

Mobility Committee Meeting Transcript – 10/07/2015

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 10/7/2015 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 10/7/2015

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[3:05:36 PM]

>> Kitchen: Good afternoon. Good afternoon, everyone. We're going to call to order the meeting of the mobility committee at 3:05. So we have a couple of agenda items to go through before we start discussing tncs so I expect we'll get to the tnc conversation probably around 3:30. So the first item is approval of minutes, but the staff is getting those minutes to us and so we're going to move that to the end. So the next is citizens communication and speakers who sign up for citizens communication, that part of the agenda is for communication on items that are not posted on the agenda. So the first speaker -- and the speakers have three minutes. And again, this is to address their concerns for items that are not posted on the agenda. So first is Edward sledge and then David king will be after him. >> Madame chair and committee, my name is Edward sledge and I live in Austin, Texas. We have -- we have ordinance, traffic ordinances that can make the roads safer, make the -- make traffic laws easier to enforce, can have a positive effect on traffic congestion and as a result make public transit work better. And at another result protect the environment.

[3:07:36 PM]

But we have one -- at least one item in our public policy that's allowing people to use their cell phones while they are stopped. This is having a negative effect on all of these and I'm going to have you run one minute of a video that you saw back on September 2nd. It has to do with requireless cars. -- Driverless cars. >> It has that accuracy down to about 10 centimeters. From there you want to know what's around you. Same thing for the self-driving vehicle. In this case this is essentially what the vehicle sees. The purple boxes are other vehicles around it. That red box is a bicyclist and you might see some Orange boxes up at the top. Those are construction cones. Then as a driver you want to know -- >> I want to make clear this is about the presentation where it came to driving in town as opposed to on the highway. On the highway was a lot easier than in town. >> Going to happen with all these things around me. Same thing for the self-driving vehicle. In this case there's a black pickup truck that's in that lane with the construction cones so its highest probability is that black pickup truck is going to change lanes and that's that green line coming out of that truck. Now, you can't just know what one vehicle around you is going to do. You want to know what everything around you is going to do and that's that complexity I talked about. But from there then the vehicle can decide what it's going to do so that green -- >> That's good. Okay. That -- could that automobile have a human mind in it instead of a -- [audio difficulties] Of course it could. You see what the problems will be when people stop and go into Google zone, you know, with their phones. I just hope you all address that issue soon.

[3:09:39 PM]

>> Kitchen: Thank you. Next is David king, and then after David is Sandee nanda. >> Thank you, chair, co-chair and councilmembers. David king, I live in the zilker neighborhood and I'm going to talk about short-term rentals and you might think what does that have to do with mobility. It actually does because the type 2 create additional traffic in the neighborhood especially on a small neighborhood street where it's maxed out with too many occupants and creates parking issues in neighborhoods. If it ever comes to your committee, I hope you will consider that impact. The same is true for type 3 short-term rentals. When we're talking about type 2 there are 472 active and pending commercial short-term rental type 2 licenses in the city right now. And even with a 3% cap over 10,000 of our homes can become the commercial type 2 short-term rentals. And so if we do -- if that does play out, then that will have a significant impact on traffic and parking in our neighborhoods. And as it relates to type 3 short-term rentals, again, there could be several -- there could be up to 10,000 type 3 short-term rentals. And when we talk about our mobility system, our infrastructure that supports our bus systems, the long-term rentals are going to be the people that support the investment, the long-term investment in our bus stops, in our mass transit sim. They are the ones that are going to ride that bus every day. Short-term rentals are not going to do that. I'm not saying we shouldn't have short-term rental-term renters in our city, I'm just saying we have to be careful where we allow those and what impact that might have. If we allow so many units to become short-term rentals, that will have a negative effect on the number of long-term renters that will use our mass transit systems

[3:11:41 PM]

and will help pay for that investment. So I hope that you will consider those comments when you think about our short-term rentals. Thank you very much. >> Kitchen: Thank you. Okay, next is Sandee nanda and our last speaker is Edgar saucito. >> Councilmembers, good afternoon. I'm here to talk to you about eradicating type 3 rentals and the effect that will have on mobility. I would ask that you emphasize enforcement and not eradication. The current resolution is a radical change based on the mistaken assumption that 25% of the housing stock and multi-family units downtown is being removed from the rental market. And that this number is growing. I will show that neither of those things is the case. The radical change if this measure is adopted is that 90% of them would be eliminated. So the number would go from 56 down to 6. By the way, that's even with a one per building minimum which already exists in the current ordinance. That is contrary to the concept that the mayor introduced that only 15% of type 2s should really be negatively impacted by regulation. If there's no options for people downtown, the problem will just go to the -- the problem would be that people will go into the neighborhoods, whereas David mentioned it will cause issues with traffic and parking.

[3:13:42 PM]

This will cause mobility issues because downtown is highly walkable and it's easily accessible by public transportation from the airport. The neighborhoods the only real option is to rent a car or to take cabs or tncs. Either way that means more vehicles on the streets at the busiest times. So tiny changes can have a huge impact. A study by the federal highway administration, the chart on the left shows the volume of cars and their speed and you can see as long as they are on the left-hand side of the pink line which represents a tipping point that everything is fine. On the right-hand side you can see once traffic crosses that line, it causes a traffic jam, so going from point a all the way down to the lower left-hand corner. Downtown is already highly dangerous. This is from a city of Austin study that was published in 2012. It's a heat map of where accidents are occurring. So I would say that walkable options should not be restricted. Again, going back to the resolution, there's not a 25% impact on housing stock and it's not

10,000 units, it's only 56 out of 6400 total units, which is .87%. By the way, there's an additional 3200 units coming online, none of which will likely allow scrs so that number will likely drop to .6%. Zero type 3 licenses applied for in the last ten months. So again, I would ask that you not adopt a radical change which would wipe out 90% of the type 3scrs or middle ground would be set a 3% cap by zone and suspend new licenses. So the last slide just has my

[3:15:43 PM]

sources. [Buzzer sounding] >> Kitchen: You can finish your thought. >> I just wanted to say thank you for your time and I appreciate it. I'm available for any questions. No? >> Zimmerman: I think when we had this discussion before on the strs, most of it was type 2s. Would it be your opinion that -- I haven't heard much on type 3s. Is it maybe because the type 3s are policing themselves is because we haven't had a lot of problem? >> Sure, the first issue is very few buildings allow short-term rentals and the second is they are very tight lie controlled by the hoas or apartment managers. If any problems come up, they are immediately clamped down on. >> Kitchen: Thank you very much. >> Thank you. >> Kitchen: Edgar? And then after him, I was reading my pages wrong. We have another person for citizen communication and that's bill bunch. So go ahead. >> Good afternoon. My name is Edgar and I was born and raised here in Austin. I'm actually currently a student at St. Edwards and the one thing I wanted to talk about was current ordinance for bus regulations. I believe that charter buses Springfield not be regulated by the city and that is because right now we're regulated by the department of motor vehicles and the U.S. Department of transportation. Every two years U.S. Department of transportation does a compliance review and I will say it is much more stringent than what the city of Austin does. Just to start off, with the city of Austin when we are -- when we get our permits, we submit our yearly report. Our yearly dps inspection, but with the U.S. D.o.t. They come and check the buses and make sure those are fixed. Another thing is basically after looking at the implication that you are required to have for the city of Austin for operating authority and U.S. D.o.t., it's pretty much the same thing. The only difference is you need to have a detailed description of proposed service, proposed rate of fare

[3:17:44 PM]

and description of the ground transportation service. That's the only difference. Also another difference is when you apply for your operating authority, dps criminal check, all that check is like we said in our last meeting only Texas. Something to consider is companies like us, we go interstate out of Texas. And someone like you department of transportation checks all that. They check from the last reports everything that happened nationwide. So all I would say is in conclusion either to basically not regulate because I think we're already regulated enough or lower down the rate because \$400 a year per bus just our ten buses that's 4,000 a year. That's a good amount of money. I mean that's enough money to basically hire someone part time to wash a bus and by hiring someone that's basically reducing one person from the people that are out there on 7th street homeless. So thank you for your time. >> Kitchen: Okay, thank you very much. >> If you have any questions. >> Kitchen: We'll follow up if we have any questions. Our last citizen communication speaker is bill bunch. >> Thank you, madame chair. I'm bill bunch, I'm executive director with the save our springs alliance. And I just want to encourage y'all to really take your mission as seriously as you possibly can and show some real leadership and push for some alternatives and innovation that's desperately needed here. I've given you all three exhibits and I want to start big. This first one is two maps. This is straight out of the campo plan. The first one over here with the few red lines, that's what was congested on our roadway network in 2010. The next one with all the additional red congested

[3:19:45 PM]

roadways all over our region, that's what our plan says is going to be congested in 2040 after we spend \$34 billion laying new pavement. This is not a plan. This is a road map to failure. An enormous financial waste. We've got to do something different. Focusing now on our primary concern, the second exhibit I gave you, the 2040 plan. And this first page of it calls for spending, if you look in hays county and Travis county, 1.4 billion with a B, \$1.4 billion to pave the Barton springs watershed in the first five years of the plan. That's what they want to do to us. Almost all of that is toll roads. Mopac, 45 southwest, 290 and 71. Who does that benefit? Y'all care about affordability, but these toll roads are being built for the people who can afford to pay. And they've said 12 to 14 bucks one way during rush hour. And with the variable tolls, they make more money the more messed up all the free lanes are because then people will pay more to get out of that. They are not adding a single bit of capacity for people who aren't paying tolls. This isn't just in the southwest. That's where it's worse. But across the whole region. The plan is overwhelmingly building toll roads for those who have money. These are luxury lanes. Everyone else is being left out. So hurts our environment. It helps nobody.

[3:21:47 PM]

Except for the wealthy. The last exhibit I gave you, one piece that might help us get out of this mess that our folks, friends on campo in other counties who don't share our -- [buzzer sounding] -- Priorities might buy into. This is txdot's own blue ribbon committee highlighted in the bracket and this is my last sentence, they recommended we pay off the tolls on 45 southeast and 130. And redesignate that I-35 so it will function to relieve traffic. That's where we should be spending \$1.5 billion in the next few years, to make 130 work for everybody and to support growth in our preferred growth areas. Thank you. >> Kitchen: Thank you. [Cheers and applause] Okay. I apologize, I do have one last citizen communication, just to get my records straight here and that's Spencer nutting. Mr. Nutting, you understand that this is to speak on things that are not on the agenda so I understand you want to tell us about your personal experience and that's okay. >> Yes, I do. >> >> Kitchen: And you have three minutes. >> Those who don't know me, I bet everybody, perhaps most people in the room know who Leslie was. How many people in the room know who Leslie was? We decide we're going to have a Leslie in this town. I'm here to denounce Uber and Lyft as stopping that project. I'm a filmmaker. I'm been a Lyft driver about a week and Uber driver about a year. They have both banned me from being a driver. I have about \$800 coming to me tomorrow from my work for last weekend. And I'm going to be very

[3:23:47 PM]

depressed watching every weekend go by that I'm not driving and making money to be making a statue of Austin's finest here. I just want people to know what kind of management that they are dealing with that they get rid of their drivers without any justifiable reasons or explanation or conversation and I denounce the means -- I cannot have the means of making free speech in my own vehicle and that sucks. All right. That's what I had to say. [Applause] >> Kitchen: Thank you. >> My check was United States of America, we had the freedom of speech. Thank you. >> Kitchen: Thank you, sir. We're going to move on to the next agenda item which is item number 3 and I'm happy and pleased to welcome Jerry Wideland with the Rocky Mountain Institute. As you may be familiar, our city, Austin was selected as the lead implementation city for the mobility transformation project that will have the benefit of working with Jerry and his team for the next few years. So he's gone to give us a briefing and Jerry, if you could speak for about five or six minutes and then we'll see if we have any questions. Thank you. >> Okay, I'll try to move through it. Good afternoon, councilmembers. Thanks for the opportunity to be here. Yeah,

we were here -- let me click through here. I guess I'm responsible for this. Brief overview. We'll talk about what's happened since the announcement about a month ago and specifically this partnership framework agreement that we're working on which is going to define how rmi is going to work with the city and stakeholders and talk a little about timing and when we plan to go back here to go through that with you again. As indicated we chose Austin as our lead implementation city for this mobility transformation initiative.

