at the next two to three years in terms of what's in the pipeline. Currently, the only installation is related to the trail head project. But there are some remaining funds for the boardwalk. And we also included the cesar chavez esplanade which is part of the public works project but it's -- it will be an extension of the rail project. So those have been identified in terms of how long a public art planning process would take. I think that's very dependent on the scope of work for the consultant and the community stakeholder engagement process. And this being a 10-mile loop and looking at the -- and the reason it's called the public art overlay is to really take into consideration those other planning efforts such as the waller creek, holly power plant, the south shore waterfront. So I think there's a lot to consider when we bring in other voices to make sure there's some cohesion with the trail area. And we have a kind of a blueprint for the next five to 10 years in terms of what that might look like and how the art can help with the trail enhancements.

[04:16:12]

>> Morrison: So does this in fact contemplate bringing in those other planning efforts and integrating discussions with them? >> The resolution doesn't reflect that. I noticed. >> Does not. >> That's not the intention. That's been part of the conversation, yes. >> So maybe we could come up with some language to make that clearer because, you know, the south shore effort and all of -- waller creek and all of that. >> There are a number of stakeholders. That's kind of part of the concept of the plan to recognize that waller creek, seaholm power plant the central library, a lot of things touch the trail and need to be a part of that plan. But in terms of the -- of the already existing projects would be included is my understanding. But anything new would be excluded from the process. Now, but -- but will you help us to zero in on what exactly is already included? What is the criteria for that? >> Included in the suspension? I'm trying to get clarification -- >> Cole: Included -- it doesn't matter if you tell me whether included in the suspension or if you tell me what would still be included, but we want to be clear about the cutoff. >> The cutoff? >> Cole: The language suppressly includes with the exception of art work that has been approved by design but has not been fully installed. That's the language that I used. >> Right. So right now the boardwalk was just completed and the installation completed and right now we still have the trail head project. That will be installed in the next few months. And then we still have remaining funds from the boardwalk. So those are the two items that we know of in the next year that we would need to move forward on. >> What the resolution does is it specifically lists belts, which is one

of the boardwalk proposals and it lists the auditorium shores trail head project related

[04:18:13]

to climate change, I'm sorry I forget the name of that. Then everything else would be on pause. >> Correct. >> Mayor? >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember morrison. >> Morrison: I appreciate that. But to go back to the specific, am I hearing that there's not a specific reference in the resolution that the -- that the planning effort will engage with the other major projects and planning efforts that are currently underway on the lake? >> It's not in there. But the intention is that it would do that. I wonder -- >> Cole: I think we can get some language that says that there will be other items within the planning process. That would be included for consideration. Is that what you are asking? >> Morrison: Not quite. What I'm asking is that the planning effort will engage with the other planning efforts and the other major projects that are underway along the shore. >> Yes. >> Morrison: Okay. Great. So -- also, I noticed that the -- that it does ask that the plan be presented to the parks and rec board, the art in public places panel, the arts commission and then coming to council for final approval, if the waterfront overlay advisory board still exists at that point I think it would make senseless for it to go to them to -- it's in the first -- at the end of the first be it resolved. >> Cole: I agree. >> Morrison: Okay. Then I want to understand a little bit about the structure of how this process is going to work. It's going to be the city partnering with the trail foundation. I wonder if you could speak a little bit to where the -- where the funds would -- are going to come from, how much we expect them to be, and how the management of this project is going to happen. >> Well, I'll start by saying that currently the

[04:20:13]

resolution is committing staff time to help support the master planning effort. And as it reads the -- we would be contracting with the trail for those consulting services. And so to speak to the cost currently there's no city funds committed to this and the timeline I would need to defer to -- to susan on -- on what that -- >> Morrison: Okay. So it basically is going to be run by the trail foundation and the -- >> that's my understanding. >> Morrison: The city will support that [multiple voices] >> yes. >> Morrison: Susan, do we have an idea, there was a thought that when this was first brought up it would cost \$150,000. >> We don't anticipate it to cost that much. What we're going to do is sit down more extensively with megan and work through exactly what we need that to be. The reason it was originally projected to be that high was we thought that it was appropriate to lead it by a national consultant and after more conversation with megan and the other people involved we realized of course we can do this locally. We will bring in a national level person to provide some guidance and insight about other places that have addressed similar kind of public space to the -- to the trail. So that's a long way of saying we don't know yet. We have to work through and carefully design how we're going to get it out there to the proposal people. >> Morrison: Okay. >> But you are clear there are no city funds. >> Morrison: There's no city funds. Not even -- I mean, no city council required funds. It doesn't say there are no city funds. It says there are city staff. The city manager, for instance, could still sign-off on \$57,000. Or is it going -- or is it going to say explicitly there's no city funds. >> Cole: Let me get back to you one second. I think it does. >> Morrison: I think that I read in here it says that the consultant will be

[04:22:13]

jointly selected. >> Correct. We're going to have to draft that process. We want to do this in collaboration, you know, we don't want anybody to [indiscernible]. It's also going to very much bring in the parks department, too. This is very important that everyone plays a role here. >> Do you want to expand on that. >> Does it say that it's going to be jointly selected? I'm concerned about -- I appreciate the -- a partnership and it's great that we have organizations like the trail foundation in order to be able to take leadership for us just in terms of maintaining our responsibility to -- to all of austin, I'm concerned about turning everything over and it's not, I understand how it's reflected in here that it really is a partnership. It's not just trail foundation, please go do that. And I think that I saw that it said in here it was going to be a consultant that was jointly selected by the city so that the city does have a -- a role in selecting the consultant. Am I wrong about that? >> It does. Yes. It does say that the city will work with the city and trails selected consultant. That's the level of detail. >> Here it is. A city and trail foundation selected consultant. Okay. So I think -- to me that's important. So we have a role in selecting the consultant. I guess that I would just want to make sure that we have a role in -- that it doesn't -- that the scope of work really endanger -- really incorporating partner with the city. >> I would really welcome that we have a process for professional design as an artist in selection, that we sort of help drive that selection process. And for public, you know, vetting and public trust. >> The selection process of the consultant? >> Of the consultant, yes. >> Would be staff's recommendation. >> Okay. And do you feel that with this resolution language,

[04:24:14]

that -- that -- >> I don't know that it's clarified in that way. >> Morrison: Okay. Maybe I'll talk to you off line and we could make sure that I could come up with some language for an amendment. >> Okay. >> Morrison: All right. Thank you. >> Cole: Councilmember morrison, you are concerned that the city manager being authorized to negotiate and execute an agreement with the trail foundation that formalizes the partnership is not a clear enough direction for the city to be involved? I guess I want to make sure. >> Morrison: How they're going to be -- I'm sorry, yes, how they're going to be involved. I think that meghan is going to help me come up with some language that would expand on ensuring that -- that it's -- that specifically what can be discussed atmosphere part of that. >> Which would be -- discussed as part of that. >> Which would really be open competition with clear criteria for eligibility. That that's lined out and available to others to apply for the opportunity. >> Cole: Okay. Susan, how do you feel about that? I just wanted your comments on that while we're talking about the amendments. >> Sure. >> We have always wanted to work with them on putting the proposal out there and we'll define the request for qualifications with them. Very, very carefully. That's great. >> Cole: Okay. >> Morrison: Great. Then just one other clarification. So it will -- it says that the city will support with staff. It doesn't say the city will not provide money. >> Will with, it just says that the city will provide city staff, but it doesn't exclusively say that there are no public funds to be used, I guess is -- >> Morrison: Right. I think it's just important to do that because in the sum -- I appreciate that the trail foundation is bringing the -- the sums that we are talking about may well be below the city manager's -- within -- I'm sorry,

correct preposition. Within the city manager's

[04:26:15]

authority so if our expectation is that it won't be city funds, then I think that would be good to -- >> explicitly say that. >> Right. Thank you. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember martinez? >> Martinez: I may have missed it, but the very first question councilmember morrison asked what is the timeline that we think it would take. I don't recall getting that answer, do we have an estimate? >> I have to defer in terms of this project because again it's going to be based on the dollars and the scope of work for the consultant. I would say a typical, thoughtful process is anywhere from six months to a year, if not longer. Again, you are engaging stakeholders and the longer you take, you know, you strive for more consensus, so I don't have a specific timeline that I can give to you. >> Okay. Mayor, I appreciate your concerns and actually share those concerns that, you know, probably it wouldn't be appropriate to let a process continue while we're going to come up with a whole potentially new program. But the reason -- one of the reasons that -- that I believe we could let this particular project move forward is if we put a stipulation that it can't be installed until the master planning is done and if it needs to go through an additional new component, that it would do that as well. Because it very well could be that it's not recommended by -- by our parks board. It could be that it's not recommended by staff. And therefore it wouldn't be a project that would be installed. That -- that is one point that I guess that I would like to make about allowing that particular donated art piece to run through the process because if it's not recommended by staff or by the parks board, it won't be accepted by the city. It will still be up to the council but I doubt that we would go against those two bodies. >> Cole: Mayor, I agree with that assessment it should go through the process after this is passed so that [indiscernible] will pass this item.

