

City Council Work Session Transcript –5/5/2015

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 5/5/2015 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 5/5/2015

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[9:14:15 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: We have a quorum present. We're going to go ahead and call to order the Austin city council work session. Today is Tuesday, May 5th, 2015. We are in the board and commission room, city hall, 301 west second street. The time is 9:14. We have a briefing set on our schedule as well as an executive session. The executive session really only has one item that relates to the competitive matters briefing. We're going to go ahead and start with -- hold that until later. If we could begin with the staff briefing on the city community engagement taskforce, that would be helpful. >> Thank you, mayor, council. This is a very brief presentation, give you an update on what I think would have been the first session of the council, setting up the community engagement taskforce. I've been in engagement with councilmember pool, the original sponsor of the resolution, as well as the mayor and they had requested that we come forward and kind of give an update of where we're at. So the communications and public information office is designated as the staff lead on this. One of the original requirements of the resolution was that we find an independent facilitator that could work with the board to get their work

[9:16:16 AM]

done. So we've got someone under contract for that. And we'd like to begin the preparation and the background work in May. That would include interviews with the resolution sponsors, with city executives, internal staff that's involved in community engagement. And start doing some of the research on best practice examples that the taskforce can review and discuss. So right now we have four taskforce members appointed. R. Darlene Watkins, Sarah Torres, Christopherly Dezavala in a and a half and a half Taylor. The original resolution called to come back with recommendations in six months. That was six months from January 29th. With the schedule that we've got in place it's going to take a full six months to get through the work. So we'll be separately coming forward requesting an extension on that to be able to make sure that we do a thorough job with this because it is just as important to us as I believe it is to you. So our next steps right now as I mentioned, we want to start interviews in May. The research and interview work with the consultant. We want to continue the taskforce appointments. During May we would also draft the taskforce framework and the time

lines. One of the things when we're discussing with the consultant we wanted to make sure that the contract was flexible with the understanding that the taskforce will have he -- task force will have some concurrence with what the pathway is. That their role is to facilitate they're work, not dictate their work. That first meeting, maybe the first few meetings, will be framing out exactly how the taskforce will go about their job and how the consultant will be able to help them do that. As I mentioned, we would like to start our work in June provided that we've got the appointments to be able to do it. And that is all, if

[9:18:17 AM]

anybody has any questions. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston? >> Houston: Mayor, this may not be the appropriate time, but it's about community engagement. Is there any way that we could perhaps refer to he either community engagement taskforce or there's another taskforce that you just appointed, transition taskforce. The issue about citizens communication. And the fact that people come week after week after week after week, even though there's some things that say you should only speak once every third time, except. So the is this something that I could refer to the engagement? Okay. >> Pool: Or I think the transition taskforce may actively be looking at that. We've met once and I think we're going to meet again. Councilmember kitchen is leading that. As you know her mother passed away, so she is currently out of the office, but we are looking at how to manage the citizens communication. >> Mayor Adler: We'll bring up that to the first venue that can reach it. >> Houston: Okay. I was just asking. >> Community engagement. >> Pool: Yes, it is. Yes. >> Renteria: Yes. I had selected a person to be on the community taskforce and I don't think I wanted to apply because he didn't -- he asked me that he didn't -- he didn't know what time or when are the meetings set? Is it going to be up to the taskforce to set the meetings or do you have a time schedule and a meeting place? >> We have a draft schedule right now, like I said, the taskforce is going to have some influence over ultimately what that looks like. Right now we're anticipating meeting twice a month for those six months. It will be in the evenings. There will be we anticipate some additional work that the taskforce might want to split out amongst the

[9:20:18 AM]

members. One of the things that we discussed was doing at least one outreach and input meeting within each district. As part of the process, separate and alone from the taskforce actual meetings where they're conducting their business. But like I said, all of that's flexible and part of the discussion once we have everybody in the room to be able to talk about how they want to do their work. >> Renteria: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Tovo? >> Tovo: I was waiting for the light to pop on here. I forgot there were new microphones. This isn't directly related to the subject, but it does relate to the question councilmember Houston raised. I did actually ask the city clerk about that, why that particular rule wasn't being triggered. And I have actually forgotten the response. So I wonder if we might just ask that question here. It's in the procedures and the rules, so I hate to -- it's great to refer to a committee, but if there's already a process, I would like to know why the process isn't working? >> Houston: It's my understanding that in F the number of people don't sign up then people can come and repeat themselves until the slots are filled. >> Tovo: And that was probably the answer and I had forgotten. >> That is correct. The rule is basically you cannot speak more

than once every three council meetings unless the 10 slots that are allotted for the noon citizen communication do not fill up. And then if we only have two or three folks that are brand new and have not spoken, then the rule says you go back in and fill in with anyone who has requested to speak. >> Tovo: Okay. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Would you go ahead and clip that section and send it to everybody? >> Absolutely. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. >> Pool: I have a quick question for Janet. Then the decision to fill the unfilled slots is made after the time

[9:22:20 AM]

frame has closed, after the window has closed? >> Yes. So after -- >> Pool: So like a waiting list. >> Exactly. So during the period of time that registration is open, we take all registrations and then staff goes through and puts them into order if they haven't spoken within the last three they raise to the top and then after that it's based on whenever they came in and registered. >> Mayor Adler: Am I understanding, Ms. Houston, is you're asking for some of us to take a look at that issue, policy? Houston correct. Because it could be that we have four people and that's all we have. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. So we have collectively as a group a lot of boards and commissions. I think the deadline to make appointments is July 1st is when people have to come on. The clerk, I guess, associated with this has asked us that they really need time to onboard and train the 490 appointments so that they can actually begin the work in July and they're hoping to be able to do that during this month, May, and June. It's important to note that even people that are being reappointed will go through the same training together with the new folks. So even if you're reappointing somebody who has been there before, letting them know so that they could be scheduled for that would be helpful. We have certain boards and commissions that have designated duties where there I think are priorities for making appointments. I've been told that those are the arts commission, the board of adjustments, the environmental commission, historic landmark commission. I'll post this on to the bulletin board. The housing authority, parks and rec, public safety, zero waste, water and wastewater commission and urban

[9:24:20 AM]

renewal agency and the zoning and platting commission. So those are the ones that they're asking to focus on first. In addition to that, we have three taskforces that are waiting to get quorums so that they can begin work. The taskforce that we created. We know them as the engagement committee taskforce which can't start until they have people. What were the other two taskforce? It was the water that's also looking for people so they can have a quorum. And then the third one was -- >> Parks and land events. >> Mayor Adler: Those three probably more than any others. As I had said earlier. >> I'm holding off making appointments if I can, for everyone to make appointments, so that we can see if there's a gap in skill or demographic or something that we can fill. But I'm getting a lot of pressure to go ahead and make appointments to some of the ones that don't have people so that we could have a quorum. But I hate to have to do that because then I give up the ability to fill the gap, but at least on those three I'll probably go ahead and do that if people don't go ahead and do it so we can get a quorum going. Everybody should take a look at that and obviously that's a chore and large assignment. Chores -- it's a large assignment we need -- Ms. Houston? >> Houston: Mayor, some of mine to those committees will be coming up for review this Thursday. >> Mayor Adler: Good. And I think there's a lot coming up here. Are we

ready to move on to the next item? We'll go then to the items that have been pulled. We had item 6 -- well, first item number 2, pulled by troxclair related to the electric power research

[9:26:27 AM]

institute. >> Troxclair: Thanks for being here. You brought in the big guns today, huh? [Laughter] Okay. I just -- I wanted some additional information about the research institute considering that we're spending \$1.2 million over three years for the membership. That's a pretty pricey membership so I just wanted to know what -- you know, what the benefit is to Austin to have membership in that organization, what policies have they helped us craft. Does city council actually listen to what they recommend? Can you help me? >> I'm happy to. Good morning, councilmembers and mayor. So the electric power research is quite an old organization. It was founded in 1948. It's funded solely by electric utilities in the United States and internationally. It's the -- really the number one organization for research in our industry. And for many, many utilities it's the only way that we can be involved in research and development. Some larger utilities actually carry staff that do R and D. Where I came from the last utility we had like eight R and D engineers. Austin energy doesn't have an R and D department. Maybe we will in the future. The utility as a whole spends the least amount of R and D dollars out of any industry. We spend less than one percent of revenues on R and D. There's a reason for that. We're a very mature industry, move slowly and we're subject to regulatory bodies like public service commissions and city councils where they do want to see kind of hard returns for our investments. That said, this is a fairly modest amount for

[9:28:28 AM]

a utility our size to be a member of apr, three or four thousand dollars a year. There are many utilities that spend a few millions. The bigger utilities. Southern companies, the largest contributor to epri, but that's sort of what the organization is. As far as the research, it goes across a whole value chain from generation all the way down to behind the meter. And they've been involved with Austin energy before. We've had very small dollar amounts, mostly in electrical vehicle space. We would like to expand that, be more involved. If we're going to be a utility that looks forward 10, 20 years where technology is going to go, I think that's the hope of city council as well. We need to be in those conversations and that's mainly the reason for this membership. >> Troxclair: Okay. So do they -- they put out reports that y'all depend on in crafting your recommendations or policies? >> Right. There are several ways for us to correct to epri and for epri to contribute to us. They do put out reports for every single thing that they do and we're free to buy any report that we want from epri. We can also be engaged in what's called programs, so the reason amount is what the amount is is we joined a certain set amount of programs and that's the cost of the program. So the dollar amount of your membership is essentially based on what you joined, the types of programs that you joined. You know, it runs the gamut. Like we're joining an industrial safety group, for example, where we can benchmark and get ideas about industrial safety from other utilities. So it just runs the gamut of -- >> Larry Weis, general manager. I might also point out -- >> Turn your mic on. >> I thought the light didn't need to be on anymore. I thought I heard that.