[3:25:47 PM]

We're looking forward to partnering with Austin to bring mobility solutions that are going to address societal and economic and environmental challenges of the present mobility paradigm we're in. Through the process we want to establish Austin as at least a national if not a global model in terms of mobility transformation, personal mobility particularly and we have also selected Denver as our lead scaling partner because what we do in Austin we want to be able to take into other cities around the world as well. That's when it can be most beneficial. So that's kind of the core purpose of the program. As I said we were here about a month ago for the announcement and signing of an M.O.U. Which we're now following up with this framework development which will define more details on the program. We've been in Austin starting to get our boots on the ground as we say here over the last few weeks with a series of stakeholder engagements and meetings. Last week our CEO was here to meet with mayor Adler and councils man kitchen so happy to be starting to establish a presence of working with everybody here. A lot going on this week here. My colleagues are over at southwest southwest eco with the mayor doing a presentation, workshop so glad to be moving forward with that as well. This next chart I think really sums up the essence of what I wanted to get across today, but as we work towards the week of November 16th, there will be another followup committee review and then I think a proposal taken to the city council that week defining more details around the content. At least probably looking at over the first 6 to 12 months what we're going to start working with the city and stakeholders on. In the talk section there in the chart focus on Rm Is

[3:27:50 PM]

content around these work streams or projects that we intend to start working on. Don't want to go into the details but it will talk about governance in particular for the overall project. Governance we want to think about in a positive way of enabling and steering the work so it can be successful rather than a controlling function. We'll talk about project outcomes. We'll talk about participating organizations. And then resources and budget as well. Importantly we recognize ongoing communication and engagement with the city and its stakeholders is an important part of this project so this whole second section will be dedicated to putting in place some kind of a communication and outreach platform. We have a lot of ideas coming on that right now that will ensure that the Austin public is informed about what we're doing with our work in partnership with the city here and not the public but the city and other stakeholders as well. So again, there's five objectives listed here and ideas in terms of what we're doing, but those will be the two key elements of this framework agreement. The actual content of the program itself and how we're going to communicate and inform and stay in touch with the city on the initiative going forward. Okay. This basically just lays out a series of things to illustrate to you in addition to what's going on here in the preparation work for Austin. We're also working with Denver as well as working on a number of other items including rmi being an Ngo and nonprofit, how we're going to secure funding for the program and continue to build support which is going very well. And also for instance the work with Denver and the scaling mechanisms is a couple examples beyond. So a lot of work going on over the past month here and will be over the next month leading up to the review in October. So just a quick

time line, I think this will summarize what we need today, but we're here

[3:29:51 PM]

this week of the 5th in Austin for this check-in. Next week we're going to be basically trying to put details together back in our home turf in Colorado, and the week of the 19th. We're going to review draft version of that program plan and then we have a couple more weeks where we will be working with stakeholders in terms of building out details and pre-reviews for the actual mobility committee and city council review coming up the week of the 16th of November. So that's kind of how things will unfold over the next 30 days and then we hope to be operationalizing things as moving forward as we get into December before the end of the year. So I think I will stop there because I know there's other interesting things waiting behind me and ahead of me. But I'll take some questions. >> Kitchen: Just to summarize, thank you for joining us, mayor pro tem tovo, we appreciate you being here. So basically for my colleagues, rmi will be bringing back to us at our November committee meeting the -- I'll call it work statement framework or whatever. The agreement that the city council will be signing so it will come to us first and then go to the full city council that will just explain more of how the work will proceed and what the city's responsibilities are. >> Yes. >> Kitchen: And just for those of you in the public who are not familiar, the kinds of projects that you guys are going to be working on is going to be helping us in the city take what -- the innovative things we've done to the next level. So for example the kinds of apps like ride scout, for example and those kinds of apps where people can understand what their opportunities are for travel and what those options are using, you know, using an app to know what that is would be one kind of example. Fleet electrification, pushing

[3:31:53 PM]

towards electric vehicles, those kinds of things. Any other example you would give? >> Obviously we're interested in understanding particularly with codenext how the city will prepare itself for what we think this new mobility paradigm will be. We're very bullish on autonomous vehicles and there's a lot of work from U.T. Austin to ati and clean tex and building around that. Obviously Google's presence is important but those are a couple. I think central to people in the near term will be this concept of mobility as a service. And people, as you said, enabling more options to be available for people to find. We're going to focus on commuting solutions is a starting point, then eventually going broader into people's personal mobility needs. Finding alternative solutions that will allow people not to have to get out in a that traffic and be more economical, cleaner, more efficient and hopefully make people happier. >> Kitchen: Thank you. Any questions? Does anybody have any questions. Did you have a question? >> Zimmerman: Yes. Welcome to -- are you from the rocky mountain high state? >> I am, yes. >> Zimmerman: Some of the people here are envious because they've legalized marijuana. >> I was wondering. >> Zimmerman: I was wondering why we don't test this in Denver before we bring it to Austin. I think the private -- the think tanks that work on these kind of social engineering projects that think about changing people's behaviors and habits and get them out of cars and on to bicycles and ride shares, it's a great thing to do. But when tax money gets involved, you will find me voting against it. As long as it's privately funded think tank stuff, great. >> Thanks, we appreciate it. >> Kitchen: Thank you for being here. >> Thank you. >> Kitchen: Okay.

[3:33:54 PM]

Let's see, next we've just received our minutes so if you all want to take a minute and could I get a motion to approve our minutes? Motion from councilmember Zimmerman, second from

councilmember Gallo. All in favor? Minutes are adopted. Okay. We had a request to take one item out of order and because it's a short item, it's 10 minutes, I'm going to ask everyone to bear with us. We'll take that item first and then we'll take up the discussion about tncs. That's item 5 and we're doing that because these folks have to leave early. This is the monthly briefing on ctma, joint work on loop 1 south. If you could speak for about six minutes or so, six or seven minutes and then if we have any questions. Is that possible? Can you do that? >> Yes, ma'am. Very much. Thank you, madame chair, councilmembers, my name is Justin wort, director of project management with the central Texas regional mobility. Appreciate coming out to give you an update where we are with this study and where we're heading the next couple of months. Got a slide that really walks us through history of the project development. In the interest of time I won't go through a lot of that. I just want to hit on that last section there. As you all may remember, we held our third open house in February of 2015 of this year. Really the important things we took out of that were getting preliminary results and feedback from the public. We presented an alternative at that meeting and launched our CSS project at that time. I just want to walk you all quickly through where we are today and the activities we've completed since our February open house.

[3:35:55 PM]

So based on that feedback that we got, we developed some additional concepts with public input. We're going through an evaluation process of those environmental considerations, the noise, the visual impacts, park impacts, historic, all those different aspects. And then from there working through a determination of the number of lanes we would need based on travel demand models. Once we figure out those lanes that is correct allows us to figure out the engineering work and where the right-of-way requirements would come in. Once we know what those lanes look like, we've gone in and worked the operational analysis, really get in there and do those detailed operation at models. We're wrapping autopsy this up to move forward to our November open house. So in addition to the direct connector to downtown option that we presented at the February meeting, we have five additional concepts we've been looking at. Those are, as you can see, listed here. They take the form of a combination of one to two express lanes in each direction, with and without a direct connector. Another concept that we've coined the wishbone option. And then finally we have looked at the city of Austin concept that was put forth by the transportation group. This is a really important slide. In the before time I won't go through all of these, but the important thing is we listened, we heard what people told us at the open houses. Our meetings with our partner agencies. So we've taken, you know, in addition to the broad concepts, we've looked at several locations along the corridor based on that feedback. That included the city of Austin, Travis county, the city of rollingwood, Austin I.S.D. And just the general public. These are the innings this -- things we have integrated. So we heard folks and we've

[3:37:56 PM]

integrated that information. So this is where we're headed to the next hope house November 10th and we'll have a virtual open house starting the 21st. So when we go back out to the public, we've got some bullet points here what we're going to show. We're going to start with background information, show our homework. We're going to show what has changed since that February presentation. We're going to roll out our U.T. Center for transportation research findings as they relate to the downtown grid and the functioning with the addition of the mopac south project. We'll show those six operational configurations, give an update on where we have with the environmental studies, walk through our context sensitive solutions options and then really inform the folks what will be the next steps in the process. So I know most of you all realize we actually extended this project schedule by at least five

months based on feedback from our last open house that say you guys need to step back and take a look and we've done just that. So in September just kind of walking through what we've done, we've completed or very close to completing refinements to those operational configurations and getting the ctr study put together. This October, this month we'll have started stakeholder outreach and meetings and continued analysis. We're going to move in November to that November 10th open hours and that virtual open house for public comment. In early 2016 we're going to wrap up our work, roll in the additional feedback we get at this next open house and reach out to stakeholders again with those results. Based on that then, roughly spring of 2016, we would have a public hearing and expect downstream of that, summer of 2016, to have a record of decision. With that, I would be happy to

[3:39:56 PM]

entertain any questions. >> Kitchen: I have two questions and then we'll see who else has questions. The first one, I just wanted to confirm, I think that I heard you saying that the alternative that was presented by the city of Austin would be part of the alternatives that were presented at the November stakeholder meeting. Is that correct? >> That has been discussed, yeah. That is our intention. >> Kitchen: Okay. And then one of the slides, I should have stopped you when you were doing the slide, but there's a slide on there that talks about lake Austin and fifth street and then it references Travis county. So does that mean that you all are working with Travis county for that -- that and I wasn't sure -- >> So we received a number of feedback from different entities. Travis county provided us with I believe six or eight different improvements that they had recommended and we have integrated some of those and are utilizing those. >> Kitchen: I see. That's what that reference means. >> Yes. I do want to add to your first question. We are planning to present at city of Austin option and we talked to having support from the transportation group there to help the public walk through that option as well. >> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you. Do we have any questions -- no questions. Thank you very much. >> Thank you. >> Kitchen: Hold on. >> I have a quick question. What is a Texas turn-around? >> That is a euphemism for you've probably seen them on free facilities where you are approaching and there's a turn-around movement so you see them on a lot of freeway facilities. >> Thank you. >> Kitchen: We have two speakers on this item. Thank you very much. Mathias got atto, and then David king.