[04:28:15]

Because the process is designed to keep the whole trail consistent visionary. >> Martinez: Understood. The other question that I had was you mentioned a couple of times that there are still boardwalk funds available. Is that specific to public art? And so that will be -- that will continue to -- we will continue to accept offers for those funds for public art? >> Meghan wells, art in public places administrator. Those funds were from the 2% of the boardwalk. As Susan mentioned we went forward with one artist, but there were others that were originally selected. They have withdrawn from the project and from the contract but we still have those funds available for public art, we have not embarked on a new selection or approach for public arts as of yet. >> Martinez: Will we hold those funds in abeyance until that master planning is done. >> That's my understanding. >> Morrison: We had artists that withdrew, offers and contracts on the table and they withdrew? >> They did. >> Morrison: Was there a reason, do we understand why? >> It was their choice. Once we conveyed the general arts -- there was some arts commission discussion about putting those remaining projects on hold because of this potential discussion point with the trail and it was agreed that we would move forward with one of those, but put the others on hold. And upon hearing that, they decided that they would rather withdraw than to -- to wait for that time period to elapse and then propose new work. >> Morrison: I see. We didn't have

contracts signed with them yet? >> We did. >> Morrison: We did but it didn't require that we move forward? I'm confused. >> They terminated at their convenience. There was contract language that allowed them to withdraw from the contract. >> Morrison: So they could have gone forward independent of anything that we wanted to do here. >> The agreement was to wait six months after the boardwalk was finished and then convene a new process

[04:30:16]

with those artists to contemplate new work or a new selection. So they decided to -- to forego that. >> There was objection to the two designs. I just want to make that clear. That's why the conversation was elevated to -- to moving forward with the project or not. And so. >> But they had gone through the process. >> Uh-huh. >> Okay. Only the belts that currently installed had been approved by the arts commission, which then staff did not get in the way of that, it would have proceeded forward with installation, but the other two at staff's discretion we did put it on hold to then engage a local artist who could work with them in a new proposal. >> Morrison: Okay, thank you. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Okay. Thank you, let's go to item 60, councilmember spelman. >> This is a resolution to call for a master plan of lamar beach metro park. And for the most part, a lot of this is just incorporating good planning practices, it's a very long resolution, there's a lot of moving parts here. A lot of this stuff looks like it's just do master planning the way master planning ought to be done. Expanding pressler street, do a tia first, shop around what happens with the tia before we actually start pouring concrete that makes good sense. Include environmental protections, sustainability, student safety, things like that. That makes good sense to me. But this is also getting a little bit more specific with respect to the results than the average resolution. And what I wanted to do was to bring up the staff involved in this, which is from parks and from animal services. Just get a sense of whether this resolution, this sense of direction is giving them the flexibility that they need to develop a master plan that is going to best

[04:32:17]

meet the public needs. >> [Indiscernible]. With ricardo soliz, would you mind repeating. >> We are getting down to details. We are going to be very specific with the kinds of things that we're going to be asking you to do at metro beach, down to the level of showers and stretching space for runners. Seems to me that's more specific direction than we are used to giving you when we are asking you to master plan something. Are we being too specific here? Should we be giving you more flexibility is this an appropriate level of direction in your mind. >> Typically you do not give that kind of specific direction. I think hopefully it's a suggestion. And that we would address these things through a master planning process. >> Tell me more, sarah, about your standard master planning process. >> When we do a master plan we are very inclusive. We don't intentionally leave anyone out. Occasionally after we have gone through it, we find that we have left a stakeholder or two out, but this is a very important piece of property. So we envision bringing everybody that we possibly can, including the general public, because this is a major piece of land that green space in the downtown area, so we would bring all of the current stakeholders as mentioned, all of our other partners, austin independent school district across the street, neighborhood, parks board, environmental board, so it's -- it's a very extensive process and

bringing in all of the different stakeholders because this is a -- a large piece of green space. Then once we go through that master planning process looking at what kinds of

[04:34:17]

things you can put in it, public wants, what kinds of amenities our current stakeholders have there -- big stakeholders way of course and then we look at how does that all play out into the scheme of things when you are laying something out on a piece of property like that, ensuring that we have public amenities there to -- to -- for the general public. Goes through a series of bids and ultimately it will come through to council, I believe, after we've handed it all out basically. Unless I'm missing anything, that's pretty much the extent of it. >> So the usual master plan -- pardon me, your usual master planning process is identify all of the stakeholders, bring them altogether, not necessarily working with a blank sheet of paper, but -- but with a minimum of requirements. Development requirements that actually make sense for this lot that meet the needs of the general public. >> Exactly. I will say, you know, I -- one of the stakeholders we just recently and council approved an agreement with them for 25 years which is the west austin youth association. That's important that we -- I think we all are on the same page, which is honoring their -- honoring the commitment to them, working with them and looking at all of the other things that -- that all of the other stakeholders that are involved and ensuring that we've covered all of our bases. >> Spelman: What's the status of our situation with west austin youth association? Do we have a contract? >> We have an agreement with them for 25 years. And we've been working with them to look at the ability to rebuild. They are haphazard, parking is a mess. We are looking at how to master plan that for a better layout, better ingress, egress, better safe environment but also to intertwine other activities

[04:36:19]

that would be there for the public. Many of the parents or guardians with their children have other children that aren't participating, we are trying to look at public amenities and address issues related to waya providing parking for the programmatic portion of it as well as for the general public, then looking at the issue related to the y and how we have worked with them on some additional parking area. But of course their parking is also a problem and we need to look at that. This is going to be an extensive effort to make sure that we are crossing all of our t's, dotting all of our i's, also focusing on a commitment that we have currently through an agreement. >> Spelman: From your point of view, best thing is to say have at it, grill automatic of the stakeholders, usual stuff if we want to. But you have a sense for how to do this master planning, if we want to make suggestions about things like stretching spaces for runners, from your point of view that would be best made as a suggestion rather than as a hard requirement. >> Absolutely. Although I think those are things that are going to come up, make sure that there's access to the trail, amenities for people that don't have a y membership, but want to be able to stay school cool. I think issues related to all of the other things that the public would want to see, including the neighborhood, that they view this as their park. So I think we're going to hear a lot of suggestions and a lot of ideas on how to put amenities here for everybody. The true test is going to be making sure that we are able to meet everyone's needs. >> Spelman: Right now there is relatively little in this section of our

parkland for the general public. There's a lot for people who have signed up for games with west austin youth association or members of the y who want to adopt an animal. Not much less for the -- not much left for the rest of it. >> No, that's going to be the balance.

[04:38:20]

I will say both of those entities are serving our residents. They are people who pay their taxes and do provide a service for us. It's just the balance of that and opening things up to the general public as a whole. I have all of the faith in the world that our staff working with our other partners in the city, other entities will do a great job of public engagement. Through our boards and commissions to make sure that we are truly reflecting what is needed here for the community as a whole. >> Requirements other than launching the master plan, how long would it take to actually do this master plan. >> I'm going to let ricardo answer that. Because it's a tough process. We're going to have to really hook it to get this completed and in front of council by may of 2015. But it can be done. Just means that we're going to have to expedite it and move quickly. We are going to have to be very careful that we don't leave someone out because that is the kicker here. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember spelman do you mind, because I think it bears on how much time it's going to take to complete the planning process. I think we all received an email from aisd from paul cruz expressing his concerns about the lack of -- basically about pressler, the pressler extension and the impacts on traffic that it's going to have for the austin high school. His recommendation and request was that we do a full tia at a time when school is in session and during the rush periods for school. Obviously, that is not going to start until september. So you couldn't even begin to do a tia until that time. I think that that is a request that should be honored because we're basically talking about -- about safety. Health and safety. For the -- for the kids who use austin high school.

[04:40:23]

So I think that might have some impact on your timeline. That's why I wanted to interject it right now. >> If we wait on that, that study, [indiscernible] if that's the direction of council. >> Mayor Leffingwell: I just don't see how you can go forward with a master plan until you have that information. You can't get that information until school is back in session. >> I understand. >> So let me nail that down then. If we can't do the tia until september. Then is that going to put off the -- well [multiple voices] push back everything. >> Clearly, typically we need at least a good six months for engaging stakeholders in the planning process. When you overlay that with the need to do a traffic analysis, you can expect that will and the timing of doing that has been said earlier, will definitely impact that master planning schedule. We don't know exactly. But we need to dedicate at least about six months in engaging the stakeholders to help us envision the future for this part. >> Spelman: I'm not necessarily trying to nail you down to a particular date. Just to be here that may 2015 is a reasonable or not reasonable date. Starting to sound as though may 2015 is not a mark that you're going to be able to hit. >> We are going to strive to move as efficiently as we can. >> Spelman: I know. >> It is very possible we may exceed that may 2015 timeline, but we will commit to moving as expeditiously as we can. >> Spelman: Is there a date that you feel comfortable that you could make? >> In light of -- >> Spelman: 19 or 2020. >> In light of the peak

time to conduct that analysis, we ought to at least consider the possibility of adding another 60 to 90 days. >> Spelman: Okay. So July 2015, you think that

[04:42:25]

would be more comfortable than May, for example. >> That would be more comfortable and we would still be moving at clip speed. >> Spelman: Okay. I'm not sure whether it's necessary for us to have -- well, I think it's probably a good idea for us to have a hard deadline, I think it's probably going to be better for you and the people that you are working with to know that there's a hard deadline. But if it's an unreasonable deadline, that's going to be counterproductive. >> Minimally, we could definitely report back to council where we are in the process. That could be an alternate consideration. And council has in the past asked us to give periodic updates on how -- >> progress reports in the spring of 2015, a hard deadline in something like July. >> Sure. >> Councilmember, if I could, with regards to the traffic impact analysis, my understanding is that the request is for the traffic impact analysis of a pressler extension, which I believe, although I believe that we need to analyze that, I think it will be minimal on the school district and their operations. I would suggest that you let the transportation staff and the parks staff work together to come back and answer that question about what kind of a delay that would or would not have. I think that the master plan -- I think that the master plan could go ahead and get started, start to inform anything that the traffic analysis would need to take into account. I think there's two separate issues. What are the potential traffic impacts or benefits from a pressler extension and then as the parks finishes their master plan, I think they will need to consider what the traffic implications of that expanded master plan might be. The plan had always been with the pressler extension to plan it such that it did not impact what parks would do with the master plan one way or the other. In fact the master plan is a mitigation project on behalf of the project. So it's an interesting dilemma from pressler