[9:30:29 AM]

Sorry. When I came to Austin energy in 2010 we actually had a -- I would call it a small department that did some R and D because ae at that time was out pretty innovative and we still are. Here we're in the cutting edge. I think what's happened is a lot of utilities our size or smaller in the public utility eye rainy in a have discovered that -- and epri has discovered that there's some value that they can bring to a lot of the work that we need to do. So I would propose that I actually kind of abolished a lot of what we were doing in that eye rainy in a when I came here to save costs, and this is a far cheaper way for us have to the highest level engineering, scientific skill set reports for what we do in our innovative programs going forward. >> Troxclair: Thank you. I appreciate it. >> You're welcome. >> Tovo: I'm glad,. >> Troxclair:, that you pulled this because -- I'm glad, councilmember troxclair, that you pulled this because it was an interesting discussion. We had a lot of discussions in the community and at council over the last few years of changing Austin energy's business model and it strikes me that this is a help to that because, as you said, it would allow some research and development without the extent of the investment that it would cost to do it in-house. So that seems like a very supportive of that mission, of that broader mission. Would you say that's accurate? >> Well, I -- go ahead. >> It is actually accurate. One of the latest for the past couple of years, epri has been actually focused on the business model of the utility. The whole industry has been focused on it, but that has been one of their kind of highest level initiatives in the past couple of years, folks sighing on how utilities need to change as technology changes with us. So yeah, you're right on point. Epri is doing that work. >> Tovo: And you were talking about I think electric cars that kind

[9:32:30 AM]

of triggered my interest because there are some potential new revenue opportunities possibly within the research and development that they're doing. >> That was an example of where we have been working with epri historically at Austin energy. And -- but all also say that epri has changed a little bit in that their working in this arena you're talking about, the new model, the new business, what the future will look like, epri is putting a ton of research into that area and it's fairly new research. There's no way we can afford that research that they're providing. It's really a good synergy that we'll get out of working with our peer utilities as well in other states. >> Tovo: Interesting. Thanks. >> Pool: Some of the conversations over the last few months have circled around ensuring that this council is able to have access to the range of expert opinion that's available out in the energy market and in the industry. Would you say that our participation in epri would bring us a level of that expertise that we would otherwise need to find elsewhere and have to also search out and purchase? >> Absolutely. >> Epri would be happy to come and talk to city council about any topic. >> Pool: Great. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else on that issue? Thank you very much. We had items 6 and 7. They've been postponed or going to be postponed. Ms. Houston, you had pulled those. Are we okay moving on to the next item? Okay. There were two items that you had pulled this morning. I don't know if we have staff to speak to those. Eight and 12. Let's come back to those, we'll double back. The next item pulled is item number 22.

[9:34:31 AM]

I pulled that. It's the appointment one again. I pulled that because it looks like we're about to have another discussion coming up on Thursday with respect to nominations. And you all had a conversation on this which I was supportive of that I missed because I was at the legislature about reaffirming that every councilmember has a right to designate their own appointees, to nominate to the city's boards and commissions and that the 10-1 process is designed to ensure that we have competing and divergent views on panels and commissions. And it's important to have diverse perspectives on boards and commissions. At the same time, all the boards and commissions nominees come to this body so there is a function for this body to perform. I hope that we get to a place where -- and maybe really fast, like within the next couple of days, where we can articulate broad policy with respect to the standards that we use to determine when we take what I think is -- should be always kind of an extraordinary step to deny somebody's appointment. Quite frankly, with the ones that we've had so far I've agreed with the actions and the sentiment of the council, but there's a danger associated with handling this kind of thing on an ad hoc basis. Maybe not for this council, but for the next council and for councils after that. It shouldn't be something that happens easily and we should be able to articulate real clearly when we're voting yes for someone whose views we don't

[9:36:32 AM]

like and don't support, and when we vote no for someone that would not be a constructive member of a panel. So we're going to have that conversation on Thursday. I had pulled this just by way to kind of highlight that. I'll be trying to work over the next couple of days to figure out how to articulate the position I take. And I would urge everybody to try to do that so that however we're going to vote we give direction to the other members ahead of time so that people know and can anticipate when it is that we would support or not support a nominee. That's the only reason I pulled that. Anybody want to say anything else on item 22? Then we'll go on then to item 23. I also pulled this one. And it was the talk about this issue and Ms. Tovo, maybe you can or the other sponsors can help me understand. My concern on this, if you can address it, my concern on this is that the Mueller-- it's certainly a neighborhood that concerns people that live there. But it's also a city asset. It was on city appropriate -- it's a demonstration project on things that the city is trying to do. A lot of people are impacted by what happens there. There are people that work there that don't

[9:38:32 AM]

live there and while I believe that there are people that have a significant on that panel when they give that advice, if it's only people that live there, then the recommendations that come from that panel would be incomplete in my mind. And I would always be tempted whenever I got any recommendation back from the panel to want to send it to another panel that would be people who also are knowledgeable or interested in Mueller or have an impact and have the city interest in that so that I could get that also divergent view. And I look at these advisory panels to a large degree -- I've said this before. In some respects I'm not sure I really care what the vote is on any of the advisory panels as much as I am interested in the issues they raise and the arguments they raise and the points they bring forward because it's an advisory group, it's not something that takes action. So I wanted to pull this because I have a concern

about limiting the participation on the advisory council to just one type of stakeholder associated with the Mueller project. >> Last fall some individuals who are part of the Robert Mueller municipal airport plan advisory committee, otherwise known as the piac, approached some -- let me back up or I'll have a misplaced qualifier. Also some members of the Mueller community approached different councilmembers and there was a couple of different levels of concern. One is that other areas have neighborhood planning teams and they

[9:40:33 AM]

do not. They developed differently and that was an interest and so the council last fall did pass a resolution that in I think 2017, I don't have the resolution in front of me, the piac would become a neighborhood planning team like other areas have. The group is to make sure that the vision for Mueller is being implemented and it has, as I understand, typically been comprised of people who either reside in Mueller or reside in one of the adjoining areas. So all this would do is really just put that in to our kind of standard operating procedure that the residents -- that the composition of this board should continue to be Mueller residents and people in the surrounding neighborhoods. And I will say, and this is a little piece of history that I discovered as I started to get calls from residents of Mueller who were interested in seeing this move forward, there was -- there was an effort last fall to actually implement this change that just didn't -- it wasn't -- there was another council office working on it and they kind of ran out of time, but it had gotten pretty far down the road and was about to hit count agenda before the previous council left. And so they again several members of the community contacted me and asked me to bring this forward, and I was very glad that many of you decided to co-sponsor it. So I understand the concern. I would say that we have several other examples of boards that recognize that having a geographic specificity is important to that work, the community development commission is one. We have a spot on that board for a resident of St. John's neighborhood, for example, and I think one other neighborhood is represented on that. And the Mueller

[9:42:34 AM]

community members who have been supporting this have rightly said that this is -- there's a lot of information that they have as residents or nearby residents that is important to implementing that plan and that this is kind of like -- it's not a completely analogous situation, but it is as akin to a neighborhood association or a neighborhood planning team as they're going to get right now this will they roll into one officially. So that's the rationale. I will say councilmember Casar brought up a good point. There are something like 19, I think I'm right on those Numbers, 19 neighborhoods that have been working on the Mueller development since its conception. They worked together to create the master plan, they worked together on the piac and so they're all represented on here. Councilmember Casar brought up the good point that there were other neighborhoods that were in close -- in as close proximity who weren't named, they weren't part of the originalled why. We've drawn them in here too. The idea is to draw a wide swath around the Mueller neighborhood, understanding that all of those neighborhoods are impacted by what goes on at Mueller. There is an attempt to be inclusive and to be broad in the reach, but also to recognize that this is an unusual -- this is unusual in that the implementation of this plan is -- really should be done by people who live either there or in close proximity. And frankly, most of the

appointments -- all of the appointments that have come forward so far are -- are within this area. And so likely our group would continue -- continue that, but it is unlike some of the other boards where it just seems to be -- there seemed to be a good case to be made that it should be targeted within that geographic area rather than

[9:44:34 AM]

citywide. >> Mayor Adler: Are the teams limited to people who live in the area? >> Tovo: No, they are not. They're people who live in the area, have property within the area or businesses within the area. But again, they're not a contact team yet. When they roll into becoming a contact team in I think 2016 or 17 -- Mr. Goode, you don't happen to remember, do you? Any minute I'll get my resolution and be able to pull it up. When they roll into an official neighborhood contact team they would be surprised of that kind of -- comprised of that kind of membership. Residents, property owners, both non-resident and resident property owners. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Zimmerman. >> Zimmerman: Yes, Mr. Mayor, I concur with your remarks. When this first came to my attention I kind of felt like you, that it seemed like we were getting back to geographic boundaries, but the more I considered it, I thought, you know, being in district 6, which is the neighborhood that most frequently votes against bond issues, we have a fiscally conservative view, a more limited government view, and I mean, I realize that we have people that share that policy and philosophical view all over the city. So it's possible to find someone in those neighborhoods as mayor pro tem points out, geographically closer that can still reflect that political point of view. So that's why I went ahead and sponsored this because it seemed I could find somebody more local to that area that would still reflect district 6 views. And I guess I kind of did that with arief panju. There was some debate and discussion on that. He doesn't live in district 6, but he is closer to the neighborhoods in question on historical landmark commission. And he has I think more of the district 6 philosophical point of view. So that's why I went ahead and decided to sponsor this. I had the same thought as you at first, that I think it is possible to get the philosophical point of view even with

[9:46:35 AM]

somebody right next to the neighborhood in question. >> Houston: Mayor? >> Go ahead. >> Houston: Thank you. I'm speaking as a person that was part of the original Mueller neighborhood design team. Back when we hadn't cleared the land yet and was trying to think about the vision for what that community was going to be and the impact that it would have putting that many people in the midst of an historic neighborhood, although that's where the airport was. Around that airport were historic neighborhoods. And so we were trying to be very intentional about the people who had the ability to have input about what kinds of things happened there. Somewhere that broke down so we have what we have. But the neighbors feel very disconnected from Mueller. I had a very good friend, Jerry Perkins, who died who was one of the people in Mueller that kept trying to engage and help Mueller people engage the community. Mueller looks very different than the neighborhood it sits in. There's going to be a big issue about the school developed in Mueller and the fact that Mueller opted out of being included in the district that it is in and got put in another aid district. So there's still some lingering concerns about how Mueller does business, who lives there, what their core values are, how they engage and reach out into the community. And I think it's beneficial to have people from those surrounding neighborhoods who are able to go in

and talk about those concerns that they have about the lack of engagement or the lack of feeling like it's a community. And so I think I signed on to this because I live in A1C and it has an I am pack, the traffic has an impact.