[3:42:05 PM]

Is Mathias here? No? Okay. Go ahead, David. >> Thank you chair and vice chair and councilmember. David king, I live in the zilker neighborhood and this mopac south, the proposed flyovers are definitely a concern for the neighborhood. But I'm really wanting to speak today just about asking the committee if it would please help if it would please request release of the central Texas regional mobility traffic and revenue study on the mopac south toll lanes. As you read in a statesman editorial today, in the interest of transparency and to provide the public with all the information possible so that they can understand what's going on and the impact it will have on them. I think this is important for this committee to ask for that study to be released and provided to the public. So I'd ask for you to please do that. And also to please ask for the release of the study buoy the U.T. Center for transportation research on the impact of the proposed exit lanes from mopac south to Cesar Chavez and fifth street. That's important too. Again, in the name of transparency and so the public can understand the impact and pros often cons of that proposal. I think that would be important. The point -- there is a concern about that U.T. Study though because it conversation the transportation infrastructure through 2020. But we know that -- so therefore it's not going to cover the additional lanes that would be added to mopac after 2020 nor the connection to the south sh45 to I-35. Those are significant changes to the transportation infrastructure that would have an impact on this study. So the study should be expanded so to a time frame that

includes the additional lanes on mopac and the connection of sh45 to I-35. I hope that you will ask for that study to be expanded to incorporate that additional time frame. Thank you very much for listening to my comments. >> Kitchen: Thank you. Let's see.

[3:44:06 PM]

The person from the R.M.A., is he still here? I'm sorry, I had a quick followup question for you. I apologize. What was your name? >> Justin wort. >> Kitchen: The -- the information about the comment from Travis county on lake Austin boulevard and fifth street, if that is information that you could provide to us, I don't think I've seen it and I'm not certain if our staff has, but if you could provide that information to us, it would be very helpful. >> Absolutely. >> Kitchen: Thank you very much. Okay. So members now we're going to go back to item number 4 which is our staff briefing and discussion on ground transportation providers including transportation network companies. So to get us started, let me just say I wanted to welcome everyone that's here with us today, all of our drivers, the work you do in our community is very important to us. And I know that I feel this and I know everyone on the dais feels that tncs are very important part of our transportation system in Austin, as are our taxis and limo and other drivers. So thank you for being here. I want to start by explaining the process so that everyone knows how we will proceed. I don't know if that's clear for everyone. First off a little bit of history. As you probably all are aware, the previous council last year about a year ago now in October of 2014 passed a resolution related to tncs and there were a number of items in that resolution that we are following up on and when we get to those, we'll

[3:46:08 PM]

mention those. This committee has -- this committee -- well, actually it's our fourth meeting related to tncs. We began in the fall with a briefing from our transportation department staff both on tncs and taxis and other ground transportation that help us out here in Austin. So we began then and then we took up some items related to taxi cabs. Then three meetings ago we started back to begin looking at tncs. So this is our third meeting recently looking at tncs. We had a full public hearing at our last meeting in September and so today's public hearing is for us to begin as a committee to talk about some of the proposals. At our last meeting we -- at our last meeting I posted and handed out a list of potential revisions or amendments, and these came from a number of different sources. Some of them were items that a previous stakeholder group had put forward, some of them were items that our transportation staff were suggesting that we take a look at. So that was a list of items for us to consider. So today, today our -- our committee will start to talk through some of those items. We're not necessarily going to move all of those items forward. The other thing just so you will understand the entire process is basically what we are looking at is a four-step process. As you probably all know, this is a committee so what we do is we vote to send recommendations to the full council. It's the full council that has the authority to vote on any changes. So this is the first in what I'm calling a four-step process just for understanding purposes where we will consider some potential changes today that are policy types of changes. Any recommendations that we may vote on would then go to the full council sometime in

[3:48:09 PM]

October most likely. Any recommendations that the full council voted to move forward would then go back to our staff, to our legal staff to put into language for an ordinance which would then come back to our November committee meeting and then back to the full council. Now, you all might think that's a

long process, but I mention that because it's important that we have all those steps along the way because there's plenty of opportunity for us to talk about the potential changes that we're making. Any potential changes that we might decide to start the process on this time. So I wanted to make that clear. I also wanted to emphasize that at our last meeting, and I'm sure many of you were there and I hope those of you who spoke with us last time are here today too, we had the opportunity to hear from a lot of folks. We had a full public hearing and we're able to hear from everyone that signed up at our last public hearing. So today we did ask our stakeholders to be here so that we could ask them questions. Today is not a public hearing day but we do have our stakeholders here. I think that our tncs representatives from Uber and Lyft are here and I know we have our transportation staff, I believe we have some stakeholders that are associated with taxis here also. I might ask, what we want to do if it's not a problem for you guys sitting at the front, we wanted to ask our tnc representatives to sit at the front because then it would be easier to bring them up if we had questions. If you guys don't mind moving that are sitting in the front row right now. >> [Inaudible] >> Kitchen: Well, no, I just think sitting in the front might be easier for them. No, no, right here. We appreciate it, guys. Because this is a discussion and we may have questions for them and so it will make it a little easier for them than having to --

[3:50:12 PM]

>> Zimmerman: Maybe debate forum, sides for, against, point, counter point. >> Kitchen: This is not a debate. What this is is discussion amongst our councilmembers, that's the purpose of this, and we have questions for our staff and our stakeholders. So they will be available for us. Okay, so I am going to suggest that there's a number of key items that I'd like to see if we have time to get through today. And I'd like to start by talking about the issue of fees. And so I want to lay that out and then we can see if anyone wants to make a motion and then we can have further discussion and see if we have any questions for folks. So a little background. I want to -- again, as I mentioned before, the ordinance that was passed last year, this particular item with fees is an item that is -- they were picking up from what was passed last year. The resolution that was passed last year, the ordinance that was passed last year states that -- and I'll quote, just to be -- just to help inform people, that a fee will be imposed on all approved tncs to facilitate the city's administration and enforcement of agreement made under this ordinance. This fee will be set by separate ordinance. So we already have in our municipal code a requirement that tncs pay a fee, and this is -- this is in line with what we do with all ground transportation. All of our ground transportation services pay a fee. So our task is to then take what the previous city council started organ and to take the next step. So that's what we're do today with regard to the fee. Another piece of background is there's been a lot of -- a lot of information in the press and some information that's been sent out by tncs that I

[3:52:13 PM]

want to correct the misinformation that's been sent out. First off, you know, we do recognize and appreciate and really value what tncs offer to our community, so our discussion today is not about getting rid of tncs, it was never that and that's not what we're about talking about today. So I want to correct -- I think it's important that we correct that misinformation that may have been sent out to some of you. The second thing is that I think it's, you know, important for us to understand -- I would like to also say that with regard to fees, we're moving forward, as I said before, with something that was started last year so we'll talk about that first. The other piece of background that's related to that, the dollar per ride fee that was proposed and has been talked about was a starting point for discussion. It was a starting point for discussion because that is what is charged at the airport right now. It was never

intended to necessarily be what we would charge. So I wanted to set that straight also. And then finally to give you a little more background before we talk about specific proposals, there is a provision in addition to the provision that is in the ordinance that was passed last year that I already laid out, there is also a state law under the Texas transportation code that is specific to authorizing a city to charge a fee to -- to impose on fee or charge and that sets an upper limit and that upper limit is not exceed 2% of gross receipts so that's another parameter by which we must operate. That section of the Texas transportation code also speaks to fees, these fees are allowed for use of right-of-way and to maintain records and regulate programs. So fees are basically for two

[3:54:14 PM]

purposes, both for city's costs related to, you know, to regulating the program and also under state law the authority to, you know, to charge fees for use of the right-of-way and essentially maintenance of our roads. So another piece of background is that Houston does charge the 2%, and so that's an example of another jurisdiction that -- that uses their charge off of that Texas transportation code. So the last thing I would say from my perspective is that when we began talking about ground transportation, taxis and tncs and other ground transportation, one of the things that we talked about was the concept of an equal playing field. And looking at our regulations for ground transportation in light of some equivalency across them. So from the perspective of fees, I think it's important to just mention that every other ground transportation provider pays a fee. And those fees range from \$450 each for each permit for taxis do you know to \$250 -- down to \$250 for the permits for pedicabs. So that's the system in place and it's timely for our committee to begin -- to pick up on the work that was begun last year and consider what would be an appropriate fee for tncs. So with that I think that I have a motion to make unless someone else would like to make a motion related to fees. Okay. There is a -- shall I go forward? There's a motion -- there's a motion sheet -- we had some -- we posted this motion she'd or I posted this on the message board and we had some copies

[3:56:15 PM]

for those of you when you came in, but I'm going to go ahead and read it, and it might be useful -- can we put it on the overhead? Okay. So people are -- can understand. I want everyone to be able to see what we're talking about. Okay. I'll wait till he gets it up and then I'll walk us through it. >> Zimmerman: Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: Yes. >> Zimmerman: On the Austin council forum.org, it's titled motion sheet related to safety. Is that what we're referring to? >> Kitchen: No, we're talking about the one that addresses fee equity and cost of service. That's the first one. It's on the council message board speaking to -- it says -- they were posted at two different times. And you have a copy in your -- >> Zimmerman: [Inaudible] >> Kitchen: It should be on the council forum. I posted it last night. Okay. I'm going to read through it. So this is one that says amend city code to address fee equity and cost of service. So -- and if you all will bear with me I'll just read it so people will know what we're talking about. Thank you for joining us, councilmember troxclair. Let's see. You can pass that down to her. All right. The city manager is directed to initiate an amendment to city code to establish a fee for tncs with the following provisions and to bring back to the mobility committee for recommendation to council no later than November 16, which is our next meeting, and

[3:58:18 PM]

here's the proposed fee. It's right there in the middle. Each tnc operating in the city of Austin shall pay an annual fee that is the lesser of the following. First, the total of the permit fee paid by taxi cab

companies times the number of persons driving for the tnc, or 2% of the tncs annual gross revenue. This is put forward to allow an option for tncs to either way the 450 per permit fee like our taxi cab companies pay, or to choose to pay a percentage of their local groceries. I've putting forward an option because I understand the way the tncs operate they may prefer to pay based on annual groceries like Uber done in Houston. In the alternative, tncs with a total number of drivers that is less than the number of taxi cab per permits may elect to pay a fee according to a graduated per driver fee schedule determined by the transportation department that is less than the permit fee paid by tax taxi cab companies. Tncs are an important part of our transportation system and there's -- you know, we may have -- there's already talk of new tncs coming into town so we may have smaller tncs that want to come into Austin and this is to recognize that with smaller tncs that are actually smaller than our taxicab companies it may be more provide to provide them an option of a fee less than 450. So that's the -- so I'm laying

[4:00:18 PM]

that out and procedural I'm not sure how to proceed. I guess I'll make a motion that we consider this. Do I have a -- I may have to turn it over to you as I proceed with this. Because I'm making the motion. >> If you need a second, I'll second for discussion, but I think we have a couple of amendments too. >> Zimmerman: Could I make a comment before we get started? You made a couple of good observations and kind of summarized the history where this has come out. But before we get into the details of charging the fee, and I do concur because I just looked up the ordinance that said there was a anticipation, I think it was on page 7 of 9 where it said that there would be an administration fee. But we have a year's worth of experience, as you pointed out with the tncs so I would like to get a little Q and a from the Austin traffic department as to what administrative fees has Austin already incurred in the past 12 months and what were those used for. If we could start with that. Mile while you are getting on the mic, I want that. >> We had hundreds and hundreds of people coming to the strs demanding that we take regulatory action. I have not heard one person come to me and ask for us to regulate the tncs or put new regulations or new ordinances. Not a single person. And I see there's a very -- constituents are coming to us saying we demand action, versus hundreds or thousands of people saying we demand no action. Do not regulate the tncs. [Cheers and applause]

[4:02:23 PM]

>> Kitchen: Let me ask a question. So commitment, we're talking about fees. Would you make the same statement about fees? We charge every other ground transportation company a fee. And also there's a fee already in the law. So do you agree that we should go forward with a fee? >> To back up a little we had the conversation during the taxi franchise renewals. We had a very robust conversation and I did bring up the fact that leveling the playing field could mean to dramatically decrease or even eliminate a number of the fees that were imposed on limousines and taxi drivers. And that would be a way to level the playing field, to bring down the fees for everyone. I think I asked the same question back then is what are the taxi companies and taxi drivers and the riders, the customers, what are they getting for the fees that are imposed on taxis and limousines and I didn't get a clear answer for what they're getting for what they're being charged. >> Carlton Thomas, transportation department. Councilmember Zimmerman, our response to you at the time was that the fees that were charged were intended to cover the cost of the administering the program. So the fees that we charge are determined by a cost of service analysis, and that takes into account the cost to the city to administrate that particular ground transportation activity. >> I did get that, but then the question was what does the program -- what benefit does the program provide for the taxi drivers, the franchises and the people who ride in taxis?