[04:44:25]

doesn't go forward, what happens with the mitigation. You don't really need -- >> money -- >> I understand what you are getting at. As you know, at least some of the users of this park have expressed a lot of interest in that pressler extension and exactly how it goes about. So I think that although there's a lot of master planning work to be done before we've actually nailed down what the extension will look like, a lot of people are going to be hanging fire until they get the tie and have a better sense of what you are going with that. >> I understand. Again, I think the pressler extension is such a big part of the master plan, cuts right through the heart of it frankly and there's concern not only by AISD but also by WPA, it's my understanding that they are totally unsatisfied with the plan that they have been told is going ahead at this point. So I think we need to step back from that, do the tie and then maybe decide how or if the pressler extension is going to be done. >> Absolutely. [Multiple voices] >> Cole: I wanted to add to that discussion because it's also my understanding that the neighborhood has a lot of concerns about pressler and that extension and the traffic impact. Can you give us some light on that? >> Morrison: Mayor I -- >> Mayor Leffingwell: I think we are cued up here. Queued up here. Councilmember Spelman and then mayor pro tem and then you would be next. >> Spelman: Okay. I would cheerfully yield on the issue of the pressler extension to mayor pro tem. >> Cole: I simply wanted



some input about the neighborhood's concern with the pressler extension and 45 sure that we are considering that as we talk about the school district also. >> Mayor pro tem, we know that the neighborhoods to the north of the railroad track have had this in their neighborhood plan for many years. This connection to give them access they currently do not

[04:46:26]

have. We know that a historically there has been a pathway that encouraged pedestrians to cross illegally and unsafely across the up that was cut off when the development around the [indiscernible] cat bar and lounge was built and cut off that corridor for pedestrians. And we know that there is a high desire for cross all up and down this portion because there is not a safe crossing between the frontage roads of mopac and lamar in this area. So we know that the neighborhoods, specifically the north are very desirable and have voiced their desire for a connection across here specifically as we looked at those crossings at the pressler location. [Indiscernible] >> Spelman: Thank you, rob I appreciate that. It's generally true we can't do a tia. The conditions, would be best -- the best tia would actually be done in september after school gets started again. Is that accurate? >> Well, you know, I -- I would like to defer that because the operations of the school we should be able to get data on how that's operated year to year. Yes, there's -- there's incremental changes made to the operations every year, but we need to look at the trend of what data we have and then plan based on what we have. I believe that we have data or can find the data to go ahead and start that traffic analysis and make reasonable assumptions about how traffic flow goes. But we will follow council direction one way or the other. >> Spelman: I don't think we need to get to the level of the engineering to tell your engineers how to do their job. Other than we need to at least model this under peak traffic conditions, which I suspect are going to be right at 8:00 on monday mornings. >> Mayor, I have a different issue if I might continue. Thank you, rob.

[04:48:27]

In addition to being relatively specific on the parks aspects of this, we have also been very specific in this resolution on the animal services aspect. I wonder if abigale could -- could answer the same question that I asked of sarah and cora just a few moments ago, whether this is giving you sufficient flexibility or whether you need us to be less directive with respect to the animal services aspects of this. >> Abigale smith, chief animal services officer. I think that from the perspective of animal services, we're going to be interested in understanding -- given that any animal facility is going to be on park property is going to have to be accompanied by a license agreement, so what's going to be of primary concern for the city's animal services department is what does that agreement look like. >> Right. >> So this -- so it's not clear in this -- what we're going to end up with and so -- what we're going to end up with, I couldn't say. I could tell you what I wouldn't want to see in a license agreement, but I'm not sure where we'll end up in terms of space and, you know -- >> does this resolution give you the flexibility to seek and obtain the license agreement or some license agreement that you think is going to be in the best interests of the city? >> I don't see that this resolution addresses the fact that there even has to be a license agreement. It simply sort of says that austin pets alive will fulfill the obligation provided for by council through several resolutions to have a satellite adoption center. Whereas the current plan that we've been

working on is that the city would operate that. >> Spelman: Okay. So your current plan is to operate an adoption center on this land yourself. And we're actually directing you to do something different. >> Correct. >> Is that right? >> Yes. >> Okay.

[04:50:28]

Is it a reasonable thing to consider the resolution what we're asking you to do in the resolution? >> I wouldn't say that it's unreasonable. Again it's going to come down to what does that operation look like. If its sole focus is that space is to find homes for the city's homeless pets that come from the shelter, clearly there wouldn't be an issue with that. That said our vision was to have it not only be a satellite adoption center but also to help to host some educational programs to do some partnership programs with the y and maybe even waya to sort of do more from the city's point of view to contribute to the park that it sits on. >> Spelman: Okay. So there's a lot more park like stuff that you can do other than having the adoption center that are an extension of the activities of the adoption center. >> That was our vision for the space, yes. >> Reporter: To fulfill or at least pursue that determine whether or not it's consistent with the needs of all of the other stakeholders, you are going to need more flexibility than what we are directing you to do here rather specifically. >> I think if we just went through the master plan without a lot of specific outcomes determined already, that we would be able to determine what's best for the community that that park serves. I think a master plan would really tell us what we need to do. >> Thank you very much, I appreciate it. Mayor, I have one last question. This is of the sponsors of the resolution. If the parks department and the animal services department are both looking for a little bit more flexibility than we are giving them, is it consistent with your own vision of the master plan process that we give them that flexibility or do we have to be this directive. >> Councilmember martinez. >> Martinez: As the lead sponsor of this item, I feel like, you know, I'm fairly knowledgeable about all of the issues being brought up. The way the resolution is drafted it gives complete flexibility. Anywhere it says it could, it doesn't say it shall.

[04:52:29]

It's all open-ended. Speaking to many of the issues that have been brought up, the neighborhood association has had it in their plan for 15 years. They are very supportive of the pressler extension. In fact it's a necessary project. Waya has shared their concerns. But understands also that it's a necessary project. We have to get connectivity to the new managed toll lanes because the only access point going north is going to be off of cesar chavez. And so the concerns with the pressler extension are really this portion that has an eastern extension that dumps into the waya tlac site, beach area, and where that leads to. I think that, you know, tias are based on modeling. We don't have a pressler extension right now. So you wouldn't build the extension and then do the tia to see how many people use it. You do it based on modeling. As mr. Spiller mentioned, I think there's work that can be done immediately and including the impact that it could have on aisd. What we felt when we started putting this together, arguably the longest resolution in city council history -- >> michael McGill. >> I was going to add a powerpoint for you, councilmember spelman. We found that aisd was largely not a part of the conversation leading up to this. So that is where we had to really [indiscernible] them into the process.

We had a meeting where the principal and amber elnz the school board member. I think that we could do the tia with modeling and move forward with the pressler extension, in fact I think we should do that. Because once we decide the full impact of the pressler extension and the -- define the project, we move

[04:54:29]

forward. That's a necessary transportation component. And then we continue master planning lamar beach. As it relates to animal services, we specifically have said we will have an adoption center on site. By -- by council action. It says that -- that it could be the davenport building or a building of similar size in nature. Somewhere on lamar beach. We weren't explicit about that. We currently don't have the funds for our existing animal shelter nor do we have the staff necessary for the animal shelter, which I have a subsequent item that I'm going to ask the city manager to contemplate that in this year's budget. So while we may be operating on the assumption that the city was going to operate an adoption center at this site on lamar beach, we are not even close to funding that or staffing that and we have until may of 2015 before apa's current agreement expires. What we're saying in this resolution is if austin pets alive is willing to construct and operate it, why wouldn't we consider that? Because it would be a tremendous savings and it would still comply with previously adopted council resolution that stipulates there would be a satellite adoption center on that site. We are not saying it has to be. In fact austin pets alive went and looked at another property yesterday with councilmember morrison and staff and pard staff. It is laying this out there as an option to be considered throughout the master planning process. But it is something worthy of our consideration, seeing how we don't have the existing funds available to construct a satellite adoption shelter. >> Spelman: I think this is one of those resolutions in part because it is so long that can be construed in different ways. To provide parks animal services with lots

[04:56:31]

flexibility and some of the stuff is just recommendations for things that you ought to think about. Alternatives we want you to consider, not places we need you to go. If you have no objection, I would like to take a -- a whack at changing just a few of the words so that our intent is -- your intent is clear and that we are sending a clear message to the public and staff that these are just alternatives for consideration and not directives. >> Morrison: I'm absolutely happy to entertain that language. We are also working on language because of concerns that we are still hearing as of late last night that this is somehow some overt attempt to kill the pressler extension, that is clearly not the case. In fact I would like for it to come back to this council for a decision so that pressler can move on and we can be done with that conversation. I personally would not like to see it hang out over 2015 or, you know, summer of 2015. This is a necessary transportation project and I think this council is -- is probably the most astute to make that decision as opposed to the next council. >> Spelman: Hard deadline for that is going to be set when people can actually start to get up on that express lane on mopac if the pressler extension is not complete by that point we're going to have a hell of a time. >> That is our intention to try to get in expedited but to do it in a manner that includes so many stakeholders because this impacts so many organizations, so many of our citizens, we just simply wanted to try to get it right, get everybody into

one item moving forward with that master planning process, including private property owners that are adjacent to the potential pressler extension. Who is a big component of, you know, the master planning process as well. >> Spelman: We agree, thank you. >> Mayor Leffingwell: I just want to very quickly I want to get some closure on this issue. The waya people have been told by people in our transportation department that the issue is settled. There is no longer any option one, two or three that the transportation has settled on a particular option and they're going