[9:48:36 AM]

There are all kinds of ways that that many people in the middle of what used to be defined neighborhoods causes concern. So I understand your issue about the broader community, but I think we can find within these how many -- well, it's a lot. I think we can find -- I was going to try to count real quick. I think we can find the kind of representation that you're looking for, but I certainly understand that you don't see a broad community perspective. Sometimes we talk about a broad community perspective and sometimes we talk about localized. So this is one of those that I think there are a lot of -- a variety of neighborhoods around that have very different issues. And I think it's important for their voices to be heard in this process. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool? >> Pool: Mayor pro tem tovo had mentioned the community development corporation -- is it corporation? Is it the CDC -- commission. And my understanding of the principle behind those is pretty much how you've articulated it and councilmember Houston, that it's people directly affected by the land in question and would have maybe the closest understand understanding of the changes that might be needed. Is that right? Is it a fairly parallel? >> Tovo: Actually, I'm sorry, I sure may have said that. I was intending to refer to the community development commission, the city's community development commission, which is tasked with advising the council on affordable housing issues and others, but it does have several positions designated for particular neighborhoods where affordable housing is a real priority or there is a lot of affordable housing involved. So one, for example, is St. Johns neighborhood. So just saying we do have other boards and commissions that are

[9:50:36 AM]

geographically specific or specific in other ways supportive of that mission. >> Mayor Adler: But not the entire commission. That had selected seats that were geographic. >> Tovo: Correct. I think you were -- I think one referring to community development corporations. >> Pool: Like blackland, for instance. >> Tovo: Right. I think this is more akin in many ways, the piac is more akin to a neighborhood association, though it looks very different from any other neighborhood association because this is not comprised just of people who live at Mueller. It is, as councilmember Houston said, it has been a much broader group recognizing that what happens at Mueller impacts all of the other communities that touch it. And some that are -- several communities over like Hyde park or -- Mckinley heights, some others that aren't immediately adjacent. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool, did you finish? >> Pool: I just had one other thought. If we proceed in this direction on Thursday, would it be possible for the sponsors or the folks who live in these areas to provide us with some suggested people to consider for nominations? District 7 I don't think is represented on this list and it may be a little -- it would be helpful to have some guidance on people who are interested that may be coming from the different districts. >> Renteria: Yeah, I was fortunate enough to be on the CDC, community development commission, when we established that. We looked at it very carefully and we looked at some of the models around the country and there was one that was in Atlanta, Georgia that really stood out. And you know, that kind of development was that you can actually build a community where it's not only

economically integrated, but also it's integrated racially. So that was the big

[9:52:37 AM]

concept. Plus it was our land so we were entitled -- we demanded that it gave us 20% affordable housing there. So that's how it was created. We not only wanted a community, but we wanted one that we had all kinds of mixed income integrated into that project. So that's why we're so proud of Mueller because Mueller is -- it's going to be a community that's -- it's inclusive. You can drive through there and you can't tell whether there's a low income person living in that community. And that's what I wish that all of Austin would just, you know, wake up and see this is what kind of community that all mixed race can live in one community and live in peace and harmony and, you know, make it really prosperous so that the kids can -- our children can learn that this is the way that future communities should look like, and not have communities where it's just all wealthy and really extreme low income and middle class gets kicked out. So that's always been my goal. And it's one of the reasons why I ran for city council. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Any other further comments on this issue? >> Sue Edwards, assistant city manager. Regardless of the decision that you make, I just wanted to -- having been involved from the very inception almost of Mueller, I just wanted to share a few things with you. This particular committee was put together as an oversight committee to assure that the thousand page agreement that was written was carried out over a 20-year plan because Mueller was anticipated to be 20 years in the making. There were 10 goals. Part of those goals dealt with affordable housing, and I think councilmember Renteria, no one could say it better than that, that there was going to be 25% affordable housing. And that affordable housing was going to be

[9:54:38 AM]

mixed throughout the community so that no one could tell what was an affordable house and what was not. Callous as -- catellus as the master developer was charged with carrying out the goals that the community put together and that the community worked very hard to do that will over a number of years in terms of planning. So as Mueller builds out, we have Pam Hefner, who is a project director, who works with catellus and works with the piac to make sure that those particular goals are followed as closely as possible. Sometimes there needs to be changes because the market changes, but basically we wanted 10,000 jobs, we wanted a specific number of single-family houses. We wanted a school and worked very hard with aisd to get a school there, but aisd in the end made a decision not to do that. We also worked very hard to get H.E.B. As a grocery store there, and one that fit within the guidelines. Of the design guidelines. So there are a number of groups that work in Mueller, one to assure that the design guidelines are correct and that when people build in Mueller that they use the appropriate materials, that they use quality materials, and that they follow the guidelines. And then you have the piac who really is supposed to make sure that until this development is completely built out that it's built out in confirmation with the 10 goals that were established in the beginning. So I just wanted to give you a little bit of history moving forward. So to us it doesn't matter what your decision is, your decision is your decision to make. I just wanted to lay out the guidelines for the

[9:56:38 AM]

basis for the development of Mueller. >> Mayor Adler: Is there a difference -- again, I'm just trying to understand. Is there a difference between the neighborhood contact team interest, the neighborhood association interest, which is something that needs to happen. And if there's not a neighborhood association or there's not a exact team, then that needs to be there. And the ongoing remainder of the 20-year interest in an agreement that was made with the city concerning this property? Are those two different functions? Should there be two different boards? Should there be a contact team that is dealing with the neighborhood association type issues and oversight board over an agreement with the city? Should there be two different things or is this all one thing? >> There is an owner's and for both property and business owners association. At Mueller. And that meet separately, and that is separate. Greg Guernsey has come to our commission and addressed the idea of the contact team, and said that the commission serves as a contact team. It has -- gets -- there's no other contact team that gets as much attention from the city as Mueller. And, you know, for good reason. And once the master developer is finished, then that's when the commission converts into a contact team. >> Mayor Adler: But this isn't -- but if there was a contact team, it would also have representation of businesses that were in the community and other stakeholders in the community. >> I think the difference is that Mueller was a planned community. So, therefore, it was planned in terms of its design and its

[9:58:41 AM]

number of individuals, and its density, was very specifically designed and approved by the council. Contact teams serve a little bit bit of a different function in that you may have a neighborhood that doesn't necessarily have a neighborhood plan, or they do have a neighborhood plan, but that neighborhood plan can be changed based on the contact team and the individuals within the neighborhood. In this particular community, because it was a very specifically planned community with very specific guidelines regarding streets and transportation, and the design material that you use in the houses, that there really -- this piac acts as that contact team because they are charged with keeping the goals of the agreement. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. >> Kevin Johns, director of economic development. I think it's important to know that the project's only a little more than half full -- half completed. And that's why the professional design team that sue has spoken about requires someone with urban design experience, someone with real estate experience, someone with commercial experience, and so on. And the neighborhood representatives were in addition to that on the existing system. I'd also like to -- just as a followup to councilmember Renteria's thought, our objective in economic development is to replicate this success throughout the city. This is an exceptional model. It's been very successful. The secretary of hud recognized it last week as the top public-private partnership of its kind in the country. So, I think it's important in this discussion, however you vote, again, the same as sue, we

[10:00:42 AM]

find a way to replicate this in other commercial areas and other neighborhoods in a way that fits into those neighborhoods, but adds the same values to them. We would like to complete it on schedule. >> I really need to add, and I think that sue knew this, but, aisd is in active conversations with catellus and the community, everybody would like to have an aisd school. They don't have the money to do it right now, but they're trying

everything they can to talk about that and to deliver it. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you, Ms. Houston. >> Houston: Thank you so much. I brought that up because that's going to be one of those issues, based on the demographics of Mueller as it sits now, and the surrounding areas where there are schools that are under-enrolled. So that's why I mentioned that upfront. But I want to say over the years -- ten years now that Mueller has been? About ten. The neighborhood views it as a contact team -- views the commission as a contact team, because over those ten years, we've had some bumps in the road about things like use of -- when Bartholomew park was closed, about using the swimming pool. There have been some little touchy things that have happened, but we go to them, to the advisory commission as a contact team, not as the implementation team. They've kind of functioned in that way over the ten years for the neighborhood. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Anything else on this item? Ms. Tovo. >> Tovo: I fear I may have confused things a little bit earlier when I was making analogies, so I'll just clarify. Thank you for making it really clear there is a neighborhood association that functions like a neighborhood association would at Mueller. And this is -- I think it's just worth saying, this is a different animal. It is not a neighborhood planning contact team. It will become one, I guess.