What benefit do they get from administering the program? >> So we regulate it for public safety and not economic benefit or gain. >> Zimmerman: Terrific. That's a great answer because right now the tncs are doing background checks, security checks, and it's kind of a market decision on how they want to do that, right? The customers that use the tncs, they kind of know

[4:04:25 PM]

that there's a certain kind of background check that the tncs are doing, and everybody is taking care of themselves. They're administering themselves. They're doing their own background checks with no input from us. With nothing from us. [Cheers and applause] >> Kitchen: Anybody else have any comments they would like to make? Go ahead. >> I have an amendment to the motion that I would like to make. I really do like the option of the companies choosing which financial process they wish to use because I think in each situation the companies' business model may be different, they may be a large company, a small company. I think if you have a company that has a lot of part time drivers it may make a difference whether they choose a gross situation or they choose a per permit type situation. So adopt to get the businesses -- give the businesses the opportunity to choose which process they use. So my recommendation is we take out the lesser because the lesser may not always be the option that the company chooses if they wish to not provide financial information to the city. They may choose to pay a little bit more to do that and do the permit per permit. I would like to take out lesser and I think it would reach that each tnc operating in the city of Austin shall pay a fee that is either of the following, and there probably needs to be some language in there to make sure that it's the option of the company, not the city of Austin's which route they want to go. >> Kitchen: Okay. So we could read each tnc operating in the 71 shall pay a fee that is either of the following at the option of the tnc. Does that work? >> Gallo: And making sure it's the option of which

[4:06:26 PM]

will work. >> Kitchen: Yeah, okay. Well, what this is is this is to be wordsmithed by the legal. So do we have a second for that amendment? Okay. Councilmember Garza seconds that. Any other discussion on this item? Do you have -- I'll let you go ahead. Thank you, councilmember troxclair. >> Troxclair: Thank you for letting me participate even though I'm not an official of this committee and I know you guys have spent a lot of time on this issue and so thanks for letting me ask a couple of questions. So I guess my question about the fees is one of the biggest issues that we heard when we were having the taxi debate was that the -- a lot of the regulations and fees that are put on to the tax franchises are in the end pushed down to the drivers and it causes them to have to work longer and harder in order to cover their costs. So I guess I just want to make sure that we're not adding fees just for the sake of adding fees so that we're the same as -- so that we have the same fees as other options, but I've heard from a lot of my constituents that they appreciate the low cost of transportation networking companies. Some of them take them to work and that means they've been able to give up their cars and vice versa, then the drivers are able to supplement their incomes by being drivers. So I just want to make sure that we're not adding a fee for the sake of adding fees that will ultimately result in a higher cost of service to the riders. And a higher cost to potentially the drivers as

[4:08:30 PM]

well. >> So basically the situation we have right now is some drivers -- not drivers, some companies pay and some don't. And so that's not fair, you know, to -- [applause]. So go ahead, councilmember Gallo. >> Gallo: One of the things I was going to recommend is as our chair mentioned, this isn't an immediate

process, it's a lengthy process with a lot more communication. One of the things I would really like our city department to come back, you said very clearly that the fees are intended to cover the cost of administering the program. I would guess that the fee income that if this is enacted, the fee income will go up substantially to the department. The department cost may not go up as rapidly so that I would really like -- I think this was councilmember Zimmerman's with his request too is that the department come back and analyze with the perceived addition of the additional fees from the tncs, do we really need a fee of 450, a permit to be able to cover your admin costs because I do think that needs to be part past conversation. We want these fees to cover the administration cost, but we certainly want them to stay as reasonable and low as possible so that the drivers can and the companies can both the taxis and the tncs provide a service that's as economically feasible as possible. So I hope that that's information that you can come back and analyze is there an ability to drop the fee for both the taxi drivers, taxi companies and the tncs to cover the cost of your admin fees? >> We do a service fee analysis each year. The intent would be after we

[4:10:31 PM]

see a year of what this costs us that we adjust this fee to again cover the regulatory requirements that we meet. But to kind of go back into some perspective for the taxi companies it's \$450 a year. That's a little less than \$10 a week. So when the taxi drivers are paying what they need to pay to their taxi company, which is the 250 to 350 range, of that about eight or nine dollars is a permit fee, and the majority of that is the requirements that the company has to run their company and to make -- to serve them? So the 450 if you look around the country is pretty light. We can do that. Our intent would be each year as part of the budget process to look at what it cost us the previous year to regulate and then spread that across all of the different modes that we regulate. >> Gallo: Okay. And what would be the process of analyzing that more rapidly than next budget year, which would be next August? I'm just looking at you've said that -- and it's my understanding that the fees we charge have to be based on the administrative cost to regulate. And if we are talking about another large group of fees coming in to the department, can that be something that's estimated a little better so that within a shorter amount of time if we feel like we have enough income or more income than we need to regulate we might be able to drop those fees? >> So we expect, you know, at least one of the companies has talked in terms of having to -- they have 10,000 drivers. So for the first year we're probably going to have a lot more work in order to regulate the system as it currently stands. So we could tell you based

[4:12:31 PM]

on what we currently have, but we anticipate that we would have to have additional administrative people to handle that many cases reviewed through the year. >> Gallo: I don't want you to have to calculate that out quickly, but if you have a sense that that could be done more rapidly, then next budget cycle. I understand you need the time to analyze it, but my hope would be that we make an effort to really stay carefully close to the cost that the city incurs and that with bringing additional resources in by extending and making it equitable that all of the drivers out there or companies are paying a fee that we're able to actually lower the cost to all of the companies. >> Yes. >> Gallo: Thank you. >> Kitchen: Other comments? >> Zimmerman: If I could, I would like to ask one of the tnc representatives if they could to come and talk to us a little bit about how the collection of more fees effects rider ship and how if there's any estimates and would we lose out on some of the passengers? Maybe there would be some other drunk drivers that would drive than taking a tnc if the fees were increased? That gets drunk drivers off the streets. >> Kitchen: I'll answer that and then they can get to both questions. When you said fees increased, you know that they don't pay any fee to the city right

now. You were talking about what the driver -- the passenger pays, is that what you meant? >> Right now there's a market agreement. If the city imposes fees

[4:14:32 PM]

somebody has to pay. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Zimmerman: I'm just trying to analyze what's the effect of that? Because somebody has to pay. >> Kitchen: Councilmember Garza. >> Garza: I guess it can be passed on to the consumer or the corporation can take a smaller profit margin. It doesn't always have to be passed on to the consumer. [Applause]. >> Thank you, chair woman and thank you members of the committee. My name is April Mihms. With respect to the fees, I want to state on the record because I want to make sure there's a lot of clarity and we're on the record. We have no problem paying a fee. We recognize we have to have fees to cover the cost of administration. I think I'm very pleased by the fact that councilwoman Gallo is stating we need more information about the fees we've been using and we have been operating under an operating agreement for a full year now. We don't have any information on what fees are routelized. -- Utilized. A majority of the fees across the country, there's been a flat fee assessed or a sliding scale based on the number of drivers and vehicles, but to be clear a 450-dollar per vehicle fee doesn't meet the nature of our platform? So the goal for Lyft is to get as many people driving, as many in this room, to be a Lyft driver who can pass our stringent background check and screening process. If every driver is required to pay 450 drivers even if they never drive for Lyft or they never drive again, then we don't have a business model. To assess the same fee as a taxi or other ground transportation provider doesn't seem fair to us. The other thing I would like to say is with respect to the gross avenue, I know that Houston was listed as a model. I wanted to state on the record that Lyft doesn't operate there, so that's not really an accurate comparison for Austin as far as we're concerned. [Applause]. >> Kitchen: One quick question. So what about the last item?

[4:16:34 PM]

Where we are proposing if a tnc is a smaller tnc and has a total number of drivers that's less than the number of taxicab permits, that we would look at a graduated per driver fee? Is that something that would work for you all? >> I don't have information about what taxi companies and how many permits are offered. So I have no idea as to whether that would work for us. >> Kitchen: How many drivers do you have? >> That information is proprietary so that's not something we're able to share. [Laughter]. Because we are in a very competitive market. As you can see, there was already information that was shared on the dais with respect to some ground transportation provider and as to how many drivers they have. That information is sensitive and we're very sensitive as to how that information is shared because it sounds like it will be in the public record. >> Kitchen: Okay. Did you have a question? >> Gallo: I was going to say that's why it's really important to me that the companies have an option of which way they wish to pay the fee. Certainly I can understand if you have a business model and you have drivers that driver very part time or maybe do a couple of rides and decide they don't want to do it or something happens and they take off for a couple of months. That does give the company the ability if your model is such that a good percentage of your drivers are part time and not working full time that the other option would be more reflective of the actual income coming in, and take that into consideration. So I'm glad and I would only be supportive of this with those two options that would go to the company to give you ability to choose those. >> Can I ask one more clarifying question? I was curious would that fee be \$450 per vehicle? >> >> Kitchen: What it says right now, and this is a starting conversation, it says at the option -- the two options would be the same permit fee that's paid by taxicab companies. And as you know,

[4:18:35 PM]

councilmember Gallo talked about perhaps there's a potential that those could be lowered. Or the other option is the percentage of annual gross revenues. So I think we need to let -- >> Adam blenic with YouTube he. Thank you for letting me speak. I would say that there are a couple of items around this that I think are key. I think that councilmember Gallo touched on a bunch of them. >> Kitchen: If you could focus on the fee. >> Absolutely, 100%. We are in a very heavily regulated environment in Austin. The requirements from a safety perspective are higher than they are for taxi. Insurance for us is higher than for taxi and the city currently has an audit provision in the ordinance that they can utilize at our experience. So I just -- I guess I have the same question as my colleague from Lyft of asking what's the issue with the current system in place? It raises the level of safety. It raises the level of insurance. And it -- with the obligation of those things we pay for the driver's background checks, we pay for the insurance, we cover the audit costs. I think we're looking for some clarity on what the imperative is here and how we can be part of a solution. This is a dialogue we're eager to be part of. We don't want to avoid this conversation. >> Kitchen: I have the same question for you as -- do you -- I forget how you put it. Are you willing to pay a fee basically? >> Absolutely. >> Kitchen: We've established that and we appreciate that for both of you. Beck. I have a follow-up question and it's based on what councilmember Garza crazed. Would either of you -- councilmember Garza raised. Would either of you expect to pass along any fee or would that be something that has a company that you could take responsibility for?