[04:58:31]

ahead. This before there's been the tia or the other things that I'm talking about. So I would like to know are you -- are you still going to do the tia as requested by aisd and are you still going to be flexible as to the exact way that the pressler extension is aligned? >> Yes, mr. Mayor. >> You still have that flexibility and that option is still open. >> We will have that flexibility to make those adjustments where we can. There's some physical issues that we have to deal with. But we will balance those with the concerns of aisd and the other -- >> Mayor Leffingwell: And I do think that it's important that we pay attention to the school superintendent's request that we do this study in real-time when school is in session at peak operating hours. Councilmember morrison? >> Morrison: Thank you. First I want to thank councilmember martinez's staff and councilmember martinez who have worked very, very hard to juggle all of these things and I think that -- what we have in the end is a resolution that really brings into play all of the things. It is directive in that there will be a tia that is -- that takes into account all of the things that this school district has asked for. That is directive. It is directive that there will be a permanent adoption center per the council's previous -- previous resolution. It's also a directive in putting into place sort of milestones, interim milestones and asks, for instance, that all findings of the traffic impact study will be presented to the council prior to 50% of the final design. There's something in there for pressler, there's something in there that says yeah we know council is going to have further discussions before there's any finalized element here. And with regard to the main east-west road that is of concern to a lot of folks,

[05:00:33]

it explicitly asks for an option that says there will be no east-west road. I think that would be a great option to be able to take. I do want to speak with regard to the neighborhood's perspective on that because that's my neighborhood and I'm very aware that it has been in the plan, it's been part of trying to bring something connectivity, some -- and safety basically. I think in terms of getting over the railroad tracks, connectivity for everybody to the north, because a lot of folks besides just the neighbors that live there that want to get from fifth street down to the lake there. So it's a critical, critical element of our sort of network that we're trying to build. Rob, can you also remind me, the funds for pressler, those are coming -- those were from -- is that voter approved bonds; is that right? >> Yes, ma'am, those were, I believe, part of the -- either the 2010 or the 2012 bond program, I don't remember which one. But yes, those were funded through the bond program. >> Morrison: Great. Something that we -- I know that our bonds are relatively -- it's part of something that we contemplated and told the voters that we were doing. It's an important element to go forward and I know that you have worked with the parks

department because we had a discussion about this at our comprehensive plan and transportation committee, a couple of times, because the question was are there choices that need to be made? And is a pressler, you know, the basic preliminary here's where we think pressler is going to have to go, is that going to be cutting off options and I know that the transportation department and the parks -- planning folks sat down and there's really only so much that you can do if you are going to put pressler extension there. There are other constraints. There's easements that have to be looked at. So it's -- it's relatively complicated. And then one other thing that I think that -- that

[05:02:37]

we -- I wonder if you can provide data off the top of your head. I know that you all, the transportation department has expressed in the past and brought up the issue of how many people we have crossing the railroad tracks. And do you have -- that's a very unsafe situation. Pedestrians and bicyclists. Do you have numbers that you can share with us? I think well obviously we want to make sure this works well with aid. We need to understand not only do we want the connectivity with the whole mopac expressway, but we're trying to ameliorate a very dangerous situation. >> Right. Councilmember, I can't give you a number. I know that in standing just north of the ymca there at the amtrak station, just in the space of about 20 minutes I must have seen a dozen people, one person sticks in my mind. She was trying to take a baby carriage across the railroad tracks. Having difficulty getting the wheels across. So there is a strong desire to cross at grade there. Which I think is a problem. The lamar underpass improvements drastically improved that but it did not change the numbers of the people that are trying to get across there. I was along there just the other day and saw a high school aged person crossing. >> Morrison: You didn't see a councilmember cross, did you? >> I did not. >> Morrison: Because I know that fence you put up there, that got put up there, makes it much more difficult. [Laughter]. >> Mayor Leffingwell: That's not nearly as serious as a baby carriage. [Laughter]. >> I was shocked when I saw it. >> Mayor Leffingwell: You could put up an electrified fence or something. [Laughter]. >> Morrison: That will take care of it. Especially with the baby carriages. Anyways, I want to thank all of the staff for this. I think that there are a lot of moving parts here. But -- but the way it's been set up is we do -- it does require sort of joint discussions with the

[05:04:38]

pressler extension design and the master planning and, you know, assuming we can get to the point where it all makes sense, we have it in here that the -- that council will be involved in that discussion and I fully agree with councilmember martinez that if we can get some of this going so that the pressler extension can be signed off and moved forward, by december, that that will really be best for all parties involved. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember riley. >> Riley: I hate to drag this out any longer. I did want to ask for funding about the mast. We talked about to some extent before. Master plan. Do we have a cost estimate for the whole master plan and have we identified all of the funding sources? >> We do have the money for the master plan. We have \$250,000 that we have available now to begin the master plan. >> Riley: What's the funding source? >> Councilmember, that of the mitigation part of our mitigation costs for impacting parks land with the proposed pressler extension. >> Riley: So that was

part of the 20,000, the bond fund for the pressler extension? >> Yes. We looked at -- we knew we had to mitigate parkland impacts and so as part of that discussion, we -- we transferred money as park mitigation and they deployed that in terms of a master plan. >> Riley: Okay. So the cost estimate for the master plan is \$250,000. And that funding will be coming from -- the bond funds, that -- for the pressler extension. >> Yes. As part of the projects, we -- we paid for parks mitigation and they have already received those funds and are deploying those to do the master plan. >> Riley: That will cover the whole cost of the master plan? >> I'm going to let ricardo answer that because we do varying master plans, we

[05:06:39]

have \$250,000 to work with that should do a stash master plan depending on how long it goes on and depending how many issues we run into. It does cost more money, we have seen that just from working on the holly shores master plan. When you finish something, you wrap it up. If you had to add more meetings, more things, there's more costs associated with it. I don't want to sit up here and tell you one thing. If we find that we have to have more dialogue, more ongoing discussions there could be more costs involved. There could be \$250,000 that we should be able to do a good master plan, that's barring any other serious issues or longer discussions that may come forward, then we may run out of money. >> Riley: Okay. But for now at least, we have that quarter million dollars that came from the transportation bond funds that has been transferred to pard as parkland -- as mitigation funding and that is the funding that we will be using for the master plan. Okay. The last thing that I wanted to clarify is just that -- about the timeline. I understand that councilmember martinez will be addressing the pressler street extension in particular. I think the paragraph that raised some questions is about presenting all findings to the city council prior to the [indiscernible] pressler extension I think what I heard is that we will be revisiting that before the resolution is approved? >> That is specifically the -- the request of the neighborhood to look at that particular resolve, where it specifies prior to 50%. We are looking for better language to give the neighborhoods to give them the assurance that they need that the project will move forward. That was language we came up with to give the other stakeholders who are concern about the pressler extension to give them I guess the assurance that's we're contemplating all sides of this, if you will. >> Riley: Right, right. But we will be rethinking that to make sure that the pressler extension stays on track. >> Martinez: I'm open to that. >> Riley: Great.

[05:08:41]

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Council, we have a briefing due today, which is on transportation projects of really significance which is very time sensitive. I think we need to go to that now and make sure that we get that in before we start losing councilmembers and then come back to our -- to our discussion. If we don't get this in today, it's not going to be done in time, so that we can -- adequately prepare for a potential transportation bond issue this november. That's how critical it is. >> Can it be handled on thursday or no? >> Can't do it on thursday. >> Tovo: We had this happen once before, I wonder if it could be a practice, if we have a briefing to be scheduled on tuesday, to always post it on the thursday agenda as well. >> Mayor Leffingwell: I think that would be a good idea for the future. But we really need to do this today. >> Tovo: I appreciate that. But since this is the time we set aside to talk about the

council agenda, it's happened once before, I would ask that we have a regular practice then if we have a briefing scheduled on tuesday so that we post it on thursday. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Let it be so. >> Tovo: Thank you. I love when I speak and it becomes action. >> Robert Goodis city manager. I want to lay the framework for our transportation director. This briefing is a response to the council resolution you passed about a month ago to look at roadway projects on 35 and other projects of really significance for potential inclusion in the november 2014 election. And as rail continues to come together with the recommended locally preferred alternative rail plan -- would this resolution to -- to also look at roadway projects, especially on 35, to be included in november location, it feels like that -- that we're going to recommend to council that you adopt a 2014 mobility plan that would include both

[05:10:41]

the rail lpa and new roadway projects that you all would want to consider in the november election. So we worked with our transportation regional partners, especially txdot to put together a list of projects that would be a best bang for the buck kind of projects on 35 and some other regional facilities. Rob is going to bring those forward for you today, this isn't our recommendation, this is a point for you all to see the menu of projects that we put together with txdot. Based on the lpa recommendations that the ccag will come up on friday and your input on council and capital metro joint BOARD MEETING ON THE 17th, Will then put that input together into a recommended plan for you to consider on THE 26th. And I just want to again lay the groundwork with that for rob to launch the potential -- the program that you will be looking at and the process that we will bring that forward to you, so I will turn it over to rob. >> Thank you, council. >> Well, we've all seen the headlines we're the fastest, large growing city in america and with that comes the challenges of transportation being our major challenge as we go into the future. What's driving the transportation issues, of course, is our population growth. Our regional growing very rapidly between 2010 and projected and 2040, we have 138% increase in the population, but look what's happening to the vehicle miles of travel and annual hours of delay as well as cost of congestion. As our population grows, those transportation impacts are growing even faster, which means that we have a system that has not been dramatically increased in capacity or efficiency for a long time. As new people move to town, I think that you have heard the statistics new people move to town every day bringing 70 to 80 cars with them a day, that is driving up our transportation