[10:02:43 AM]

I would just review the resolution in 2020, or when the master agreement . . . When the master development agreement is terminated -- expires or is terminated. So, you know, there are several differences. You wouldn't have a neighborhood planning contact team that reports to council as this one does that forwards recommendations, or a team that has residents outside of the area as this one does. It's just a different animal. The point I was trying to make is like we've adopted a philosophy at the city that planning efforts are on a local scale are well-done by people who live or are immediately impacted by those plans, and that's really the analogy I was trying to make here. But it's just not quite -- it's really not one or the other. If it's like anything, it's like a neighborhood planning contact team in that they are the guardians of that plan in the same way a neighborhood planning contact team is for a neighborhood plan. And though a neighborhood planning contact team will make recommendations to council, it's not an official -- it's not quite the same kind of commission. So. Anyway, I hope that the discussion has answered some of the questions about the spent the intent here, and hopefully some of the concerns. >> Mayor Adler: Any remaining concerns -- it's kind of serving as a contact team, then -- and it's going to turn into a contact team, should it have the same kind of membership the contact teams have? I would assume there's a policy reason why a contact team includes people in addition to those that are just in the neighborhood. And should we be moving away from that policy, should we be changing the nature of contact teams? Or if that's a good policy and this is going to head into a contact team, should we also

[10:04:43 AM]

allow for the kind of broader membership that's on a contact team to be part of this? >> Tovo: Well, I guess that's maybe a longer conversation about the nature of planning contact teams, but, again, one important difference about this is that a neighborhood planning contact team would not include representatives from ridgetop, skyview, it would include just representatives from Mueller. So, in some ways, it would be much more narrowly focused in membership. It would have the nonresident

property owners who have the ability to participate, but the other neighborhoods you see represented here would not have a voice in that process. And as councilmember Houston articulated, right now what is -- especially in this development phase -- there's a tremendous impact on those surrounding neighbors. They would no longer really have a voice in that conversation -- an official voice in that planning process. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. Anything else on this item? We'll then move -- thank you very much. We'll move to item number 26. I pulled this, and so did councilmember troxclair. I pulled this in part -- you know, I had concerns about the -- what's going to happen on mopac, and I think that we have city concerns that are separate and different from the ctrma concerns. Or different priorities, or different focuses. I'm concerned about its impact on our parkland, its impact on Cesar Chavez, and I think that at the same time, I have both a city interest, as well as a regional interest in ensuring that we have transit lanes, because I think we're never going to get out in front -- in a meaningful way, of the

[10:06:46 AM]

congestion issue that we have in the city until we start providing alternatives to cars on roads. And the thought of having buses going 45 miles an hour in a dedicated lane past cars that are stopped in traffic, I think will get some people to get out of their cars and to get into buses. And we need some measure of control to ensure that those buses are always going 45 miles an hour, and they're not stopped in lanes. And I see that the tolls as a vehicle to ensure the free, uninterrupted, and speedy passage of those buses, without which we're not going to get people to do that. And something that encourages people to carpool, or encourages people to drive in those lanes at other than peak hours, I think is also a good policy. So, I support, generally speaking, the concept of what's happening. I have concerns about the designs. When these initial designs for the four lanes were presented, it raised a lot of red flags. And I went to the people on campo and on ctrma and I said, you can't approve that design, because you haven't seen what the alternate designs are. And I understand that our transportation folks have come up with alternate designs that meet some of the concerns. So, my drumbeat to folks that might have otherwise just said, "We know what we're doing," has been you can't do that until you see the other designs. You can't pick until you've seen the other designs. My concern with this resolution that's coming forward is I don't know how to go to the same people and say, I asked you not to pick until you saw all the designs, but I'm picking now before I see all the designs.

[10:08:47 AM]

I just think that I would lose credibility with the folks that we went to and said, you need to look at different designs for this. And they have now engaged and kept open the period of time for them to be able to do that, which I think was, in part, response to the delegation from this council to them, as well as the county delegation to them to do that. And now they've done that, and I hope that -- and expect that those engineers will engage in good faith in sitting down with city staff and going through those designs. But until I see those designs, I don't know whether they're four lanes, or three lanes, or two lanes, or one lane. Or whether there's a different number of lanes in different sections depending on how you route things. And so I'm just uncomfortable with the whereas clause that chooses an option after I have just spent time lobbying other folks not to choose an option until they've seen the plans. The first two whereas clauses, I

don't have any problem with, because I like the idea of our city staff having an independent look and giving us independent advice, because I think we do have municipal concerns. And we want that. The second one, I'm in favor of that recommendation and that work. I would like to have staff comment to us on the timing associated with that. There's a June date, just to make sure. I think the ctrma had a longer period of time for their review. But it's the third one where I have some concern. Ms. Troxclair, you also pulled this. Did you want to say something? >> Troxclair: Sure. I appreciate your comments, and

[10:10:49 AM]

agree wholeheartedly with them, seeing as this project is almost entirely within my district. I just wanted to speak up and say, from the perspective of people who live in southwest Austin who have felt very overlooked when it comes to transportation infrastructure, transportation options, bus service, ways for them to get to and from their homes, I have real concerns about taking any options off the table before we have all of the information. You know, from what I understand from campo and ctrma, this is an environmental study. So we're just allowing them to study the issue and to come back with more information before making a final decision on how to proceed. And like I said, I think that in the -- with the transportation problems that we have in the city, and especially in southwest Austin, we need all the options and information that we can get, and I think we need to -- they need help as soon as possible, so I want to keep the process moving. But I can't support making a decision that I feel like is premature that would take an option off the table. So, that's my thoughts. >> Mayor Adler: Tovo. >> Tovo: It looks like our staff has comments they may want to make, but I just want to be clear that while ctrma has responded to the community concerns and removed the double-decker option from the 2035 plan and extended the comment period, they haven't done so for 2040 as far as I'm aware. Maybe staff can speak to that. But I'm very appreciative that they did respond to you and others in the community who raised concerns -- hundreds of people, as most of you know,

[10:12:50 AM]

because we were all there together at the town hall meeting. Hundreds of people raised concerns about the impact of the double-decker toll lane, the impact that it would have both on Cesar Chavez, and the immediate vicinity of Austin high school which is in my district, zilker park which touches several of our districts and that whole area. And so, again, I'm very appreciative that they responded and removed it from consideration in the 2035 plan. It is still in the 2040 plan. And so this resolution is intended to give a strong signal that pending some information about alternatives, we can't support having that included in 2040. It's my understanding that the campo policy board is going to make a decision on that here within the next week or so, and so I think it is -- and, you know, we can look at the language again, but it would be my urging that we need to send a strong message saying "Many members in our community have very strong concerns about this being part of the 2040 plan," for the same reasons you removed it from 2035, we'd like you to remove it from 2040, as well. It doesn't seem to have stopped the consideration of that as an option. Not having it in 2035 hasn't kept the various parties involved from studying that as a particular option or alternative. But, anyway, that's part of the rationale. I watched a lot of the ctrma discussion where they talked about the environmental study and whether it could or couldn't be studied.

It seems to me the reality is, it's being studied as an option even if it's not in 2035, and same could be true for 2040. >> Mayor Adler: What's the practical, legal effect of having the plan with respect to ultimately gets built? >> Mr. Mayor, Robert Spillar, I know there's also staff here

[10:14:50 AM]

from CTRMA that might be able to provide other information. My understanding is that for a project to be funded for construction, that it needs to be consistent with the regional plan, especially where that is on a major roadway that has received federal funding in the past, or federal money is going to be spent. It needs to be consistent at the time a decision is made, which is typically somewhere during the environmental process, a formal addition is made by the region that a project's going to have a certain definition. At that time, my understanding is that it needs to be consistent with the regional plan. Obviously, there's two ways for a project to be consistent with the regional plan. Either the regional plan is adjusted to match the definition of the alternative or proposed project, or the project is modified to be consistent with the existing plan. The Campo Regional Plan can be amended. In fact, we know that there's a regular amendment process to the plan. And, in fact, in casual conversations with the executive director we know that the current plan, the 2040 as proposed, once it's passed will immediately begin its first amendment process. And so amendments are typically done one to two times a year on a regular basis, just as a matter of business as definitions of projects or whatever change, or new projects come up of regional significance. You asked another question, or I'll stop there if you want to ask a clarifying question. >> Mayor Adler: We'll come back in just a second. I'm trying to find out what's really important and what's not as important. I think it's important to send a message, because this community, I think, is really concerned about its parks. I think this community is really concerned about what happens on Cesar Chavez. This community is really

[10:16:52 AM]

concerned about what happens with the high school. So, we have real concerns. We have both practical concerns, logistic concerns, we have aesthetic concerns, we have value concerns. And I'm trying to figure out where, strategically, to make my fights and my stands with respect to all of those issues. But I hear you talk, and it almost sounds like it doesn't make any difference whether it's in this 2040 plan or not in this 2040 plan at this point, because the environmental study will still move forward. The designs are still going to be considered. And that the ultimate decision, the one where it is really important, is something that happens after that process happens. >> Well, again, Mr. Mayor, my understanding is that when the region makes a formal decision, that is the point where it has to be consistent with the regional plan in order to receive approval. I am sure that it would be more comfortable for federal highway administration, as well as the NPO to be consistent as early as possible and have a, you know, envelope that is defined in terms of a project that you're looking at that size and everything smaller in terms of capacity. But, again, my understanding -- and I think this should be something that we can flesh out between now and Thursday to just verify that the, you know, legalities -- verify my understanding. My understanding is that the time that the project is adopted, if you will, is when it needs to be consistent. >> Mayor Adler: If we have it in the 2040 plan, you said envelope that would allow

consideration of that and

[10:18:52 AM]

anything smaller. >> Mmhhh. >> Mayor Adler: Are we still in place to be able to advocate for two lanes if that's necessary to save our parks, or Cesar Chavez, or a school, or to preserve our values? >> That is the discussion that I've heard. Just because it's defined as one thing, you can certainly look at something smaller. But I would suggest that the opposite would also be true, that you could come back. At some point, you would need to change the definition of the regional plan to match what you're actually building. >> Mayor Adler: Right. >> It would seem to me. >> Mayor Adler: That gets me back to the other question, if it's smaller to big, I'm trying to figure out, at which point we fall on our swords. At which point we actually make this the contested issue. >> Right. >> Mayor Adler: And I'll feel better able to do that once I've seen the plans and they've seen the plans, and we have plans to go off of. Ms. Troxclair. >> Troxclair: Since we have staff from ctrma here, it may be helpful to hear directly from them. >> Mr. Mayor, if I can. So the question that's on the campo board agenda for Monday is adoption of the 2040 plan. So, the difference between the 2035 plan and the 2040 plan, the issues related to the high school, the ramp that comes from the south and over Cesar Chavez, that's in the 2035 plan. So, the incremental change from 2035 to 2040 is having a second lane in the south region, and connecting the south managed lanes to the north managed lanes. So that's really the incremental change that's being -- in the plan right now between 2035 and 2040. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Good morning.