[4:20:39 PM]

What's your thinking. >> Gallo: I'm going to jump in at this point. I don't think we should be asking companies how they're going to model, their business model and how they're going to do that. I think it's a situation as we said over and over to the taxi companies and drivers, that is really a situation and a discussion that is between the drivers and the company. I would feel uncomfortable with us asking that. >> Kitchen: That makes sense. >> Gallo: Unless you want to answer. But it's not our business. >> Kitchen: I want to make the point it is your business, but what we're doing -- I wanted to be sensitive to what councilmember troxclair was raising. What we're doing does not have to be passed along to the driver is the only point I wanted to make. Okay. Did anybody else have other questions. >> Garza: I don't have a question. I wanted to say that when we're framing the fees, I understand it's supposed to cover the administrative cost, but I think you laid it out in the beginning that state law allows the two percent, which is not -- it's not, I guess, -- it's not matched with the administrative, it's purely -- and that is based on just the use of infrastructure, which we just went through a budget session where we funded the five worst intersections. And so I just want to be clear that it's not -- maybe we're having different conversations, but the fee is not purely for administrative. We also want to be able to have a fee that covers the use of the roads and I was trying to think of an example. There were fitness companies that were using our parks, Austin parks, to -- for those boot camps. And then it became apparent that these companies were profiting from using public land and so that was fixed. I think they have to pay some kind of fee to be able to hold their boot camp on our parks.

[4:22:42 PM]

In addition to covering administrative costs, they also need to cover the use of the infrastructure, the use of our roads, so taxpayers foot that bill and if a company is profiting from use of that road, it's important that we're recouping something to be able to repair that infrastructure. I want to be sure that it's not purely about administrative. [Applause]. >> Yes, that is true. The structure is set up and that's the basis of the state law. The state law is a recognition that it's an authorization for cities. That the cities

may choose to charge a fee that relates to the maintenance of the roads because of the use of the roads. Yes. >> Garza: That being said. >> [Indiscernible]. >> Kitchen: Excuse me, folks, we're trying to have a conversation. >> I could see where the gas tax the average resident is paying that, but if you're making money off a service, I don't think it's unfair to ask for a fee. [Applause]. That being said, I would make an amendment to the options that -- I want to emphasize what councilmember kitchen said in the very beginning, chair kitchen said in the very beginning. That this is in no way, we're not trying to stop tncs from operating. We're just trying to find a way to make sure that their safety protocols are in place. And so what I would -- because I understand the model and I've had a conversation with the tnc companies would be to reduce that two percent to one

[4:24:44 PM]

percent. So that would be my amendment. [Applause]. Audio]. What that percentage would work out for the taxi companies, I think that would be very helpful. You're getting to know us too well. >> So we ran some Numbers based on if we went to -- if the taxi operations were one or two percent flat fee for the use of the streets and that's the Numbers that are reflected there. >> Zimmerman: Could you put one on the overhead. >> Gallo: And how would you compare that to the fees that are currently being collected at 450 a permit? That's kind of what I was -- >> We have roughly a thousand taxis at the moment. So 900 at 450 a piece, so a thousand will be really easy, 450,000. So it's a little bit -- it's about 400,000. >> Kitchen: I'm sorry, Gordon, Mr. Durr, can you say that again? I didn't quite catch what you were saying. I'm getting copies made for everyone. >> With 912 current taxi permits, our annual is 410,400.

[4:26:44 PM]

So that -- so in 2014 there was about 3.4 million taxi trips. So at a dollar a trip that would be 3.4 million, considerably higher than what we have now. The total fares were 54 million, so one percent and two percent are shown there. Then the bottom case is the one data point we've gotten from public -- Uber said they paid 27 million to their drivers, so one percent of that, 270,000, so two percent would be 540. That's just one data point. But to just give you some idea of the relative values. >> Kitchen: Okay. Go ahead. >> Gallo: So the way I'm seeing this is the one percent fee -- so what I'm seeing -- help me with the math here. The one percent fee if taxis were also given the option of a one percent fee, that would come pretty close to what the 450 fee is. >> That's correct. >> Gallo: And in line with that. So the one percent would be more equitable for tncs with what taxis are currently looking at now. >> Based on again the data point I think was taken from the statesman and a statement that was made by an Uber representative, it's not direct information that we have. So -- and again, so it would be some number above that probably, particularly taking into account all the tncs. But that's ballpark. >> Kitchen: My concern is making it equitable to the taxis. And making sure that we're not overcharging the taxis with what we're getting ready to do with tncs.

[4:28:47 PM]

So it looks like the one percent is more equitable to what the taxis are currently paying. >> Zimmerman: Thank you, councilmember kitchen. These business models, we've talked about this extensively already. The business models are very, very different. But if I look -- if there are fees that are willing to be paid and that could make sense it seems that the one thing that makes sense is a road use fee because whether you're driving a taxi or whether you're driving a tnc vehicle you're driving on the road and that represents some wear and tear. So why don't instead of trying to do things that don't make sense, taxi

licenses per taxi doesn't work for tncs, why don't we look at the number of miles driven by the taxis, number of miles driven by the tncs. And use miles driven by each one as the metric from which a fee is charged. And that's what we do. And that money goes to road maintenance. How about that? >> Kitchen: Can you speak to that? >> That's certainly information we get from the taxi companies now about miles driven. Council can do that if they want. [Laughter]. >> Zimmerman: It's the one thing that makes sense. They both drive along the road. Business models are different, but they're both driving on the road, so let's take the mileage that the taxis are driving, mileage the tncs are driving and come up with a formula that works for miles driven and that's what we charge the fees on annually. And then we take that money and put it towards road reconstruction and a small amount for administration. Why don't we do that? >> The only thing we would have to look at again is the state law speaks specifically to fees charged so that would be another calculation and we would have to see how that would fit under state law. >> Garza: That was my question if that ended up being more than two percent we couldn't charge that fee, correct? >> Correct. >> Zimmerman: But you could scale the dollars charged per mile so it would fit within the allowable

[4:30:47 PM]

caps. You could absolutely do that. >> Garza: And I guess because I've heard the concerns of the tncs and how they have proprietary information about their business model, I guess the question would be is that information that tncs would be willing to give, the mileage that their drivers drive or would that be another proprietary piece of information that you wouldn't want to give? >> I think it's a question that we would have to get back to you on. And I'll -- it's been a frustration from our end at this point is that the conversations are happening in this forum without the chance to have appropriate consultations on this matter. We're seeing fee proposals come without our input on it. And so councilmember Garza, we are absolutely happy to have a conversation around that issue. There are sensitivities around it. We don't believe this is the appropriate forum. We think more collaboration and consultation would improve this process. >> We've certainly been meeting -- all of us have been meeting with all of you, so please don't imply that we haven't met. >> And staff would be happy to sit down and meet with you. [Applause]. >> Kitchen: Okay. So let me take us back to where we're at right now. So we've had some -- we have a motion on the table. Councilmember Zimmerman, you brought up another way of calculating. Do you want to do anything with that? >> Zimmerman: I wouldn't make a motion at this time because it sounds like there's a question about how the data is available. And I don't know if the taxi companies -- are they willing to provide the data? To me it seems the policy discussion and what we need to do as a council is come up with a metric that makes sense for these different business model models. That's been very hard to do. We've been working on this for months. It's very hard to find the right metrics to where we

[4:32:49 PM]

can create a fair way to assess fees for these very different models, taxis and tncs. We're struggling to do that, to find a fair way to do that because the business models are so different. >> Kitchen: Is there any other -- so thank you, councilmember Zimmerman. So I appreciate that. Is there any other comments that you guys would like to make? Councilmember Garza? >> Garza: I agree that it's difficult to find, and I think that this tries to, you know, reach that, gives options. I could see where tncs coming -- drivers driving for that one hour and then not driving you wouldn't want to pay the permit fee for 450 for that person who will drive one time. I think this proceeds some options where that model might not fit, but let's do a percentage of while we could do two percent, that's why I made the amendment to one percent. Because of concerns and how this would affect cost to consumers. >> Kitchen: I would like to

propose at this point that we move forward with this motion, if people are ready to vote on this motion. As amended. Where it says that each tnc -- I'm sorry, what? Go ahead. >> I'm Angela Rodriguez from the law department once again. Before you vote I'm hoping that the amendments that would give the tncs the option to choose which role is best for them is okay, but I would have -- I wanted to let you know I would have to clear it with our municipal finance attorneys. So again, that would be the goal. We would craft an ordinance and bring it back to you if this motion passes to do just that, but just as a warning, I may have to -- it might look a little different when it comes back, but I understand the objective. >> Kitchen: Let me talk about the process again. There's multiple options -- not multiple options. There's multiple steps. So if we pass this motion

[4:34:50 PM]

today, the next step would be that this motion would go as a recommendation to the full council and then the full council would have to pass it. Then it would go to you in whatever form the council passed it to put into ordinance. So that's the way -- that's how the process would go. So I understand the caveat that you're making. >> I'm just saying if it turns out to be illegal, I will let you know, okay? >> I know you will. Anything that -- anything that we pass. And we appreciate that. Thank you very much. >> Thank you. >> Kitchen: Okay. So we've got in front of us a motion that -- if we could put it back up -- with the amendments. And let me make sure I have all the amendments. Each tnc operating in the city of Austin shall pay an annual fee that is either of the following at the option of the tnc. The total of the permit fee paid by taxicab companies times the number of persons driving for the tnc or one percent of the tnc's annual local gross revenues. And then we have an alternative for -- I won't read that language, but we have the alternative for smaller companies. And then of course we have the request that -- which we could make as part of this motion if we wanted to. The request that councilmember Gallo had made with regard to the department giving us their estimate of cost. Would you like to add that to the motion? Okay. So that will be added to the motion. So are we ready to vote? Go ahead. >> Garza: Does somebody need to second my amendment? We had a second of your amendment. Okay. Are we ready to vote in this. >> Garza: I wanted clarification from law. I understand your goal of letting the council vote on it first before it goes for ordinance, but I think it would be important to know if it's illegal before then. >> Kitchen: Yes, exactly. >> Garza: So I guess you could advise us.

[4:36:50 PM]

And maybe it could come back to the mobility committee if that is the case. >> I can talk to the municipal finance attorney tomorrow and draft a memo for the committee members, absolutely. I just wanted -- I didn't want you to be shocked. >> Kitchen: We appreciate that. So councilmember Garza, is your intention if we move forward it's with the understanding that this is an approach that is allowed under the law? And if it's not, we'll regroup and come back to the committee? Does that work? Okay. All right. I'm ready to take a vote. All in favor of moving this motion forward? Okay. Opposed? >> Zimmerman: I'm opposed. >> Kitchen: All right, thank you. So we'll move this forward. Councilmember Gallo? [Applause]. >> Gallo: I just wanted to say a couple of things. Open meetings act means that we have a lot of our discussions in front of the public, which can be attended by the public and also is broadcast. So I understand your concern about feeling maybe that you haven't met with everyone, but as we know through the budget cycle that we experienced is a lot of times the ideas that we have come out first before the public in these discussions so that they are public discussions. We do have the message board that everyone can have access to that we do try to post. And I know the chair has really tried to post her amendments on that too. So we are a little -- we are really regulated with open meetings so we do have to have a lot of our discussions on the dais. So that would be one. And two, as

she mentioned, this is a lengthy process. It still has to go to council. As we found in many recommendations from committees, the council will independently decide what will happen and sometimes the vote can be very different and sometimes things can stay in, sometimes they get taken out. So there is still a lot of opportunity for dialogue back and forth.