[05:12:46]

statistics in the wrong direction increasing delay and increasing our congestion. You probably have also heard the statistics about a future commute from places like georgetown or round rock to downtown of possibly two and a half hours, those are driven off a travel time index developed by texas transportation institute that shows that as our system gets more congested, especially in comparison to our peers or some might say our competitors here in texas, that only gets more congested and the travel times get exponentially worse very quickly. So that's an issue that we have to be mindful of. I think it's also important to know that there's been a lot of projects under construction just since 2000. Something like \$5 billion worth of projects. Under construction postally by our partners of txdot and the central texas regional mobility authority. But we've been involved in that, too. We have a number of projects in the

pipeline and some of those great projects that the city of austin has participated in is, of course, the pass-through finance and construction of the ramps at mopac, at ben white. Certainly our investment in improvements at the oak hill y intersections. And then, of course, our sponsoring of the i-35 and 51st street interchange improvements, but also the corridor planning for i-35. We've had a lot of help in getting that study and that corridor moving forward, but we're very excited to say that we've actually been participating. This is really new in the last five, six, eight years that austin and this region have turned towards a transportation infrastructure approach following a number of years of not having done much. Our dilemma is, though, that even with these improvements demand continues to outpace capacity. And so one might reasonably ask what can we do about it, what are the next steps in addressing this worsening

[05:14:46]

mobility or decreasing mobility situation. And so what I would present to you today is, as robert said, is a strategic mobility plan for 2014, which really bases its approach on a -- seeking a shared solution. Investing in both roadways and high capacity transit and to build on the previous mobility investments. You know, this is not the first time that we have brought a mobility plan forward, we did that in 2010 and again in 2012, with major investments in getting ready for strategic projects, investing in initial projects on i-35 and really building those regional partnerships that I think that you have been very supportive of as we've worked with our sister agencies at text dot and ctrma and capital metro and lone star rail and others. [One moment please for change in captioners] >> the i-35 project I want to go into a little detail. You will remember that the city started with the definition or looking at a project that was really just between ben white and 183 on the north.

[05:16:47]

With help from the state from rider \$42 brought by senator watson and then projects brought to the table by williamson as well as hays county, the region is now looking at a project on i-35 that does stretch from san marcos all the way up to georgetown, with the key being unlocking that central part of i-35 here in downtown and central austin. The project goals are clearly to increase capacity where we can, to better manage the traffic that we have and enhance the safety. To improve east-west connectivity, enhance all modes of transportation, not just freight and vehicle traffic, but to make sure that i-35 is a better neighbor to our surrounding neighborhoods that it serves bicycle and pedestrian as well as other transportation uses. One of the major things with i-35 is it's not trips from laredo to kansas, it's really trips in and out of our region on a daily basis. The majority of traffic is here and that has led us to a different set of possible solutions than just purely adding capacity. Can we are looking at solutions with our partners that look at a series of incremental projects, modifying the project road, improving the efficiency of east-west connections as well as the main lines along the corridor. Making incremental ramp modifications, adding collector and distributor loads if you can't quite fathom what those are, if you come south on i-35 and you exit from the upper deck on to the mlk 19th street exit you can also take a road that gets you to the 15th street corridor.



[05:18:56]

We have a platform for what's called a future transportation corridor, an fkc. And here you see pictures of the existing corridor on the left and what it could look like in the future. When we talk about adding capacity to this corridor, we're not talking about a lot of new capacity. We really only have room for one new lane in each direction, but I would put to you that new lane in each direction is very important because right now it's difficult to envision how capital metro or any other transit agency could run high capacity transit, park and ride transit on the i-35 corridor, all the existing lanes are blocked during many peak periods during the day because of traffic. So we need one more lane at least in each direction so that we can think about how to then manage that new capacity to make sure that we have transit into the far southeast portions of our region as well as into the northeast portions of our region. I-35 really becomes a platform for moving lots more people in and out of our region on a daily basis. The process called the planning and environmental linkages is being launched by txdot and funded by the city of austin to see how that might be managed in the future. In downtown I'm sure you've heard about the two alternative about how to move and reconstruct i-35 in downtown. There of course is the mod fight existing, which is similar today. It ends up adding more structures in downtown. I don't think that's very popular with neighborhoods or the community. And txdot and the city and its other partnered in that. There is also another solution and that is to depress the main lanes through downtown. That provides potential to you'd future lids over the freeway to connect more streets across the freeway. I believe there's actually operational advantages to a depressed section through here, and those continue to be looked at as we go

[05:20:56]

forward as opportunities to improve i-35 through the core of our region here in downtown austin. So there are a set of keystone projects on i-35. When I talk about keystone projects I mean projects that have to be built before we can even consider adding new capacity to the corridor. So before we can add that future transportation corridor there's a series of projects that have to be sequenced in advance of the new capacity in order to allow us to even contemplate building in our core. And so the state and the city have been busy developing an implementation strategy that would allow the keystone projects to move forward. I'd like to identify those for you and you will see here I've identified them as unfunded. On i-35 there are a set of interchanges and access roadways that have to be constructed first. Those include a u.S.183 up north fully directional interchange with i-35. I'll show you a picture. It's only partial right now. We need to divert traffic from downtown, that piece of traffic that can get downtown we need to shuttle over to the 183 corridor. We have access roadways in downtown and rebuild the riverside interchange, that gives us a change to move the traffic that needs to go through downtown during construction, out of the way so that we can do the main line construction. And then we have a series of interchanges down south, oltorf, stassney and william cannon, that plain have to be rebuilt because we have to widen the box, if you will, underneath -- the gap underneath so that we have room to do the future project. Simply this is a picture of the 183 north at i-35 north interchange. The existing ramps go from the west to the south and we need ramps that come from the north part of our region and head east to give direct access for future traffic.

[05:23:00]

Similarly at the riverside interchange downtown to your left here. We have to move the access from the downtown ramps to underneath riverside. That would include new cd or circulation distribution lanes. That actually improves access to downtown, but to do that we need to rebuild the riverside interchange. Coincidentally we also need to rebuild the riverside interchange to replace urban rail into the urban corridor and so there is a great nexus of those projects at that interchange. And similarly on the three interchanges south of there, oltorf, stassney and william cannon, we need to rebuild those interchanges so we can add the new capacity, spread the lanes out and reduce the existing congestion coming off of the ben white interchange that empties into i-35 to the south. And these projects would achieve that. All make room for that future transportation investment hopefully by the state. Another keystone project that I think many people don't often think about is you need to add a lot of technology to this corridor so that during congestion or during construction we can help people get through the corridor and around the corridor or at least have information to better plan their trips. What that provides is construction advisory systems, adaptive signal systems, realtime data, etcetera, that really do help people travel during the construction and help people plan. If you're looking for the slide I showed just before this it's actually just a cover up here to give you more information. So we're trying to save some paper. But we've already been talking with the ctrma as well as with txdot and our goal is to partner on this. We'll be bringing back information on a grant that I believe you all approved us to pursue with txdot to

[05:25:01]

coordinate arterials with the freeway system. It is the cutting edge. Dallas is the only city in state that has led that effort and we are learning from their benefits to achieve this. So this too is a keystone project. Now there, some other projects of regional significance that I think will be of interest to you that I think are currently unfunded. As you know, ctrma is with txdot is building the 183 corridor and will soon started construction this year on a dramatically changed 183. At its intersection with 71 we have an opportunity to provide direct connectors into abia, our airport. Many cities of our size have direct access ramps from the major freeways feeding to the airport directly into their airport. As you see there, there's an unfunded amount of about 80 million. We have an opportunity to bridge riverside at 183. The interesting thing about that is that bridge eventually will be needed if we need urban rail to get to the airport. So that's not the project that's under construction by txdot right now at riverside and 71. 183 is the other roadway that's perpendicular there on the other side of metro town. I believe metro center rather. We also need to start thinking about our next corridors of significance, and as we've done in each of the previous bond proposals we've proposed a series of corridors. These being state, roadways of regional significance that we would recommend or offer for your consideration as currently unfunded, but those projects needing some attention as we move forward. The project at 71 and 18 I can't to give you more understanding, the reddish orange there is the proposed project that txdot has

[05:27:02]

approached us about. And there in the dashed black is the corridor that's been discussed for future urban rail extension from our riverside terminus that will be recommended in the near future. With that I would like to talk about high capacity transit. You will get your own presentation, but you know there is a recommendation moving its way towards you for a nine and a half mile urban rail rho double tracked electrified route system that would serve riverside grove to southside lady bird lake crossing somewhere around trinity. The trinity corridor certainly serving the convention center downtown, dell hemmed center, san jacinto to the university of texas and then the red river serving st. David's hospital and hancock center, moving on into the airport boulevard up to the highland acc campus. You may have seen the statistics in the news, but it is projected to be a successful system as we move forward. That system is about 1.380 billion, given the current thinking that we have taken from the c cal or the advisory committee is that you are likely to get a proposal that will come back and say we're going to pursue about half of that through federal match and the other would be a local match that is currently unfunded until council takes action over the summer here. Just as with the road corridors there is the next set of projects that we need to start thinking about for urban rail. We suggest that there are a range of corridors that might be considered for future investment and just as with the future roadways of significance we're suggesting that we would fund money to start the project development for the

[05:29:02]

next phases of urban rail. I'm not suggesting any order or priority here, I'm just suggesting that those are the ones that we've heard interest in. I know I've been asked by some councilmembers what are some of the corridor projects that we've done previously. Certainly we've done corridor projects on riverside, airport, north lamar, burnet and mlk junior boulevard. We had funding in 2012 to do the corridor plans. We actually had funding for initial projects in the lamar and burnet corridors. There is proposed urban rail on both the riverside and portions of the airport boulevard. That project in its cost estimating includes reconstruction of those portions of those corridors that it touches. The reason being is because the curb lines have to change so they're affecting enough of the arterial that it has to be funded as part of the rail construction there. You will also be getting a recommendation from us to pursue some surface transportation, funds through cam positive. We think that the projects in the north lamar and burnet corridor are very ripe for that type of funding so we are proposing to pursue additional funding to support the previous bond funding in that corridor. And then if you include project connect next funding as part of a future proposal, all of these corridors would be ripe for analysis there. So those are important corridors. We think they are fundable through a variety of funding mechanisms. We have not included them as part of the corridors of