[10:20:54 AM]

>> Good morning, Mario, with me is Sean, an engineering manager. I apologize for looking so perplexed, but in my world, red does not mean go. [Laughing] >> Not sure if I'm supposed to speak into it or not. But, what Rob said is correct in terms of how we place the project itself into the 2040 plan. I do know, though, that if we place four lanes or two lanes in each direction in the 2040 plan for the mopac south project, we do not necessarily need to construct two lanes in each direction. It does give us that flexibility as you were saying earlier in terms of -- we can always do an interim or phase build, so that as growth continues and there's demand, we can do that later. Of course that is something that's being developed as part of the study. I don't want to mislead you and tell you that's what we're going to do -- looking to do, because obviously we have determined in many cases, like in our previous projects, that seems the ultimate build is the best way to move forward with the project, if anything, because of cost. Costs are known today. They may be higher or lower, but in most cases, the value of the construction dollar is going to be better today than 10-20 years, similar to what we saw in mopac north of the river. I live 45th and mopac. My neighbors that bought their homes 50 years ago said we overbuilt mopac, or at least I thought. Today they won't even get on it because of the congestion. It's just one of those things about how we construct our roadways, do we want to construct for the next 5-10 years, or the next 30-40 years. >> Mayor Adler: How open will they be to looking at the alternative plans or designs as proposed by the city of Austin and Travis county? >> It is our responsibility and our obligation to be open to all citizen community input on our

[10:22:56 AM]

projects. I want to clarify something. There has been a lot of discussion about the elevated structure that was proposed to be built over town lake. Many people think if you do two lanes in each direction, that's the driver that forces us to build that elevated structure. That is not correct. The elevated structure is an entrance and exit out of downtown. As you all know, there's 130,000 commuters on any workday that use that section of mopac, south of the river. Approximately half of those come into downtown. Just coming to downtown this morning, everyone knows the going joke in the city is our official bird should be the construction crane. There's no doubt there's more residential going up downtown and more commercial buildings, which means there's going to be more workers, more demand for people to come into downtown. Basically, our two avenues for coming downtown, Cesar Chavez and 5th street, or shoot north going to inville road and that route, going into the state complex. My point with the elevated structure, it's a way in and out of downtown. If we were to construct one lane in each direction, we would still be looking for answers to get people seamlessly in and out of downtown. That doesn't change the need for some type of connection into downtown. Having said that, we are open to looking -- and we're currently studying other options for getting those commuters out of the express lanes and into downtown, outside of the elevated structure in and out of downtown. That is some options we're looking at. One option would be tougher for some commuters to swallow, to be to open up the express lane heading south pretty much near 360 or Barton creek mall to let those folks weave over three lanes so they can be in the right non-tow lane to come to

[10:24:57 AM]

downtown just as they do today. It's easier for you and I to do in our vehicle. It's going to be tougher for buss to make that we've over. That's why it's important that we continue to develop options, that we continue to develop concepts for getting that traffic out of the express lane and into our downtown area. I don't mean to be long-winded, but, one of the other things we're doing, because of the concerns we hear about traffic flow on to Cesar Chavez, which is a serious concern, we engaged the university of Texas center for transportation research center to look at how the impact of that traffic is going to impact Cesar Chavez and the downtown grid. We've invited the city of Austin and Travis county to participate with us in that study, and we just heard yesterday, we were very pleased to hear the city as agreed to partner with us. We have not heard back from the county at this point. It's just a little bit of the things that we're doing to try to develop the project, and try to do everything to try to work outside of what some people see as a silo. We realize it's going to be a community effort and really, a regional government effort to get this project achieved. >> Mayor Adler: For what it's worth, and then I'll pass it, this concern about this design that's been presented has galvanized this city in ways that a transportation traffic issue has not in a while. This is an important concern that we have. And my hope and trust is that you will work really hard and be able to find a solution that obviates some of these concerns. They're real, significant, and widely held. >> I agree with you, mayor. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Garza. >> Garza: I just wanted to give my perspective as someone who was at the last campo meeting, and also a suggestion for the wording that maybe you -- the mayor would be more on board with. I think a lot of the heartburn from people who were at the

[10:26:57 AM]

campo meeting, the Austin representatives at least, the conversation in my opinion really seemed to be it was a foregone conclusion, this double decker was happening and that's where we're headed. We asked a lot of questions about, you know, the explanation that was given there was we kind of have to put the biggest plan out there, and then we can whittle it down, you know, after these studies are done. And -- but I didn't -- neither of us felt really good about the responses that were given from the campo staff. And so, that's just a little perspective of how the last meeting that I went to. And if these studies were already happening, they don't have to be in the 2040 plan. The environmental studies -- my understanding is they're going on now, they're doing them now. You just -- there are studies being done now that are pursuing other options. So all those other studies are being done now, and we haven't even approved the 2040 plan yet. So I -- so my suggestion on the wording may be to make it less -- that we're, you know, picking a side here would be maybe be the last be it re resolved. The city of Austin requests that the expansion of mopac south from one managed lane in each direction to two managed lanes in each direction be removed from the plan pending the results of the studies. So, take out the formally opposes the expansion to mopac south. I don't know if that gets to, maybe, your concerns, mayor. But I mean, the conversation at campo seemed like it was a foregone conclusion. A lot of people that spoke in favor of keeping it in the 20 ho 2040

[10:28:58 AM]

plan, that's the point they seemed to be making. We need this, and it's going in there. That's just my perspective. >> Mayor Adler: That may very well be. Let me work with you all and see if there's something that enables me to go back without violating what I had said to the people in urging them to keep open. Ms. Pool. >> Pool: There's been some conversation about the effects on the school, Austin high school, zilker park, rolling wood. I've had conversations with the mayor of rolling wood. They're adamantly opposed to the four lanes, the impact it will have on their neighborhood. Sunset valley mayor was at the rally on Saturday, sunset valley is also opposed. Last night I went to a trustee's meeting for aid. This item was on the agenda. And the trustees directed superintendent Cruz to submit a letter of support to us. We'll receive it on Thursday, in support of the council resolution. They're expressing their concerns about safety, noise, and environmental and traffic impacts of the proposed double decker on Austin high campus. They are deeply concerned about that, not only about the double decking, but also the Pressler extension, which very little information has penetrated into the community. I'm well aware of it, and have been for some time because of where it comes down and affects the Lamar beach master plan. But in talking with people in the community, there's not the level of knowledge about those effects. And I think it may be too late on Pressler, but it would be really good to get better information out to everybody on that. And so, aisd has created a working group with the school district, city of Austin,

[10:30:58 AM]

txdot, the rma, the old west Austin neighborhood association, and others to address ongoing traffic impact concerns related to the Pressler extension. I agree with what mayor pro tem tovo has said about sending a strong signal. We're the voice of the

community here, and I've been to a number of rallies, the town hall March 31st, Saturday may 2nd, it was really well-attended. It's our job to be the voice for the people who are most directly affected, both positively and negatively. And what I was going to urge was some specific notice in the resolution. We have a whereas that is the second one on the second page that points to a resolution that was done on may 15 of 2014 where council had requested a comprehensive study of financial, transportation, and environmental impacts along with a study of transportation alternatives to the proposed expansions and improvements from the southern terminus of mopac to Cesar Chavez before taking further steps to build sh45 southwest or expand south mopac. And then the third whereas on that page says this study has not yet been conducted and should be coordinated among the relevant entities. But I've heard that this is ongoing, so I just have a question for staff. Is this happening? Is this accurate, or has it not yet started? And this would be the comprehensive study of financial, transportation, and environmental impacts that council requested be done just about a year ago.

[10:32:59 AM]

>> Director of transportation. We -- so, Austin transportation has not undertaken that study because it was our view that ctrma is obligated, as the proponent or proposer of the project, to do that study. That, in a sense, is the environmental study and design study that they are involved in. So, given that they are the proponents or proposers of the project, it's really their responsibility, we thought. And so that's how we thought we were addressing that request from council, is to participate in that environmental and design study that ctrma is certainly locked into right now. >> Pool: Was council aware of that is the the time this resolution was passed? Maybe mayor pro tem can offer. >> Tovo: I'm sorry, I kind of missed your question. >> Pool: Mr. Spillar said the reason the resolution passed a year ago to do the financial comprehensive study wasn't undertaken by our transportation department was because the rma would be handling that. I asked if council was aware of that at the time. >> Tovo: We did get some reports back from staff about alternatives, but, you know, I certainly can't speak for others. But I guess I would concur that what we were trying to do was send a signal to the lead entities that we believed these should be studies together. They were creating -- they would create a loop, and they should -- and they deserve a comprehensive study of impacts, and should be done. And so that was . . . >> Pool: Great, thank you. >> Tovo: We can ask our staff in the resolution to provide us with their thoughts about alternatives, I know you have suggestions. I do agree ctrma has the responsibility of providing our region with a comprehensive study of the impacts of that system of routes that, in the end, creates a loop.