[4:38:54 PM]

>> Troxclair: Thank you, councilmember. I think the important thing is that we have this information in advance because these are huge structural changes that are going to have to happen with respect to the company with these types of fees being proposed. [Garza]. What I saw with respect to that sheet that was posted, for example, by atd, those are fees that are higher than we pay for some state usage. So it certainly would be great to have more information about how those fees are being utilized, and more information about what motions are going to be offered, you know, prior to us coming to the meetings so that we can alert our community as to what's happening. >> Kitchen: That's fine and we did post these motions prior to this meeting. Okay. >> Garza: I think what councilmember Gallo was saying is sometimes we don't know what motions are going to be made. So just to let you know that sometimes if there's motions and amendments ahead of time, some councilmembers will post that to the bulletin board, but during conversation amongst ourselves, sometimes an amendment or idea just happens. I mean, that's how open government works. >> Kitchen: And I'd also just like to say that this information was posted and shared prior to this meeting. So -- and we'll have -- one reason we have this. This is the first step in four steps. We have a lot of time for more discussion. Yes. >> Zimmerman: Thank you. Before we go off this, one more quick note. Is the committee here interested in making an attempt with Austin traffic department to do the computation of how many miles they think are being driven on Austin roads? So we have a certain budget that we're spending to reconstruct and maintain our roads, and there's probably some number -- it's not going to be easy to compute that, but there's some number of mileage that we think is being driven. And then look at the percentage of the total miles that regular taxpayers are driving, then there's this additional taxi and tnc road mileage. Is there -- can atd compute that for us with

[4:40:55 PM]

10% or 15% accuracy? >> [Inaudible - no mic]. >> Kitchen: We can't hear your mic. >> Sorry. Gordon durr again. So we currently get from the taxi companies the amount of mileage they spend carrying passengers and the rest of the mileage when they're under operation. So at this point I guess we'd have to ask the tncs if they would be able to provide us with similar information. By we could certainly show you with the taxi companies what percentage. Rough calculation, I think about half the mileage was under fare and half the mileage was people driving to get to pick up the fare. >> Zimmerman: That's excellent, but the other part of the question, the data that's very important, we have a certain figure of tax dollars the city is using for road maintenance, reconstruction. We know that number. Then there's another unknown number of what's the total mileage of all the buses, cars, vehicles? There's a total mileage number. Can we know that and compare that total to what's being added by the tncs and taxis and use that as a rational way to say here is your fee for your part of the road construction reconstruction budget? See where I'm going with that? >> It would be very comparable to the rough proportionality calculations we do now where we look at a private development and based on that activity we get miles of travel and convert that into usage of roadways. >> Zimmerman: That sounds good. Maybe we can do that then. >> Yes. >> Zimmerman: I'd love to see that in two or three weeks. Can we do that? >> Yes. With the data that we have. >> Garza: I want to be clear, though, this is American that's spent right now through the budget, but there probably is a lot more that should be

spent on -- >> Zimmerman: It could come from here. >> Garza: That's what I'm saying. Are we using those Numbers to say what is being spent now or what should be spent to keep

[4:42:57 PM]

our infrastructure? >> Zimmerman: We could do it either way. We could say here's what's being spent now and because this additional activity on the roads, let's apply that same dollars per mile and use that as a base for the fee? >> Garza: I guess my point is it's not necessarily because of extra drivers. I'm saying right now there's not enough money in the budget to find everything that transportation -- not even considering tncs, like taking tncs out of it, what's used in the budget right now to improve our infrastructure could be probably quadrupled and it's still not enough to keep up with the upkeep in our city. >> Zimmerman: This could help on the roads. They don't drive on sidewalks and the boardwalk and the lake. The taxis and tncs are on roads and those fees could be applied to roads, additional revenue for roads because that's what they use. >> Kitchen: [Inaudible]. You can sit down now. We'll probably have more questions. So all right, now we're going to move on to the next item and I'd like to propose that we take up the issue of the -- issue related to the fingerprinting next. So I'll lay this out like I did the last one so we could have people understand. If we could put this up on the -- so this is the issue of using boyio metric -- bio metric information based on criminal background checks. I would like to say two things before we talk about the specific motion. The first is that one of the responsibilities -- from my perspective, one of the responsibilities of the city is public safety. And this is another item

[4:45:00 PM]

where we treat our tnc drivers differently than all the other drivers that are driving in the city. For example, the fingerprinting is something that is done as part of a criminal background check of taxis as well as -- taxis, limos, charter, all other types of ground transportation. So from my perspective, this is a question of public safety and it's a question of equivalency. And not only do we -- have we made the decision as a community that for public safety purposes that fingerprinting is an appropriate and best practice approach to criminal background checks, but we do that also for many other types of professions that work with the public, all the way from teachers to bus drivers to realtors. And so I'm bringing it forward -- I'm bringing this motion forward with that in mind. So let me just speak to -- this is again a motion that was posted on the message board and I'm going to walk through it. Just so that everyone has an understanding of what's in it. So amend city code to address public safety. The city manager is directed to initiate an amendment to address public safeties as it includes tncs that include the following provisions, and there's four parts to this proposal. The first is to align the background check process for tnc drivers with the process for taxis so that the check is conducted -- [applause]. Conducted nationwide for both types of drivers. And that would mean amending the taxi ordinance if necessary to allow for a nationwide process. The second bullet is to align the driver

[4:47:00 PM]

eligibility standards for tncs with that for taxis so that a history of certain offenses is treated the same with regard to an eligibility to drive. And the issue there is allowing some opportunity for re-entry for drivers. The third bullet is to add a fingerprinting requirement for tnc drivers that collect the same fingerprinting information for tncs as is collected for taxis and other ground transportation drivers. The fourth item is to authorize the Austin transportation department to contract with a third party to manage the background check process so that the process is completed quickly and does not create barriers for onboarding drivers. I want so say as to that last item I think it's important for all of our

drivers, our taxi drivers as well as other types of drivers, that we take a look at the process for fingerprinting and the background check process to make that as expeditious a process as possible for all our drivers. And we understand -- we've received some information from D.P.S. About the process for fingerprinting and the possibility of working with a contract with more of a trust, which I understand we already have with regard to our hr fingerprinting, hr background check. So that would allow for multiple places that people would go and get fingerprinted and it would also allow for some efficiencies so that a driver doesn't have to, you know, take -- get their fingerprints, take it from there to the city and back and go through a long process. So the purpose of that last bullet is to be clear that what we are aiming for is a process

[4:49:04 PM]

that is completed quickly and does not create barriers for onboarding drivers. So those are the four bullets that are part of this proposed motion. So I would make that motion for purposes of discussion. Do we have a second? Discussion, questions, comments? Yes, go ahead. >> Zimmerman: Thank you, councilmember kitchen. I'd like to bring our tnc representatives up to the mic if I could again because we just discovered something today on money.cnn.com, and I would like to put this up. I only have a can copy. We just saw it today. There are more studies coming out that are comparing the safety, the relative safety of problems that they've had with taxi franchises versus problems with the tncs because I hope that our committee recognizes there's no such thing as a perfect safety solution. We'll have risk no matter what we do. So what we're trying to do I think in our community is get the best safety we can for the dollar and have an affordable ride and have some measure of background checks. So money.cnn.com, October 7. According to the study on the CNN website they said the cities with the safest ride share drivers are Seattle, San Francisco and Austin. So Austin was the third safest based on this study they've already done. There's also some assertions here that I can't vouch for either way, but I've heard a lot of discussion about this. The taxi franchises telling me that their safety checks are better. The tncs say that no, their background checks and safety record is better. And my answer to this question is let the consumers decide. Let's let people that pick -- right now people have a choice to take a tnc or they can call up a taxi. So they have a choice

[4:51:05 PM]

today. And choices are great for consumers in my mind. So I have to object to all of these points, all four of them, on the basis that it removes the choice from our constituents and consumers about what they would like to do. So there's an argument about leveling the playing field, but that takes away the element of choice that the consumers currently have. Right now they can choose a tnc based on the tnc safety record or they can choose a taxi. So I'm going to be opposed to all four of these, but I would like to discuss all four of these separately. Maybe you could give us some comment on the tnc perspective from the tnc perspective. >> I'll keep it short, but I think there's a couple of points to be covered. One, there's a lot of misinformation about fingerprinting generally. All of these things are different ways of accessing databases. And these databases contain certain types of information. Councilmember Zimmerman is right, no one process is going to be 100% accurate every time, but the problem with fingerprint databases is it discriminates against individuals who are arrested, but not necessarily ever charged or convicted. Fingerprint databases are arrest databases primarily. Some do include dispositions, but not all. And certain communities are more likely to be arrested. So we find that this is a process that in fact is actually discriminatory. There are also times that you can be charged and convicted, but not fingerprinted. DUI's, you might get sent home. You might -- you might get charged with domestic

[4:53:25 PM]

[indiscernible]. It's a snapshot in time about an individual's history. It facilitates safety that is unparalleled by taxi and limo. They can't do it. It's not meant to be a criticism. Their model just doesn't support it. Our technology allows for gps tracking. Every time for those of you who have not used Uber or Lyft, every time you request a ride you see your driver's face, their name, their license plate, their make and model. You know who is coming to pick you up and you can verify that before you get into a vehicle. Your trip is tracked all the time. In fact, with our app you can share your map, the route you're taking in realtime with a loved one through it. Payments are cashless so the driver is not a target for theft. And there are several other features in the app that ensure safety. We at Uber have dozens of people that are working full time on looking at our product and ensuring its part of what we do. I respect the council's desire to discuss this issue. We're really eager to engage in it. But we do believe that what we do in totality is extremely comprehensive. It is very safe. It is what drives us. It's what makes us successful. And we do believe our background checks are extremely thorough. >> Yes. I wanted to add I agree with what the representative from Uber was saying, Adam. The the other thing that I wanted to add is that from our perspective we are concerned about the process that's going to go into place. Lyft does not currently operate in my jurisdiction that requires a fingerprint, including Houston, which I know has been referenced on this dais. We have received a memo which I would be happy to share with the committee after the hearing, talking about what is going to be the cost of including potentially tens of thousands of drivers who

[4:55:25 PM]

are now going to be part of this driver funnel of fingerprinting. Who is going to be responsible for making sure that process occurs. And in Houston the estimates were that it could increase the work load up to a thousand percent, which could potentially cost the city almost a million dollars. So we do have concerns about the extent to which it will have an impact on our users and the other thing that I would say is that we are very concerned about the impact that it could have on certain communities. 58% -- 20% of our drivers are coming from east Austin. We know that we have people who are using this to supplement their income and it is a way that they are able to make ends meet in Austin. And if they are forced to go through a process that is giving a false positive because there's no final disposition on the case or it's only an arrest, then that's unfair to foes comments. And we know based on research that in Texas in particular about a third of D.P.S. Records do not have a final disposition on the case. So we have a third-party background check process and so what we're asking is that it not be duplicated. We're happy to have a discussion about what is wrong with our background check process. We haven't received any complaints. Our understanding is that other councilmembers aren't receiving safety complaints. So we're happy to have that conversation, but I think we reject the premise that fingerprinting is the only way to guarantee safety. [Applause]. >> Kitchen: Do we have any comments? Councilmember Gallo? >> Gallo: Thank you for the comments. I appreciate that. Could we get staff to talk a little bit. I believe that with taxis we require fingerprints. And then also if the fingerprints -- I think we had this discussion when we were talking about the taxi franchises, I think that when the application indicates that someone was living out of the state that you would do additional work in that community as far as -- could you describe the process? >> Carlton Thomas, Austin transportation department again. Not just taxi drivers, but also for permit