[05:31:04]

regional significance, and think we can provide funding through a variety of means for these. That said, just to review what we would suggest as a proposed strategic mobility plan would include both roadway, projects of regional significance, as well as high capacity transit, projects of regional significance. You will notice that our roadway projects are all those -- all of the projects presented are

those on state regional freeway systems. We think that's important going forward. We know from survey after survey that the public is focused on the elephants in the room, the traffic on the major regional freeways, i-35 and 71. It does include a regional operations center because that is key to the construction of all of these projects. And it includes corridor development programs for both the roadway as well as the transit moving forward so that we are always prepared as money becomes available whether it be at the state level, the local level or the county level. Just as a review, some terms of the roadway projects of regional significance, what I've provided to you is about a 480-million-dollar shopping list, if you will, you will notice that many of them are on i-35. That reflects the fact that we invested previously in our bonds to get ready on i-35 and so we think that there's a good set of potential projects there on i-35 that advance the potential for future transit investments as it is most important for us to focus on moving people in and out of our key employment centers. In terms of urban rail, as I said, there is a proposal moving its way towards you that will look for up to \$700 million in local funding, local match for federal match, hopefully at the 50/50, so we would look for another 700 million

[05:33:05]

there. And then a project connect next as I said of five million. So that brings the rail component potentially up to 705 million. If you add that to the roadway total the proposed strategic mobility plan sits at \$1.2 billion and I see people have already been adding to make sure my math is correct. That is a big bite that would be on par with what places like denver did when they did highway and rail together. It is a shock I know for metropolitan areas when they look at major infrastructure of significant on the regional roadway system, these projects are not cheap and they don't get cheaper typically. So with that if you have questions I would be happy to answer them. >> Next steps. >> I'm sorry, mayor. Hears the schedule of the next steps. Robert reminded me. On june 13th ccag will make a recommends to the mayor on a locally preferred alternative or what they believe that a locally preferred 11 will be. That or some form of that recommendation will be presented to council and the cap metro board on june 17th. That's a joint meeting for you to review the locally preferred alternative. I'm committed to do that by june 20th. So as soon as the june 17th presentation is done we'll able to finalize that. Cap metro board is scheduled to consider the urban rail lpm on june 24th. That is important because we're reliant on them for the bulk of the operations and maintenance. Then council will have the

[05:35:05]

opportunity to consider the 2014 strategic mobility plan on the 26th. And then council would consider it a bond election on the seventh of august. >> Okay. Before we succumb totally to sticker shock here, I think it's fair to point out that you've seen a big list of road projects in this briefing which should be considered to be a menu. Because if we did the \$1.85 million, obviously that would exceed our bonding capacity and we can't do that, but we have had previous briefings so what we can do, what bond capacity we do have, and that's around -- amounts to about six cents. To get that number down to somewhere in the neighborhood of \$800 million if my recollection is close to connect, 790, 800 million, is that correct? >> More like 960. You're thinking about the five cents. >> Sorry, yeah. The six cent is our maximum bonding capacity and this number will have to be shaved and it will be the council's

prerogative when we go forward about making decisions with this, about which road project should be in the priority. And I expect all of us will do a little bit of thinking about this and hopefully strategic thinking about this before we actually go into the process of making a decision. We -- the proposal that's going to come before you, the decision made by the council, will be for a single proposition. A roads and rail prop advertise sys that will contain enough money to get us started. With the next phase of urban

[05:37:07]

rail, a downtown portion, and it will also contain a certain amount of money for some of these road projects. We believe that a package that looks like that has a great deal of appeal and has a good chance of succeeding. If we can put together a package that has broad appeal, I think there's a good chance we can go ahead with our strategic mobility plan, and after -- let's see. After 15 years at least, a lot of years before that of planning and discussion maybe we can actually get this project going. As far as timetables, there will be a lot of discussion about what happens next, but the next critical step is for the council to make the decision about what the proposal that we put before the voters is going to look like. Then another thing is to go before the voters. I'm going to emphasize this, but I'll reiterate here again today that money approved by the voters for a rail component here will not be spent unless we're able to secure the federal matching funds. We can secure that language in any way that is proper and appropriate. So assuming that the bond proposal is approved by the voters, then we can go ahead with a -- with some preliminary engineering and launch the process so that we're prepared in a couple of three years tops to make our case to the federal transit authority for matching funds. We believe based on analysis by people who have dealt

[05:39:08]

thoroughly with the fta over the years, we're going to be a highly competitive for first start money for fta -- from fta. So that's another three years. We anticipate that if we get that money we can go into the final engineering and construction phases. You've heard a lot of talk about that. I won't try to cover it all, but I think it's important to reemphasize the fact that it's important that we have a proposal to put before the voters that addresses our total mobility problem and not just part of it. So we have to show that we're moving on all fronts to address what has now made us the fourth most congested city in the united states, slightly better than new york city, but slightly worse than san francisco, which is -- I don't know if that's a good niche to be in or not. Those are good names to be associated with, but the subject is not very appealing. So obviously we need traffic congestion is the number one concern of people in this region and I think to be responsive to that concern to everyone so that there's something in some package for everyone we need to move forward with the multifaceted mobility plan. And I hope we're able to do that. Council will make the decision in august to exactly what goes on the ballot. Mayor pro tem. >> Cole:. >> Cole: I was lead on the resolution on what the roads would look like in the area to try to reduce congestion and bring up mobility. And I know that we have basically a 50-year problem that we're trying to address

[05:41:11]

in november. But I want to walk through that and recall exactly the numbers from the information that you gave us before, robert, about our bonding capacity. I know the mayor touched on that a little bit, but if it's six cents, then what is the amount that we can put on the ballot? >> I might ask elaine if she's still in the room to give the exact numbers before I misquote her. >> Good morning. Elaine hart. The six cents would generate 965 million. Five cents would cover 790 million. Four cents would cover 615 million. I can get you the other information. >> That's fine. I just needed ball parks. And then I want to go through real quickly the projects that you have listed that are a menu for the 480 million. >> Certainly. If we could just put that summary slide up. >> Cole: I have them in front of me. I know we don't have much time. Do any of these projects require a nepa analysis? >> So all of them require some form of environmental process. I will tell you that txdot has already advanced the interchanges in the south in terms of the environmental. Both because of what they are may require a very minimal environmental process. >> Cole: Those are the ones at iltorf, stassney and william cannon? >> That's correct. They're in the process of starting the riverside pieces and that is an environmental process because of just where it is and what those projects are. The i-35 at 183 interchange potentially requires some right-of-way acquisition so that probably lags the

[05:43:13]

others in that process. I will say all of the interchange with i-35 south if those were funded together would allow the future transportation corridor in the south to proceed because all of the barriers, if you would, to adding capacity south of the river would have been removed by those four projects. To the north the 183 project interchange is important, but it by itself does not clear all the hurdles to extend new capacity to the north, if that helps at all. >> Cole: So if we did the south project on i-35, it would do - it would have significant advancement on clearing the congestion problem. More so than in the north. >> Incrementally it would get you closer to adding the new capacity. Each of these projects I believe reduces congestion incrementally. Together they start to form a system that really does provide some congestion, larger congestion benefits. >> Cole: Rob, I know you said you didn't have any particular priority -- >> riverside absolutely does reduce congestion immediately as do the ones at william cannon and stassney. Those address immediate capacity -- capacity deficits. The project to riverside also has the advantage that we have to put urban rail, assuming council approves urban rail, into the riverside corridor. That project in particular is beneficial for both projects. So that I would suggest should be considered as your -- as these projects are being prioritized. >> Cole: So we've worked with txdot in terms of coming up with these particular projects. Is there any partnership funding being contemplated by them? >> Councilmember, as you

[05:45:13]

know, txdot will be going to the voters are, the state, in november. It's called proposition one, asking for access to monies that are currently being sent to the rainy day fund. That's my understanding. That's very abbreviated. They had indicated a very large interest in two things. One, investing in communities that are themselves investing in the regional system. So sort of helping those that are trying to help

themselves. And then number two, they've also recognized as the mayor has said, this is the most congested corridor in the state and they are very intent on addressing it. So every indication is that they will -- are ready to go to the table. In fact, they've already brought a big chunk of the money to the table thus far to get us from the initial three-million-dollar investment by the city up to the 64-million-dollar total investment. So yes, they're bringing monies. >> Cole: When you say this is the most congested corridor, you mean the i-35 corridor. >> Yes, ma'am. >> Cole: Do we have any idea of what the timeline - like we talked a lot about rail and the timeline for rail and the contribution from the federal government, but do we have any idea of the timeline for the interstate i-35 proposal? >> Yes, mayor pro tem. Of course with the i-35 project they've been doing lots of public outreach, they've been working with the advisory committees. So the timeline that on these projects, because they are keystone projects, meaning they have to be done before they can get to the capacity, they're looking within the next two to five years to be on construction on all of these. Each one has its own timeline, but for instance the southern interchanges, I believe that they're making them to final design and environmental clearance right now so that they could actually be into construction did they say 2017? Early 2017, early to late

[05:47:17]

2017. So in terms of infrastructure that is really just around the corner. >> Cole: Okay. Thank you, mayor. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Let me just say, emphasizing again that what you presented us is a menu. We obviously can't do all that. I would like to see staff's recommendation within that framework of a six cent or roughly 965 billion-dollar package, what your recommendations would be to fit that to make sure we stay within our bonding capacity. >> Yes, thank you. We will. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember Riley. >> Riley: I'm going to have a number of questions about items that are on the menu, but I also want to ask about items not on the menu. I know we won't have an opportunity to have an entire discussion about all that today. And I see on the timeline there will be some other opportunities. I just want to ask the mayor when would you expect that we would have an opportunity to really visit about exactly what is on the list and what's not on the list? >> Mayor Leffingwell: Well, that's a good question. Let me look at the timetable. >> Mayor, we suggest that after this meeting the June 17th meeting that staff would bring you recommendation -- June 26. June 26 is when you all will consider what's on the staff recommendation, what's not included that you would like to include. That's when you would discuss that action item. >> Riley: Okay. So the council meeting on the 26th. And I assume we would be able to discuss it at the work session on the 24th? >> Mayor Leffingwell: Yes. >> Riley: I would just ask that we plan on -- allow some significant time at that work session because this is obviously a very important item for the future of our region, and I know there's going to be a lot to talk about. And so I would hope we would have room on that work session to have a full discussion.