[10:35:00 AM]

>> Yes, mayor pro tem -- >> Pool: I have a follow-on question to that. Currently, the drawings that I see for the double decking and the Pressler extension stop at Cesar Chavez. We don't see any plans for how that road will handle the incoming traffic that will be in the larger Numbers exiting onto Cesar Chavez. And the first stoplight, I think, is right past Austin high and right before the bridge at Lamar. My question, then, goes to the rma. Are your plans at all embracing the fact that there will be increased traffic coming eastbound, parallel to the river? And if they are, to what extent? And if they are not, Mr. Durham, Mr. Spillar, can we request that the Austin transportation department pick up this piece? >> As part of the study, councilmember, that is one of the issues

we're looking at to see what it will be, the increase of traffic into downtown. We're not sure at this point whether it's actually going to be a significant increase of traffic or whether it's the timing of how that traffic that currently comes into downtown today will get into downtown quicker, because of the option to be able to get into downtown via the express lanes. That is part of the study we're conducting. >> Pool: I'm confused by your saying you're not sure if it's the number of cars, or there won't be a number of cars. The reason for making the expanded lanes is because you expect a large number of cars coming downtown. >> Not because of an expectation, but to provide reliable travel time to the vehicles on the roadway today they don't have currently. >> Pool: Can you guarantee the reliable time? >> That's why we do variable holding on the express lanes. The more cars on the lanes, the higher the price, the lower number of cars, lower price.

[10:37:04 AM]

It's a tool to make sure we have reliable travel times. >> Pool: I understand. The people who can afford the higher tolls will zip along the double deck and come downtown more quickly. And the people who cannot will have no change to their expected transportation timeframe, because they will still be in the large number of cars that are currently on these roads, is that correct? >> I think that what we have found is that it's not so much who can afford and who can't, but how much people value their time. If someone is trying to get out of downtown to get to daycare because they weren't able to get there at 5:30 and after 5:30 pay a higher price, they may determine it's better for me to take that connection into downtown, or take the express lanes in general so they can reach their destination. Whether it be childcare or going to the school play, soccer game, church activity, whatever the case may be. We found in various studies throughout the country, it isn't necessarily those that have more that are able to use these lanes. >> Pool: How much is the variable rate on the lanes? >> On mopac north, the traffic and revenue study shows it will be somewhere between \$4 at peak periods. And nonpeak periods, it's 25 cents per zone. So yeah. Anybody, again, it's going to depend day in, day out. Some days, Monday appears to be, of course, a lower traffic usage on mopac, at least for me on my commute home. Thursday seems to be the highest. Prices will be regulated based on the usage of the express lanes. >> Pool: I just complete my remarks by saying that it's in the plan, which is usually what we hear from campo and the rma, that building a road -- we're going to build it, it's in the plan. And I've never seen a situation where "It's in the plan" has ended up where we've gone

[10:39:06 AM]

smaller. We've always pushed up to the very limit of what is in the plan, so I would respectfully disagree with the concept that it's important to have the four-lane conversation so that we can somehow whittle it down to two. Because in my experience, if it's in the plan, it will be built. And I just want to, one more time, say that the school district is highly concerned about what is happening here. They have a direct -- they have direct responsibility for the health and safety of the students. They have buses, kids on bikes and student drivers who will be exiting onto the eastbound Cesar Chavez, which is a terrifically -- that will be a choke point, and the safety concerns there are elevated. And the fact that Pressler is also coming down into that same area just exacerbates that situation. And so, I will wait to see what happens on Thursday,

but I am highly supportive of this resolution, and will continue to be so. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar. Your light isn't on. >> Yes, it's Robert Spillar. If I could make one clarification just to make sure, for transparency that the Pressler project is a city of Austin local connection to Cesar Chavez via Pressler, obviously. It is separate from the proposed ctrma, but they are in the same general location. The school district, or members of the school board, have helped articulate concerns that the principal, as well as some of the parents have had about that connection. We are actively working with the school district. We've done a significant traffic

[10:41:07 AM]

study that we want to share with ctrma, because I think it helps us better understand the -- what happens on mopac. But we have committed to work with the school board to work through their issues on that. And so, although councilmember pool, you did mention there is controversy, there is ongoing work to resolve that controversy, and we would hope that we could do the same thing on mopac working with ctrma to resolve some of the concerns that the school district has. The other thing you brought up was the previous study, and mayor pro tem, thank you for reminding us. We came back and reported with the information we had. We were not able to do a comprehensive study, but we certainly analyzed the information provided by txdot, mostly coming out of the 45 southwest and the two interchange proposals at slaughter and at lacrosse, and we did provide that information. But in terms of a comprehensive environmental revenue study of the system, and/or of mopac, I believe we said that was the responsibility of the proposer at the time to council. So, I think . . . Just to clarify the answer, what we did and didn't do. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Tovo. >> Tovo: I had just a couple quick points/questions. My first one is that, I think I may have heard you say -- this is an aside, but I think I heard you say that people might be getting into downtown to pick up their children from childcare, or vice versa? >> Vice versa. >> Tovo: I was going to say, I wish we had a situation with lots of daycare options downtown. That's been a longtime priority, and we desperately need it. >> Unfortunately, they're leaving downtown -- >> Tovo: To get their children. >> That's correct. >> Tovo: Since you are here, it would be terrific to have that requested comprehensive study that councilmember pool

[10:43:08 AM]

referenced that we've just been discussing on the environmental transportation impacts of all of the pieces of that loop. But just -- you know, we could get down in the weeds. I've got about 40 pages of information and questions that people have forwarded and researched and whatnot. We could probably be here all day. I just want to make a general point. If it is in the plan, it's my understanding there would not need to be a vote of campo to build a two-lane double-decker highway. And that's the fundamental difference and the rationale behind the resolution. We would like for that not to be in the 2040 plan. And if in the array of alternatives, if that is proposed, then there would be -- continue to be a full discussion and a vote at that point. If it's in the plan, that gets voted in on Monday, then there is not a need, as I understand it, for further action for that double-decker toll lane to be built. And so, I guess I would continue to urge that we provide a recommendation from this council that indicates we would like to continue to see studies and alternatives, or if staff has some ideas before that piece gets contained within a plan. Given the huge amount of community concerns. >>

Mayor Adler: Mr. Renteria. >> Renteria: I agree with you, mayor. I'm not going to be able to support this the way it's written. I don't think that we're responsible for -- should be responsible for conducting any kind of studies and paying for any studies on this. It's -- I know that, you know, there's a lot of concerns about this flyover, you know.

[10:45:08 AM]

But I also -- we constantly talk about, you know, transportation and having vehicles move. I live here in the downtown area. I live in the bowl, they call it the bowl here. And this is where all the dirty air hangs out. You know, I even suffer sometimes. I have to take sinus pills every night, because the air is so nasty and dirty here in downtown. And, you know, every time we hear about building highways, we have fought it for years and years and years. I mean, I remember even in the '80s and late '70s, '80s, we told tdot that we didn't want the highways here. We didn't want the roads. Take the money somewhere else. And, you know, we're paying the price now for doing those things. And the future generation is going to pay the price if we don't do something with our transportation, you know, moving vehicles out of downtown. Because, you know, I feel like, you know, I'm -- my quality of life is being affected by having all these vehicles stuck on 35 and mopac here downtown. You know, and they leave all their pollution behind while they go back into their suburbs with their clean air. So, you know, I have a lot of concerns about, you know, how we look at things, especially for my point of view. And I guess I have a little prejudice because I live downtown. And I get to enjoy all the beauty, but I also get to the wonderful things that we have here downtown, but I also have to live with all the dirty air that we have here. So I am -- I have a lot of concern about this. And the way it's written, I'm not going to be able to support it. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Zimmerman. >> Zimmerman: I concur with

[10:47:11 AM]

councilmember Renteria. He summed up my thoughts about as well as I could. I'll join that effort and oppose the section that says the city of Austin formally opposes the proposed expansion. Again, I concur with councilmember Renteria. We are suffering now from decisions that were made 30 years ago to push back against funding to hope, believe, and wish that Austin could remain a little quiet university town. It just hasn't happened. And we're paying the price. I don't like any of the options on the table in front of us, but we can't go back in history 30 years ago and change things. So we've been dealt a very bad hand right now and our options are not good. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Spillar, what about the June 2015 day? Does that work? >> Yes, Mr. Mayor, that's the other question I wanted to come back to. If the expectation of council is to simply put before you a set of alternatives, both that are publicly being discussed, as well as ones that we might be able to report to you back after we talk to ctrma, I think we can achieve that. I think that's probably an appropriate level of report back at this point, since, you know, we're told we're really at the alternative stage getting ready to launch the next detail. If the expectation is a detailed analysis, I can't do that. But my perception was it was the first. >> Tovo: It definitely was the first. Just to clarify a concern that was -- that did arise, we're not asking you to contract with anybody and do any kind of analysis, or study. We know that you've been looking looking at alternatives, and we're looking for the relatively brief report back. The more comprehensive financial study of the pieces that add up to a loop was really directed at