[4:57:25 PM]

holders in the city are required to submit to a fingerprint background check. And as a part of the application process one of the pieces of information that we seek is if an applicant has lived outside of the state of Texas during a certain period of time. And if so then they're required to secure a fingerprint background check from the governmental agency where they used to reside. >> Gallo: And the representatives -- thank you for bringing this to our attention. Said that there are two situations. One is that some information is not reflected on a fingerprint report, but the other is that sometimes information is reflected that may have not resulted in a conviction. How do you handle that with the taxi fingerprinting process as you already do it? >> Yes. In the instances where there is no disposition that's provided on their criminal background check, the applicant is asked to provide a disposition to the city. Which basically requires contacting the clerk of the court to indicate that charges were dropped or they were dismissed, whatever. We do not permit or make an assumption on the disposition. We require the applicant to provide a disposition. [Applause]. >> Gallo: So >> Gallo:so does that process address your concerns. >> I might steal her thunder on this one. I think the answer is no. The reason is when we conduct our background check we are doing that on behalf of the -- of the applicant because we're aware that the more friction -- the more steps you put between someone -- and I think a key component is -- I don't know the exact number for Lyft but I'll say for Uber, 50% of our drivers are on the platform for less than ten hours a week. So the more steps and the more costs and the more hoops you make someone jump through, the less chance they're going to take advantage of this economic opportunity and even

[4:59:26 PM]

test. So we undertake that work on the applicant's behalf. April can speak more to her experiences with it. >> I wanted to make sure that I was specifically responding to the question, and I think one of the things that was left out of the background check process -- I can appreciate the fact that if there's a driver who has lived in another jurisdiction that they will require disposition from that jurisdiction but that's not comprehensive enough based on our platform we do a social security trace that looks as where people are voted, they have permits, where they might have property, anyplace where there's a footprint it is about where they live and play. We do a search of all of -- of millions of databases across the country, even looking for outstanding warrants. So not only do we have a problem with this process because we don't believe it's comprehensive enough but we believe it's providing false positives. I think at the end of the day what we want to say is there's more than one way to do this process. If taxis want to have their process that's something they can advertise to consumers, that they do have a fingerprint. From our perspective, we're perfectly willing to disclose to any kind of consumer that there is no fingerprint process that we do a third-party background check. But we're very proud of our process because we know it's not just the initial background check, it's all the safety features that go into this, including a million dollars in commercial insurance. >> Gallo: But you really didn't answer my question. My question was one of the concerns specifically you brought up that you were concerned with the fingerprinting because if something showed up you doesn't know the disposition, whether that resulted in arrests or whether the charges were dropped. So the staff meant -- said that if that is the case, and something shows up, then the fingerprint report doesn't show a disposition to it, then they would require the applicant to bring the proof that it had been dropped. Does that address the concern that you had that doing this did not allow the disposition to be dealt with in a way that

[5:01:26 PM]

situations where somebody was arrested but perhaps it was dropped or not processed would -- would not disallow them from getting their license some. >> -- >> Yeah, I appreciate the question. Still it directs

unnecessarily barriers for entry to individuals. >> Gallo: Once again you're talking around it. I'm asking does this specifically address your concern that somebody in that situation would be allowed the opportunity to be a driver because they could show proof that that -- that that arrest had been handled in some other way than conviction. >> So that does address that specific concern. It still doesn't address the concern with respect to communities of color, who we have found through our partnering with the green lighting institute and other communities of color feel disproportionately that that process is intimidating. The other factor to take into consideration is the fact we just saw reports from obm that 21 -- potentially 21 million fingerprints and -- were released -- I'm not sure where they're going. They're apparently hacked into by the Chinese government. So from the perspective -- this was a public report that I'm happy to share with the committee. From our perspective we also know that the people who utilize our platform are also concerned about the fact that the government has this proprietary information, appear if you're from a -- appear if you're from a community that has been traditionally disenfranchised. >> Gallo: Thank you applauds. >> Kitchen: I have a question. So in -- and this question -- I understand -- I wanted to address something that you standard, in terms of the -- being a barrier to onboarding. One of the items that is part of this motion is to put in place a process that is quick and does not create barriers. So I'm understanding that if we -- you know, assuming --

[5:03:28 PM]

okay. Let me back up. The intention is -- and I think it's quite possible to put in place a process that doesn't create barriers to on-boarding. So if I'm understanding correctly, that's one of your concerns. Is that right? Am I hearing you correctly? >> Exactly. >> Kitchen: All right. I think that's a concern that can be met. The other thing I would say is I do applaud y'all's processes. This is not a statement on how well you're doing the background checks that you're doing. In fact that's why -- that's why we have the first bullet item here that aligns the taxi process with your process, in terms of a nationwide check. So this is not about -- this is about bringing both these processes up for public safety purposes so that they're equivalent or actually the same processes. Because from a driver -- from a perspective of getting -- you know, from a perspective in riding with someone else, I would want, from a public safety perspective, for my drivers to be checked out in the same way. And I would just like to make one statement with regard to your statement about choice. I do not believe from a public safety standpoint that that's a real choice for individuals. I think that -- [applause] >> Kitchen: I think that as a -- and I'm just going to speak for myself. You know, as a woman, I want to know that whoever I'm driving -- whoever I'm riding with has that kind of safety check done, a fingerprint check. [Applause] Because as much of the checks -- I appreciate what y'all are doing, but you're still not tying that individual to what you're checking. Without a fingerprint check, you're not tying that individual to who you're checking, and fingerprint checking is best practices. We see that for a whole range. So that's what I'm saying there. I don't think from a public

[5:05:29 PM]

safety standpoint that there's a reason. [Applause] >> -- To differentiate between types of drivers and I don't think that public safety is a choice because that's a false choice. It's not a real choice for the public. [Applause] >> There's a misnomer there that the background checks that we conduct do not tie the person to the -- >> Kitchen: Okay. >> We are collecting -- >> Kitchen: How do you do that then? >> We are collecting several databases from them, social security Numbers, driver's licenses that have to be approved by the state motor vehicle record, bank accounts. They would have to have opened up a bank account, insurance. All these things have to come together and be resolved. And -- >> Kitchen: Well, you still don't know that that person is the person that's handing you -- how do you know that person is attached to that name? >> This is -- you know, I also appreciate. [Applause] Councilmember, I

appreciate your -- >> Kitchen: Could y'all, please -- I'm sorry we need quiet because we're trying to have a conversation. Thank you. >> I appreciate the safety. I'm a woman too, woman of color. I've had situations where I've had a problem getting a ride. And I appreciate there's a platform now where any time there's someone coming to see me I see the picture of the driver, make and model of the vehicle. I can send my rider coordinates to a family member so that my husband can track my ride until I reach my destination. So from our perspective, the fingerprint isn't necessarily making a safer process, especially when you take into consideration all of the other factors that we're doing. You spoke about aligning our process with the taxis. So my question for the committee is are the taxis going to be required to have gps tracking in every vehicle, to be able to share the ride, every single vehicle -- >> Kitchen: Please, please. >> To have \$1 million in commercial insurance, to have a picture of the driver, make and model of the vehicle, to be able to zoom in on the license plate, a 24/7 trust and safety team because that's going to be true alignment.

[5:07:29 PM]

>> Kitchen: Okay. Did anybody have -- wait. Councilmember Garza. >> Zimmerman: I'm sorry. >> Garza: Yeah. I guess I just want to go back to the original ordinance that was always intended to be looked at again, and it was -- you know, there's been a lot of -- a lot of stuff has happened between then and now, and as the chair mentioned best practices. But, I mean, the article that you referred to, Seattle, the safest city, Seattle requires fingerprints. [Applause] >> Garza: Of their tncs so I would want Austin to be in that list. And I -- >> That's not true. >> Garza: I don't know. Looking at the crowd and who the tnc drivers are and the taxicab drivers are, the argument of this -- this hurts minorities, if you look at the people who are the taxicab drivers who are fingerprinted, the majority of the minorities in the room. So I'm having a hard time being sympathetic to the argument that this hurts communities of color. And I -- and to councilmember Zimmerman's point of it's a consumer's choice, I agree it's the consumer's choice, but I, as an elected official, I'm the one that's going to have to answer that call of someone whose loved one was hurt. And I'm not willing to be able to justify if there was one tiny thing I could have done to put in place and say this is why I didn't do it. And so -- [applause] I feel this is simply a protection, it's a protection for our constituents and austinites and that's what my job sup here. >> Kitchen: So, councilmember Zimmerman, did you have something? Okay. >> Troxclair: I just wanted a clarification. I think the Seattle and Austin were two of the three safest cities and I guess Seattle was brought up. Does Seattle require

[5:09:30 PM]

fingerprinting for tncs? >> They do not. >> They do not. >> Troxclair: Okay. >> This report says it does. >> Zimmerman: Not for tncs. >> Garza: It says in this report they do. >> Troxclair: Will you explain maybe the confusion is. >> Kitchen: Yeah, because we have a document that says that it does. >> I'm not sure. But I'm happy to provide that information. [Applause] >> Kitchen: Please, please. >> We're operating in Seattle and so we don't operate in any jurisdiction that requires a fingerprint. >> Garza: Is that because of the -- I mean, clearly that's a decision -- it seems that you have consistently made. Have there been cities that you have -- that Lyft has decided not to operate in because of the requirement of a fingerprint? >> Correct. So Houston is a city that required a fingerprint, as well as a number of other requirements, that I think we might actually discuss as part of this process. Seattle is another city that -- Seattle. San Antonio was another city that we were forced to leave because of that requirement. And we've recently entered into an operating agreement with them, where there is no fingerprint required. Kansas City is another city that requires a fingerprint. We do not operate that. A county recently passed an ordinance that requires a fingerprint and we don't operate there as well. These are decisions we take

seriously. We know based on or driver population, part-time nature and all the factors we discussed there's no way we're going to be able to have the critical mass of drivers we need operating on a part-time basis in order to be able to make a profit in that city. >> Troxclair: It does seem like as a -- it's a sticking point or something that is very critical in the operation of your business model if you're making the decision to actually pull out of entire markets and not operate. >> We've done the same in San Antonio and Brower county. >> Kitchen: I'd like to point out that Uber is operating in Houston, right? Where