[05:49:17]

>> Mayor Leffingwell: And I know obviously the wish list is going to be a lot longer than the can-do list on this. And as we're formulating this list, I think we have to be realistic about the political aspects of it too. Because you've got to get enough voters to go in the voting booth and vote yes on proposition 1.

And that should be taken into account by every one of us as we try to make our decisions on what this menu looks like. >> Riley: Okay. As I mentioned there are items on that wish list that I would like to burrow into a little bit, but just as a general level, I want to raise a concern about what's not on the list. That relates to the type of roadway infrastructure that we are choosing to focus on. Here we are focusing on both for the projects that will be funded through this effort and through the planning that we're doing for future efforts. This is all major highway funding. This is txdot work. Meanwhile we have an imagine austin comprehensive plan that envisions walkable corridors with mixes of uses that enable people to live in urban settings and reduce their vehicle miles traveled. That is an entirely -- it is a very interesting departure from the way we have done -- have thought about transportation in the past and it was a significant aspect of the whole vision of a compact and connected community. We recently completed a series of corridor studies on some of our most important corridors, north lamar, burnet, east riverside, airport. We are in a position to make some significant improvements that would foster additional mixed use redevelopment of our urban corridors in a way that would enable people to live in urban settings and reduce their vehicle miles traveled and stop putting as many cars out on the roadway.

[05:51:19]

And yet even though we have done those studies I don't see anything in this entire project that really moves us forward on -- with the exception that the actual urban rail project that would entail improvements on both east riverside and airport. Our other corridors that we have looked at, even though we've identified the infrastructure needs, we're not currently planning -- there's nothing to address that work. Those corridor studies I assume will be left to languish until the next major bond opportunity, which I am told would be 2018 by which time I would have fully expect that those corridor studies will be stale and we may need to start fresh again. And in the meantime we will have shifted back to the old school of really just trying to pour money into the major highways that really are not going to foster the sort of walkable environments that imagine austin focused on. I just want to raise a concern about the balance of the -- that we are seeing in this mix insofar as it really does not appear to offer a lot of opportunities for the type of mixed use redevelopment along corridors that is envisioned in our comprehensive plan. >> Mayor Leffingwell: The bulk of the items on the menu, at least the amount of money, have to do with i-35. And I think it's without question that interstate i-35 is by far the biggest concern of most people in this city, if not this entire region. Interstate i-35 is a critical item for us to address and that's why this money is focused there. I would I have to respectfully remind you that in 2010 we devoted a big percentage, almost half of a bond package, to the kinds of projects that you're talking about now. And again in 12 there was a significant amount devoted to this.

[05:53:19]

This menu has been developed with a respect for what people in this city have been clamoring for, the majority of the people. It's also been developed, frankly, to have appeal to voters. The objective is to have a strategic mobility plan that actually makes a difference in moving traffic in the shortest time frame possible. So we'll look forward -- if you have specific suggestions, councilmember, please submit



them to transportation department for their consideration. So I have to be someplace at 12:00. If we could go back to our items for discussion this morning. If that's the will of the council. We still have a number of them left. Councilmember spelman. >> Spelman: Mayor, you have to leave. I'm just told that the mayor pro tem has got a commitment also. Mike is already gone. Anybody else? >> Mayor Leffingwell: I'm trying to count to four here. >> Spelman: Okay. We can count to four. >> Mayor Leffingwell: All right. I'll leave it with you then. >> Spelman: By my count we're up to item 62, which was pulled by councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: I can't stay a long time so I probably can't get through all my questions, but I can get a start. I guess I want to start by saying that certainly we need to continue to promote a diversity of housing across our city. And I think we have options in our code for doing just that. I am concerned about this

[05:55:19]

resolution for a few reasons. And these aren't going to be new. We're all getting emails from neighborhoods, individuals in our city, not just where it hits the hardest, but throughout the city. And those concerns are along the lines of my kind of big picture concerns here. We have adopted an imagine austin plan. The council voted on it. I'm just going to read a little bit of the language here. This is from page 207 in case anyone is interested. It talks about the continued protection and preservation of existing neighborhoods in the natural environment as being top priorities of comprehensive revisions to the city code and it goes on to talk about making sure that before we make code changes that we're really taking care to evaluate the impact of additional density and infill in existing neighborhoods. To endanger the existing neighborhoods and exacerbating community health issues such as flooding. Modifications to the city code and building code should be measured with regard to their ability to preserve neighborhood character, consistency with adopted neighborhood and area plans, impact on affordability and the ability of existing families to continue to reside in their homes. So this is part of a compact that we've made with austinites. Before adopting the comprehensive plan we had language in there saying that as we move forward with code changes we're going to consider them carefully, we're going to look at the impacts on infrastructure, flooding, affordability, the ability of folks to stay in their homes. And in my mind proceeding

[05:57:20]

with a code amendment at this point really undermines both the language that we adopted as part of our imagine austin plan as well as our neighborhood plans. In looking at our neighborhood plans across the city many allow for the infill plans being discussed in this resolution. Many plans, brentwood, highland, chestnut, dawson, east cesar chavez, these are all neighborhood plans, holly neighborhood plan, montopolis, that have adopted secondary apartments as part of the tools that they wanted to see in their area. And I know that hyde park for example is having a discussion of that as part of their neighborhood planning team. Councilmember spelman and I were both present in a meeting where some neighbors had proposed an amendment to that neighborhood plan to allow secondary units on smaller lot size. So we have mechanisms for allowing areas that want to encourage that kind of infill to go through a process, a public process that allows them to consider the impacts of such a change on

their specific geographic area and presumably those discusses are going to happen with an understanding of what the watersheds are like, what the existing impervious cover is like, and in terms of interacting with that watershed, what the increased infill and density could be on the watershed, what kind of infrastructure they have. We've seen on south lamar and in other areas what happens when we don't take into account our existing infrastructure. So that's my general concern about this. We have neighborhood plans, we have an adopted comprehensive plan. We have mechanisms for allowing these options, and what we seem to be being asked to do instead is take a very top down approach to

[05:59:21]

make some key changes from the council level rather than asking those neighbors and neighborhoods to consider whether this is an option they want to look at. As I understand it, the main -- some of the main changes would be to waive parking requirements, which in certain areas could be a major concern. It appears to be based on a presumption that individuals who live in secondary units are not going to have cars. I think we were all copied on an editorial from the portland tribune talking about how well this has succeeded in portland where they did waive parking requirements to encourage the construction of secondary units. In one of the examples they looked at, 72% of the documents still owned vehicles. So I would say we don't have good evidence that waiving parking requirements are going to mean that those units are attracting people who don't own cars. It's not clear to me from the resolution as it's written whether there would be affordability requirements for these units. You know, there's been discussion about this being a more affordable option. Is there any evidence of that really? We've got anecdotal evidence from neighborhoods like east cesar chavez and some others that talk about how the construction of microunits or smaller sized secondary apartments hasn't resulted in affordable units. The square foot price is lower because they're smaller spaces, but it's not -- but there doesn't appear to me to be an affordability requirement. So that's a question I have for the sponsor. Is there an affordability requirement? I would like to know the earlier version talked about asking for some code recommendations to come back that would allow increased impervious cover. This version doesn't include that. It's not clear to me whether

[06:01:22]

or not that's an excluded, whether that is now off the table. And the same is true of height. And then I do have some specific questions about some of the other provisions within here, like interesting separation requirements, which are being proposed for changes. And those of course are in place to guard against fire and other kinds of health safety issues. Let me pause there and ask the sponsor about the impervious cover and the height issues. Are those off the table? And why it is that # this is being proposed outside of our neighborhood planning amendment process and well in advance of our code next rewrite? >> I appreciate the question and I certainly support the idea of having a thorough, thoughtful public process before we make any changes. Of course, the effect of this item would be to initiate a code amendment process which would go through the planning commission's -- there would be lots of opportunities for public input and discussion on this item. I fully embrace the idea of helping people stay in their homes and thinking carefully about impervious cover and the other issues that were

mentioned. I have been hearing from many austinites who feared that they will not be able to remain in their homes unless they are able to secure some revenue stream that will help them offset the property taxes that are mounting each year. Some of them have existing spaces that they're not able to use as apartments. And they simply would like to be able to plumb them and rent them out as apartments as a way of being able to remain in the homes where they have been for a long time. Think about that. We're talking about existing space. It would allow them to

[06:03:23]

provide housing options in existing space in order to allow them to remain in their homes. It seems to me that if we can make that easier we're -- we're doing a couple of things. Not only are we promoting the interest of enabling people to remain in their homes, we're also in the process providing more housing options for people who want to live in the city and in apartments, typically most often in the central city. Currently our code poses a number of barriers causing people difficulties as they try to do that. We're talking about keep in mind that this ordinance is restricted to current homeowners. This is not something that would be available to speculative developers. This is about current homeowners being able to generate a revenue stream to help them stay put. Currently the city imposes hurdles that makes it difficult to do that. For instance, for people who currently don't have the amount of parking required by our city code -- and there are many, especially in places like central east austin where there are many lots with homes, fairly small homes that did not originally have on-site parking. Currently our city code said if you want to provide a unit in your backyard, you will have to not only provide one or two parking spaces for that unit, depending on the size, often two additional spaces for that, but before you can pull a permit to do that you have to pave two parking spaces for the main structure. So on a relatively small lot in the central city, the city mandates that you pay for parking spaces simply to provide a housing unit behind you that would help you provide a revenue stream and provide a housing option that you want to provide to