[10:49:12 AM]

our planning authority. Since I have the mic, I just want to say one other thing. On Thursday I will be asking the council to consider making this a time certain for 4:00. And so just a signal to the public I'll be making that request, and I hope it's approved. We have a large number of people who want some sense of when this will come up on the agenda. I'm sorry, one other thing. If there are concerns about that, it would be great to air them so we can let people know that may not be the expectation. I just wanted to say, since there are five sponsors on this resolution, I appreciate any wording suggestions. Those are really welcome, but they would need to happen here or on the message board. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Garza, then Ms. Troxclair. >> Garza: In response to councilmember Renteria and Zimmerman, it's not my intent as a sponsor for us to not build anything. It was just not to make this what seemed like the conversation was at campo was this was what the plan was going to be. And so that's certainly not the intent, to go forward saying we don't want anything. I agree that we need some kind of solutions. And as I stated before, those alternatives are currently being looked at now. We're looking at alternatives, and environmental study is being done already without it being in the 2040 plan. And I don't think we're using any city money to look at the alternatives. So, none of this is coming out of the city's budget. We're looking at alternatives. I just think the purpose of this is to say, we don't want this to be the only option. So, just wanted to make that clear. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Troxclair, and then Ms. Houston. >> Troxclair: I guess I was thrown off by your last comment, because that's my whole perspective, is that I don't want there to be only one option in front of us. And I feel like allowing you to

[10:51:12 AM]

continue to study all of the options that are available will provide us with the most opportunity to make an informed decision. I was hoping you could speak to the issue of, does removing this from the 2040 plan hinder your ability to proceed with exploring the option of having four lanes? >> This is Sean Biel, engineering manager for the mobility authority. If the 2040 plan were to be amended to list just one lane in each direction for the mopac south project, there would be some analysis that we would have to do as we get the new traffic figures that would reflect that one-lane configuration. Basically, as we go and endeavor to do the environmental study, we have to take a certain amount of the traffic counts from campo. And so to make this exchange change would have an impact on the schedule and costs associated with our study. >> Troxclair: Okay, thank you. Thank you for clarifying that. Including this in the 2040 plan would allow you to fully study all of the options and have the information that you need, that campo and ctrma would need going forward? >> That is correct, because the model runs are going to be based on the new campo 2040 model information, and not the 2035 plan. >> Troxclair: Okay. Yep. Thank you. And like I said before, you know, I'm not really prepared to advocate one way or the other, because I feel like we don't -- it's too premature. We don't have the information that we need. And we're hearing consistently from both the city and ctrma that we're in the beginning stages, that you're continuing to study, that you're continuing to work together, that you're continuing to develop design options, that you're continuing to make sure that public input

[10:53:14 AM]

is taken into account by extending the public input period. And so, I appreciate all of the work that you've been doing, and I appreciate your willingness and your intent on also allowing the city to have a say in the pieces of the project that are going to most directly impact Cesar Chavez and other main downtown arteries. And I guess . . . Yeah. You know, the mayor mentioned -- you said this community is very concerned about the environment, safety, schools, very concerned about parks. But they're also very concerned about traffic. The vast majority of the city is very concerned about traffic. And so, I just hope -- I just want to make it clear going forward that, you know, there's been characterization as the community feels this way or that way, and this is, of course, an issue that people have varying degrees of opinions on based on which issue is more important to them, or possibly where they live in proximity to downtown, and how they feel like this project might affect them. But I just want to be really careful of the characterization that the city of Austin, or that the community feels one way, because I can say that I am receiving a wide variety of opinions on this topic, and that's why I'm not prepared to advocate one way or another yet. But I want you to be able to continue to examine all of the options that are potentially available to us. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Ms. Garza. >> Garza: I don't think her question was answered, though. And the question was, if it's not in the 2040 plan, are we still exploring these options? Aren't there currently tests? Aren't there currently -- we're seeking alternatives now, correct? >> Absolutely, that is the case. Based on the feedback we've received, we are looking at various options.

[10:55:15 AM]

As Mario mentioned, there's several different configurations we're looking at right now. And, again, we hope to work with the city of Austin to vet those options, but we are certainly looking at various build configurations for the project. >> Garza: So it in the being in the 2040 plan doesn't affect those studies happening now? >> It would not prohibit us from continuing to look at different options. I apologize if I didn't hit the question correctly. But, there would be a certain amount of rework that we would have to do if it is not adopted as currently proposed. But that would not prohibit us from keeping all options on the table and continuing to look at different configurations for the project. >> Garza: Okay, thank you. >> Mayor. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: Is the difference in that then, if the four lanes, two in each direction, are in 2040 plan, there would not have to be any additional vote or outside of campo or rma in order to build to that size? Size? Is that correct? If it's in 2040, then that is a tacit approval to build to that size? >> That is correct. That would be -- >> Pool: Right. >> Yeah. Red, confusing. [Laughing] >> That is correct. That would be the limit would then be for -- ask your question again? Sorry, I apologize. >> Pool: If a project is in the 2040 plan, if it's approved to be in that, that means all the approvals have been complete. And as the project moves forward, then the determination to build to the larger size, or to the limit of the plan, has already been made by the officials that are on -- that are given that authority. And then the rma and txdot would proceed? >> The approvals as it relates to the campo board, that would be the final approval. But that would not be the final

[10:57:15 AM]

approval, because you have state and federal regulatory or really agencies that review the plan to determine whether they're going to give us a record of decision, whether we need to move forward with the project. And that is based on the environmental document that will be submitted to them for re-sue. >> Pool: I won't express an opinion on that particular portion of it, I just want to focus on the rma and cam. If the smaller project were approved in 2040, one lane in each direction, or two lanes as mayor pro tem mentioned, then that would be the limit there. You can still -- and, in fact, are still looking at all the alternatives, including two lanes in each direction for four lanes. But in order to move to the larger project, you would have to secure the approval of the officials that are on the campo board, is that correct? >> That is correct. It would come back in the form of an amendment to the campo board. >> Pool: That's what I wanted to make really clear. That is what the community is asking for all throughout. I think that the signal is that Austin residents and the people who commute through Austin want an intentional, deliberative process. They want to follow it carefully from now until when the various studies have been complete. Look at the alternatives that are offered and follow it very carefully so that they know when the tipping point comes in order to make it smaller or larger. And to have an affirmative vote to include the larger project in the 2040 plan would be something that is an asset and a benefit to the community as far as their understanding of how this project is proceeding. >> Councilmember, that's what we want as well. We want that deliberative process with the community, whether it be a two lane or four-lane facility. >> Pool: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: If there is nothing further on this there were two items that Ms. Houston

[10:59:16 AM]

pulled today. Item number 8 and number 12. Thank you very much, gentlemen, thank you. Item number 8 and 12, 8 relates to the recommends not to remain Austin tennis center. Rename Austin tennis center. But the recommendation considering rename was not to rename. >> Houston: So my broader policy issue is is there a way to help parks and recreation come up with a more collaborative way of coming up with these names? I'm not sure what their process is, but this is in district 1. The first time I heard about this is when it and on the consent agenda and people in the community get really crazy will stuff that appears on the consent agenda and they have no input and no deliberation. So I don't know what their policy is and so I'll just -- I just brought that up to say that maybe we need to have a clear policy of how that goes through a process to make sure that when you're going to change your name or recommend name changes that people have an opportunity to provide input. >> Mayor Adler: What is the process now? >> Mayor and city council, Burt Lumbrellas, assistant city manager. There is a pretty described process, mayor. There is a 90-day period that is pretty well set in our code that we open it up for any names to be submitted. In this particular case we did actually do that, and there were three submissions. And then it goes to a subcommittee of the parks board. It's the land facilities and programs committee. And in fact, councilmember Houston, they are asking for an opportunity to go back and relook at the overall policy. I think they concur that there is a need to look at what the policy -- what the policy is right now and it comes both

[11:01:16 AM]

with the recommendation from the subcommittee and the overall parks and recreation

board. So there is that recommendation overall to the council to do that. And we would be happy to facilitate that back to -- through one of the committees, possibly open space and others, and come up with a process that eventually get you something that you could consider. >> Mayor Adler: That would be helpful if that came with that recommendation to go ahead and refer it to the open space committee. >> Houston: On Thursday? >> Mayor Adler: The general policy. >> Houston: On Thursday we can refer it. >> Mayor Adler: The general policy question? Did you say there was a recommendation for that that would be coming from the commission? >> In the backup they actually did not make a recommendation. Their recommendation is to be deferred to this process to where they would actually come up with a renaming policy. So they're not making a recommendation on this, but I think what councilmember Houston, if I understand her, is saying on this item, to simply refer to that the open space committee for the bigger policy issue. >> Mayor Adler: We'll go ahead and refer to your committee, but it almost sounds like you may want the commission to make you the recommendation that it sounds like they're wanting to -- we'll leave that to you and your committee. >> Pool: I think the parks board did have some action on that and we did talk about this a couple of council meetings ago where we chose not to take any action. We tabled it and that effectively didn't rename something. So I think we can come up with a specific policy, but for now my understanding is that we won't move forward with my renaming actions until something does come up for our approval. >> Mayor Adler: We'll go ahead and defer that to your committee. That then gets us to last item that's been pulled, item number 12. >> Houston: Yes. And again, since this is my first time here and

[11:03:18 AM]

having this long list of 506 historic properties, I need to understand what does this mean if they receive partial ad valorem taxes and what's the property of the 506 that have been identified. >> Good morning, Steve Sadowsky of the historic preservation office. We go through this every year where historic landmarks are allowed to apply for tax relief for their property taxes and this is to help them maintain their properties. The overall figure I would have to get back to you on that. >> Houston: I think it's important that we know what the cost burden is because all across this city people just got their property appraisals and people are -- my email floods every night about this. So I need to be able to justify that so I need to know what that cost burden is going to be on the other rest of the people that are going to be picking up their half of their ad valorem taxes. So that's one thing. The other thing is that there's a lack of equity in the 506 properties that we list. Most of them are in other parts of the town, very few are east of I-35. And so I just want to point out an equity issue. As well. >> Okay. And actually, councilmember, we are -- >> Mayor Adler: You pushed it off accidentally. >> There we go. We are actively looking for properties in east Austin. In fact, we've listed probably 10 to 12 properties in east Austin in the past two years. So we have folks from the community who come to us and every year we go out and talk to people who own potential landmarks about landmarking their properties as well if they're significant to the history of the community. >> Houston: Okay. It's not just about an individual, is it?