[06:05:23]

people who want to live in austin. That actually paving the yard would, I would submit, would significantly endanger the neighborhood -- the character of the existing neighborhood. That is our current code requirements, meaning that in order to actually comply with -- in order to add a unit, you have to take action that would not only add significant amounts of impervious cover, but would dramatically change the neighborhood. I don't think that reduces impervious cover or provides affordable or allowing people to stay put or in any sense serving the interest of the overall goals of imagine austin. We imagine a more compact, connected city that is less auto oriented, the consultants on our code rewrite have called out the specific requirements and noted how auto oriented they are and how beneficial it would be if we could ease up on those requirements and enable more people to live in units like that that actually would not interrupt the disrupting character of our neighborhoods. I think there would be real value in enabling people to take that sort of action and address the housing crisis that we are facing right now instead of waiting until 2017 or later before we can proceed with any of the recommendations that we've already heard. I fully -- I'm fully aware that there are areas that --

where they are complications. You mentioned hyde park which has an nccd. This -- this is really those areas around the city that are subject to our standard code requirements and not the places like hyde park that have devil in detail into regulations like we see embodied in the nccd. So whether this would --

[06:07:25]

whether this would actually expand to a place like nccd is something that could be discussed if people really feel like there is additional discussion to be had regarding allowing more units in nccd, then this could be an appropriate time to do that, but I would not generally envision that this could r. Would apply to places within an nccd. This would be the standard code requirements in other places. Although I recognize there are some who feel strongly that we should revisit the nccd and this may be a time when we could have that conversation. So to speak to a couple of the specific questions, there is a question about the affordability requirement. As a general matter I would not say that anyone who builds a secondary unit should automatically be subject to an affordability requirement. That I would note that our current code doesn't include a provision that actually allows you a little bit more impervious cover, five percent more impervious cover if you commit to having an affordable secondary unit and that is something that is in current code and we could certainly talk about how that can be extended to other efforts -- extended under this initiative. That is something that maybe there are circumstances in which if you commit to making a unit affordable, maybe we should continue giving you more room for the impervious cover. So I think there is a lot we could do with maintaining the current impervious cover requirements and I think easing up on parking and driving requirements will make it a lot easier to focus more on providing homes for people rather than storage space for cars. To me that is where our principal focus should be is on learning more about

[06:09:25]

housing for people than the storage for cars. And yes, I recognize that may well result in some additional cars being parked on the street. And I realize that that may have happened in portland and elsewhere. I will say although the portland tribune was critical of efforts to make progress on this, but other news sources such as the "new york times" and others have been very positive regarding the progress that portland and other cities have made in promoting accessory dwelling units. And similar progress has been reported in vancouver and other places. And I think there is a lot of progress that we could make here that serves the interest of imagine austin and follows best practices of those cities that have been out in front on this. Toys since you mentioned -- toys since you mentioned the "new york times" article, they singled out austin as a city allowing secondary dwelling and units for a long time. We have tools within our current code that allow for this increased density and these infill options and areas would like to have them. So I think we have a fundamental difference in how we begin that conversation. Do we begin it with the neighborhoods that have worked for years in crafting their neighborhood plan or do we issue an edict from council that this will be a tool throughout our city under these particular conditions? There all kinds of ways to begin discussions. We have several different kinds of examples in our agenda on thursday where we've introduced a stakeholder process or introduced some community conversations to look at options. Taking -- initiating a code amendment as we've discussed several times

recently is a much different action. It is taking an action from

[06:11:27]

the council and saying this is a code that we want in place throughout our city and there will be hearings about it at the codes and ordinance meeting and at the planning commission and then at council, but it's not beginning with an openness to considering all the alternatives. One, for example, might be to begin a conversation about whether our infill tools that are available to neighborhood planning teams ought to include an option for waiving parking. That allows neighborhoods to consider whether it would be appropriate in their areas. You know, I think -- the portland -- the information aside, we have information from our staff memo and microunits and information in other articles, not just the portland tribune, about the fact that waiving parking requirements does not prohibit people from having cars. And if you've made planning decisions assuming that people are going to stop driving if they live in a place without a parking spot, those just aren't borne out by the examples. It's not going to necessarily be what happens. And we need to make decisions that are going to be realistic. And if we know from other cities that waiving the parking requirements creates conflicts for small businesses that are trying to provide parking for their customers for other residents that may or may not have their own parking spots because they're older neighborhoods that don't have driveways, these are some of the considerations that I believe need to be contextual in nature and that's one of the things our planning process allows us to do. >> Spelman: Councilmember morrison, do you want to get in on this? >> Morrison: I do. I would briefly say I know everyone is on pins and needles to find out where I stand on this, but I agree with councilmember tovo. [Laughter] I think that it's entirely appropriate that this is the kind of thing that should be done through a carefully discussed code

[06:13:30]

next opportunity. Yes, our consultants do call out that these were some of the barriers, but they also were very clear that we need to carefully refine the neighborhood plan infill tools and it needs to be done in context, in overall context. And frankly, if we come in after all of the -- all of the work that's been done on neighborhood plans, I have to say that it is a fair question for any individual in this town to ask why should I bother participating in something like that? Besides the rhetoric, there are two points I want to make, and that is one, that the resolution says a 500 square feet [indiscernible] is likely to be affordable and I want to know from the sponsors what do you mean by affordable here? Like to satisfy someone that makes 30% mfi or just cheaper th 600 square feet apartment? I think that's very ambiguous. >> Riley: If I may. If we were going to be revising this, one of the edits I was going to make is insert the word relatively affordable. The concept is in comparison with principal dwelling structures that an accessory dwelling unit of a small size, 500 square feet or less, is likely to be relatively affordable. Typically people will be paying less for a home that is 500 square feet or less than they would -- they would be paying less for that sort of home than they would be paying for a typical home that is a thousand, two thousand square feet or more. That is the idea, that a smaller unit is likely to be relatively more affordable. >> Morrison: So relatively less costly? Affordability has such a lot of meaning to it, so you want to say -- for me the accurate statement might be to rent a 500 square foot apartment is going

to cost less likely than to rent a

[06:15:30]

similarly situated, a similarly whatever one thousand square foot. But there's an assumption that all of this is based on, and that is that allowing these will provide an income stream for a homeowner to allow them to stay in their home and pay their taxes. And here's my question about that assumption. Has anyone ever actually looked at if you invest -- I don't know how many thousands of dollars it would take to build. And it's going to be commercial. You get no exemption on it. You get no cap on the appraisal, so the amount that it costs to build that and then what it adds to your property is going to be a big chunk of change, which is going to increase your property taxes significantly and there's no limit on those property taxes in terms of capping keystone projects them like a home -- capping them like a homesteading property is. Has anyone looked at how much they're going to have to charge on a 500 square foot apartment that's newly built to be able to make up enough money to make it worthwhile taxwise? I don't know if -- I think that -- I have no idea what the answer to that is, but I think it's forming the foundation of this argument as I understand it. And I think it would be interesting. >> Riley: If I may - - I'm not proposing that we require anybody to build a secondary unit. We would leave it up to the individual homeowners to make the decision whether it would serve their interest to have a secondary unit there. We're not talking about people looking to put their home out on the market and in the situation you're describing it's someone who needs to take care of an elderly parent or a child

[06:17:30]

with disabilities. I've not gone so far as to grill them on exactly what studies they have done in terms of the impact on their appraisals, but I do know I have heard from many people who feel like it would be an option that would be -- that would work very well for them. >> Morrison: I appreciate that. What I also heard earlier was the argument that this was going to help people stay in their homes and pay their property taxes. And I would love to be able to get some estimates in different situations of whether -- because if we're going down -- if the city decides to go down this path, which I think is negative in many, many ways, accused r. And should be part of the code next discussion, I think it's fair to do to analyze the assumption and the scenarios that people think it's going to solve. I know there's a lot more discussion to be had on this. >> Spelman: As a young child in high school I had to read the Lincoln Douglas debates in my history class and some future class may have to read the Riley Toivo debates. It is like that debate in format and in quality. I'm happy we had it. It seems to me that at 12:20 this is a good time for us to stop. I'm happy to hold off on the items that I've pulled. We can pick them up again on Thursday or through the formal Q and A process. Is there anything else we need to do right now? >> Morrison: I would like to briefly bring up item number -- excuse me, 84. I guess I'm relieved that I don't see anything from my

[06:19:32]

colleague, councilmember Spelman, because I thought if you were going to try to address that

complicated issue that you had -- [overlapping speakers]. >> Morrison: That you had intended to bring something to work session and I see that you haven't brought anything to work session. >> Spelman: I haven't brought anything to work session. >> Morrison: I'm going to assume that that means that you're not going to be bringing a section al amendment. I do want to say that there is that language that has caused ambiguity and whether it was meant to be a not to exceed [indiscernible], I think some of our community folks have been concerned that it needs to be clarified that it's not to exceed -- may not exceed as opposed to you get it independent of all the other expirations. So I did want to mention that I will probably be bringing some simple amendment change that just adds a may not exceed in there on thursday. >> Spelman: Regardless of what it is that I do or not do, I think that would be perceived as friendly by at least me. >> Morrison: Excellent. I'm glad to hear that and I wanted to give everybody a head's up on that because I know it's been a complicated discussion and I am keeping my fingers crossed that we can finish it up. >> Spelman: We are all since we have a long agenda. There being no further business, we are adjourned.