[11:05:22 AM]

Does an historic individual need to live in a property or can the property be significant to the culture of the neighborhood? >> The property can be significant to the culture, it

can be -- have the historical association with a person. That's one of the criteria. It has to maintain its historic appearance, and that's the architectural part of it. And then the historical association is its significance to the community and that can be defined in any number of ways that are set out in the code. >> Houston: Okay. So I guess this is one of those issues that several years ago there was a real rush to get many properties in west Austin zoned historical. The amount of the application fee I think is \$400 to do that. Has it changed? >> The fees have not changed, no, ma'am. >> Houston: So that puts a real burden on people who are in historic neighborhoods who may have historic properties, but they've got to be able to put down \$400 and then hire somebody to help them do the research and the process. So there's a real burden and inability to get properties east of I-35, to get even a partial ad valorem tax break because we've not had -- again, the equity in the system has not been there to help people get those kind of benefits. So I just am pointing that out so that we understand, but before I can vote on this I need to know what the cost burden is going to be for these 506 properties, if we take half of it off the rolls. >> Mayor Adler: How does that work? These are properties that have been previously approved for the tax break. Subject to them complying. And you do your analysis to see whether or not they comply. >> Right. And that's what this is. We're now approving that report. >> Yes, sir. >> Mayor Adler: What if the council wanted to change the policy with respect to -- are these

[11:07:23 AM]

annually renewed, separate and apart from compliance? >> These are landmarks and we send out the process, the instructions. If the property owner doesn't return that application and file the affidavit with us stating that the property is in need of tax relief to encourage its preservation, then they're not on the list. And then we inspect the property every year to make sure it's complying with our standards. >> Mayor Adler: Can you send us a note that lets us know what the cost is of that property? >> Definitely. >> Sue Edwards, assistant city manager. We can also send you maybe a one pager on the program itself. It's always had a lot of discussion. One of the other things that keeps people from applying is that there are standards of which they have to upkeep their houses and they're inspected on a yearly base, so there are certain requirements that will require additional cost if your house is historical. So we'll send you a one page update on what we're doing. >> Mayor Adler: That would be helpful. >> Houston: Mayor, if I'm not mistaken, there have been times when people have not kept up their houses and they still got the tax exemption. So if we're doing a better job now, I thank you for that, but I am aware of many houses that did not get it and did not keep their properties up and they still got the tax break. >> I think the last discussion we had was a couple of years ago where we made some -- major changes to the program itself. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Zimmerman. >> Zimmerman: It seems like, Ms. Edwards, on item 12 on my note here, the fiscal note is conspicuously blank on the fiscal note. So I think the way to fix that would simply be

[11:09:24 AM]

to go through the appraisal rolls, look at what the reduction is, just do some relatively simple math and you could come up with a number of how much tax revenue is being - is being lost here or how much is being awarded to the property owner. It doesn't seem like that's a complex calculation to make. >> Councilmember, I think we have that information anyway. >> Zimmerman: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Tovo. >>

Tovo: Councilmember Houston raised several points that have come up in the past and I wonder if at some point you could provide us some information about how the historic preservation office and our partner organizations in the community are addressing that issue because it has been a goal to assure that we are landmarking properties in neighborhoods that haven't -- haven't traditionally had landmarked properties and reducing the barriers to property owners who would be interested in exploring that. So I don't know if you have any information for us now, but I would be interested in -- since this concern has come up in the past, what's been done to address it. >> We can get that for you. And also too if I can just address councilmember Houston's one other point. On a lot of properties if it's an individual property owner that's coming to us and wants to landmark their properties, we actually help them do all the research and write up the reports. So they're not having a higher -- an outside consultant to do that. And also too we can approach the city's landmark commission and ask them to initiate the case and then that saves them the filing fees as well. >> I think this would suffice. Thanks for providing the details. If there are other existing resources people can use in the

[11:11:25 AM]

community, that would be good too. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Renteria and then Ms. Troxclair. >> Renteria: Mine will be real quick. Do y'all have a yearly inspection that you actually go to house and take a look and see because I've seen some of the historic houses on Cesar Chavez that the gutters are all busted and hanging down. And I'm wondering, you know, when you have gutters that are broken or something that some of the woods are hanging, deterioration can happen quickly on these whole houses. I was just wondering. >> We do, councilmember. We go and inspect every landmark every year. And if we see a maintenance issue we contact that property owner right away because our goal is preservation. So if there's a maintenance issue we want the property owner to address that. >> Renteria: Okay. So if we see something then we can just call your office and say, hey, this gutter is falling off and redirecting water somewhere else, into the house arrest something. >> Yes, definitely. >> And councilmember, also sometimes you may see that they are no longer receiving a tax credit. >> Renteria: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ms. Troxclair, did you have anything else? >> Troxclair: What are the time restrictions that we are looking at with this item? >> What's your schedule? >> Our schedule is to get it to aisd and Travis county as soon as possible. We usually try and do it around the first of may. But because we had some scheduling difficulties with the landmark commission we're running a little bit late so that's why it's on Thursday's agenda. >> Troxclair: Because I'm really interested -- I thank you, councilmember Houston, for pulling this. I am really interested to see the information that you requested and considering the budget issues that the city is facing I do think it's an important piece of our puzzle to understand the cost implications. So I'm just wondering if this is a decision that needs to be made on

[11:13:26 AM]

Thursday. >> Yes, it is. >> Troxclair: What would be the implications if it was on the council agenda for the next week? >> I think that that would pose a problem for the school district and Travis county, and the tax bills going out that reflect the exemptions, if they are granted. >> We'll try to get you the information just as soon as possible. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool? >> Pool: Mr. Sadowsky, can you explain where these particular

approvals are in the current process that the city has approved? I think you mentioned previously that they had come to the city with the application and had complied. >> That's correct. And then we take our list after we've completed all the inspections, we take our list of the historic landmark commission and they make the recommendation. That is the list that has been presented to y'all for discussion on Thursday. >> Pool: So the people who are on this list had an expectation that if they were approved by the historic landmark commission that the council would approve it as well, generally speaking? Are there times when the council will perhaps pull off a property or not approve a list? >> That has not happened yet. >> Pool: And that has not happened because the people are complying with the program that has been approved by the council to date? >> That's correct. They're holding up their end of the deal, yes, ma'am. >> Pool: Okay. So they have -- so what I would say is it would be useful to understand how the program works completely, but I would be hesitant to deny the residents this approval considering that they had entered into the program before this council came to be, and that they had moved forward in good faith

[11:15:27 AM]

with the program that had been developed over time and supported by the city. So we need to take that into account. It may be that we want to change some aspects of it, but I would be very hesitant to impose those changes, essentially grandfather in people who had been in at the time and moved successfully to the end. >> We'll be happy to look at that and get that information back to you all. >> Houston: And may I ask a quick question? In the back of your minds, mayor pro tem, the people on this list have in the past gotten a full exemption, is that correct, and recently it just changed to the partial and can you tell me when? >> Actually, the list has always been for a partial. >> Houston: Has it? Okay. Because I remember somewhere in the back of my mind having the conversation about a full exemption. So thank you. >> Yes. It's a misperception, I think, that people who own historic landmarks don't pay any taxes at all. They actually do pay about 66% of their taxes. >> Thanks. >> On average. >> Mr. Sadowsky, but there are two tiers depending on when they entered the program. >> That's correct. >> Tovo: Depending on when you enter you had may get a higher partial exemption than people who entered the program later in part because of the changes the council adopt. >> That's correct. After 2010 any landmark designated after 2010 there's a cap. That's set by the city, the county and the school district. And then any new owner since 2010 of an existing landmark is also subject to that cap. >> Houston: Thank you. Thank you so much.

[11:17:29 AM]

>> Pool: This almost sounds like a tif where the increment is used, is plowed back into the area where the tif is laid upon so that the idea behind the reduction in the property taxes for homes on this list is so that they may use that money in order to keep the home at the level of authenticity that the program requires. Is that correct? >> That's correct. >> Pool: And there's some very specific things that they have to do in order to qualify? >> That's correct. >> Pool: Okay. >> Troxclair: Can I ask a clarification? You said on average the people who qualify for this program pay 66% of their property taxes. Of what their total property tax would be otherwise without an exemption S that of their entire property tax bill including the school and county or is that school and property taxes are both? >> That would be the entire property bill. >> Troxclair: Okay.

And then they're also paying about 66% of what they would owe to the city otherwise?
>> Yes. We work in conjunction with AISD or the school district and Travis county. So this is a three-party process. >> Troxclair: Okay. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: [Inaudible]. Sorry. All right. So we are going to go into closed session to take up one item. Pursuant to section 551.086 of the government code, the city council will discuss the following item: Item 5-3, matters related to large primary and transmission electric customers. Item an H 1 and a-2 have been withdrawn. Any objection to going into executive session on the item announced? Hearing none, the council will go into executive session.

[11:24:51 AM]

>>

[12:12:37 PM]

Minutes. >> Mayor Adler: We are out of closed session. In closed session, we took up a competitive matter in a-3. That's all the matters we're handling in the meeting today. The meeting stands adjourned. Thank you.