[5:11:31 PM]

fingerprints are required. Right? >> Yes, there was one of the -- >> Kitchen: Okay. >> -- First cities to pass an ordinance and indeed since that time every other city that has gone that route, the very few that have, I believe it's only two at this point, we've decided not to -- we cannot operate. It just takes -- it does not scale, it does not work with the model. >> Kitchen: But you are still working -- operating in Houston, correct? >> That is correct. >> Kitchen: I'm sorry, councilmember troxclair. I didn't mean to interrupt if you want to ask another question. >> Troxclair: I just want to make sure if it's not the committee or the council's intent to put tncs out of business, if it truly is about public safety and making sure we have an even playing field and all that I would just encourage the committee to think really carefully about this provision because it does seem pretty clear that if a fingerprint requirement is put into place that there's a very good possibility that we will not have transportation network companies anywhere in the city. [Applause] >> Kitchen: I would just have to say that I don't think -- that -- thank you, councilmember troxclair. I don't think it's appropriate. I don't think that if -- okay, let me just say this. Public safety is a key -- it is our job. And I know that you're operating in other cities that have fingerprinting, and to threaten to leave simply because we're trying to protect public safety cannot meet -- cannot be my deciding determining factor because there are other tnc companies. Tncs are part of our -- they're part of our present and future and they will be here. [Applause] >> Kitchen: And I just don't think it's appropriate, and I think it does a disserve to threaten to leave. I'm sorry, I just have to say that. >> Troxclair: Okay. Well, I guess -- I didn't hear you threaten to leave. I'm sorry that I asked a question in a way that may have come off that way because

[5:13:32 PM]

I just asked whether or not you required fingerprints in those certain cities. So I hope did you not intend to make a threat. That was my own assumption based on clearly what has happened in other cities. But I am curious. So is there -- what is -- I thought -- I think I read an article that talked about San Antonio model, the city there decided to do a -- to basically leave it up to the driver whether or not they want to submit to fingerprinting. And then the consumer, the customer, the person requesting a Lyft or Uber can make the decision to have a driver that went -- that did -- that went through fingerprinting or injured went additional background checks. Is that accurate? >> So that's reflective in an agreement that only Lyft has reached. >> Troxclair: Okay. >> So we have not yet launched. The idea is that it would be a 9-month pilot program and an opportunity for the city to see whether if they provided free fingerprinting for drivers, that they could voluntarily submit to an additional background check, fingerprint-based background check and that that would provide them with an additional appeal to consumers. >> Troxclair: Yeah, I think that's an interesting idea. I think we're probably hearing from the conversation today that the fingerprinting issue is a very important issue to the members of the committee. So if there are other ideas that may work or that you can come up with that may work for both the city and to give us the public safety assurance, as well as for the company, I guess I would just suggest that you bring those forward so that they can be considered. >> Kitchen: Okay. I think that -- I think -- just a

second. Did you have your hand raised? Yeah. >> Garza: Does Lyft operate in New York City? >> So Lyft does operate in New York City. >> Garza: Don't they require fingerprints? >> So in New York we don't have the peer to peer model. That means they're not people

[5:15:33 PM]

using their personal vehicles to operate on a peer to peer basis. New York City is the one place people who are already commercially license ready on-boarded on the platform and using dispatch. They're using the app to dispatch. >> Garza: But Lyft does operate in a city that requires fingerprints. >> In that case we're not onboarding people who are not full-time commercial drivers. It's not a platform that we want or the one that the pilot has -- that has been going on in Austin is reflective of. Neither is it based on other 64 cities that we operate in. >> Garza: But you do operate in a city that requires fingerprints? I think you answered that. Thanks. >> Kitchen: Okay. Let's see. Did you have something? Okay. Did you have something? >> Zimmerman: Yeah. >> Kitchen: Go ahead. >> Zimmerman: I have a couple things. I have a couple of points on this. So I've heard two reasons for the fingerprints. The fingerprints are a biometric identifier, and there's been some concern raised that a biometric -- if I understand councilmember kitchen correctly, biometric identifier is necessary to confirm someone's identity, and I don't agree with that. And if it is true, then what would stop the city from demanding -- because in some cases fingerprints -- people's fingerprints are messed up. They have injuries. It's not 100%. People are misidentified, right, through fingerprints I think about seven or 8% of the time, people are misidentified or not located. Could the city then say we need a blood sample to do your DNA, to identify you that way? Maybe a retina scan? Maybe a voice print? There are a lot of other biometric identifiers that the government could then demand to prove who you are. And that's to me the wrong direction to go. I think it's a terrible direction to go. The second thing about safety. So we've been talking about drivers. So we have fingerprints for the taxi drivers and now maybe tncs. What about the passengers? Is the city not concerned with

[5:17:34 PM]

safety? Put that in quotation marks. Is the city not concerned with the "Safety" of the drivers who pick strangers who haven't had fingerprint background checks. [Applause] >> Zimmerman: So I have to categorically reject the idea that city government should be in the business of forcing people to surrender biometric identifiers in the name of safety for the reasons I pointed out. I'm going to be voting against this. >> Kitchen: Thank you, councilmember Zimmerman. Councilmember Gallo, did you have something? >> Gallo: So part of my struggle with your company's not wanting to do fingerprinting is that, in the industries that I've worked in it's required. So as a realtor, fingerprinting is required. As a mortgage broker, fingerprinting is required. And at my -- my friends that are in the title business that close loans on properties, fingerprinting is required. So we were just curious what other industries use that as a best practice to require? In my business as a realtor, you know, I may put a person in the car with me to drive them around, but it's after they know me. It's certainly not before they know me, and I'm required to get a fingerprint. In the mortgage business, they are coming to my office. And I'm required to get a fingerprint. So, anyway, the list is aid, the school district requires fingerprinting for everyone, including the people that drive their buses, day cares require fingerprinting. Adoptions require fingerprinting. Foster care. Nurses require fingerprinting. Physicians, insurance companies, private security to get a capital access pass, pharmacy licensing requires fingerprinting. I mean, and the list goes on. So it's -- you know, the argument -- death, if you're a dentist, it requires licensing. The board of professional

[5:19:35 PM]

engineering. The Texas board of architectural examiners. So there are lots of industries that have gone in that I think are much less risky for the public that require fingerprinting. So I just -- I have a hard time understanding that. Then the second part of that is that I understand that you would be concerned with a process that takes a long time. I don't remember either of the two processes when I got my two different fingerprinting cards done that, it was a lengthy process, that I had to stand in line for a long time. It was very seamless. In fact I was surprised it took as little time as it did. So we actually today tried the process through the dps website. What we found is that you go online and you set an appointment. It looked like the appointment was about four or five days to get there. So you can't do it today and get it tomorrow. But there is a little bit of a wait period. Then the turn time is three to four days. So you're looking at a week, maybe week and a half to get this process done. So I think that that, too, tells me that it's not a process that would add exorbitantly to the wait time. And I'd love for you to respond do that because I'm really struggling with the fact that a mortgage broker and realtor and for a lot of friends that work in industries, it's a given. I mean, it's a requirement. >> I appreciate that, councilmember Gallo. I think what I would say about that is, once again, it's really important to remember that fingerprinting is just one way of accessing a particular type of database. No one is here -- no one here is arguing that there should not be thorough background check processes. We firmly believe in the safety of our system and he believe that background checks are important feature of that system. I think where people sometimes get, unfortunately, hung up is on the way that that background check process has to be run. And we can articulate in a -- now or later all the issues with fingerprinting that raise questions about how effective

[5:21:35 PM]

it is. No background check is going to be 100% perfect so I think it's important to remember that. But no one is arguing that a driver partner should not go through a thorough background check. In fact we voluntarily -- you know, before there was a regulatory structure, our driver partners were going through a national search like the one that has been codified in the ordinance and it's actually the one that the atd recommended that taxi go through this past March. It was our background check that set the standard for it. So I just am -- I just want to ensure that when we're talking about background checks we're talking about background checks and, in that there are different avenues, different ways of collecting information about who the individual is and what their past is. But then, once again, I think it's really important to understand from a comprehensive standpoint how the system works and that is why not only are we fairly confident the person who is getting in the car has a clean background check, the entire system itself is set up to ensure safety of both the rider and the driver in a way that you couldn't have done in an analog world. >> Gallo: And I really do appreciate the model that you use to do that. But our dilemma is that there may be other companies that come forward that don't have that business model. And so our ability to protect our citizens and our public is to have something that at least is an initial step towards that. It may not be the answer to everything, but when I look at multiple other cities that require it and probably hundreds of thousands of people in the state of Texas that have to get fingerprinted in other cities, it just -- I'm struggling with trying to understand why your industry should be the exception. >> If I can actually address the -- [applause] The second part of the first question about a 10-day turn around, whatever it would require. One that would be a cost borne

[5:23:36 PM]

on the individual. If someone is working a regular job 9:00 to 5:00, booking that appointment, getting in,

they've never been on the platform, don't know the opportunities it would provide. The reason why we absorb that responsibility -- and it is a responsibility to run their background check -- is because we know that someone who is looking to try this out, to pay for their kids' soccer game, to send -- to go on that vacation for three years, they're not going to necessarily take -- have the time or the ability to go through that process or spend that money. And so we undertake it for them. It's a more seamless process. It's an extremely thorough and rigorous process and because of the part-time nature of our model, unfortunately, we just see that any time you add unnecessary friction in the system, it indeed affects the way it works. >> Kitchen: Okay. Let's see. So I -- I would like to -- did you finish your questions? >> Gallo: Yeah. >> Kitchen: I'm sorry did you want to say -- >> Garza: I was going to add to that, you know, the one thing that I believe that the tnc conversation has opened up is an entire conversation about potentially doing things differently. And this isn't just a question about transportation network companies. It's really a fundamental question about the shared economy. Other people who are doing, you know, part-time work to earn flexible supplemental incomes and what are the barriers we're going to put in place, how are we going to require them to comply in a more traditional way when that doesn't necessarily meet their business model. So I definitely appreciate that there are other more traditional requires requiring that fingerprint requirement. I have no idea whether plumbers or airline folks have to get a fingerprint as well. There are certainly industries that are not required to do that and they have a lot of interface, they're coming into people's homes. You're flying with them. I think this is about we understand there kneads to be a thorough look at our background process. All we're asking is you look

[5:25:37 PM]

at the record we have over the past year and to consider thinking about this in a new way. >> Kitchen: Thank you very much. I would just have to -- I would just have to say this. I mean, the other industries that are fingerprinted, it doesn't depend on whether you're working part-time or full-time. There are plenty of part-time realtors and part-time folks in other professions that have to be fingerprinted so the distinction about whether someone is part-time or full-time is not persuasive to me. The other thing is we have part-time taxi drivers in these other fields. So I would say that. And so the bottom line for me is public safety. [Applause] And the print -- the print -- the print is the mechanism -- it is a mechanism for determining that the person who is giving you all of this other information is the person that they say they are. And I don't -- I'm not hearing a substitute for that. So with that said, I think that -- I think I'd like to go ahead and see if -- if the committee is lady to vote on -- ready to vote on this motion? Okay. >> Zimmerman: Are we going to consider all of them together? All four of them together? Can we divide them out. >> Kitchen: What would you prefer? >> Zimmerman: I would make a motion we divide out the four and take four separate votes if we could. >> Kitchen: Sure. >> Zimmerman: Thank you. >> Kitchen: So is that acceptable to everyone else? Okay. So we'll start with the first one. And that's aligning the background check process for tnc drivers with the process for taxis so that the check is conducted nationwide. So all in favor of that? Okay. Opposed? Okay. The next one -- the next bullet is align the driver eligibility standards for tncs with that for taxis so that a history of certain offenses is treated the same with regard to eligibility to

[5:27:37 PM]

drive. All in favor. >> Zimmerman: One point of inquiry. You talked a couple minutes about what that means? >> Kitchen: Oh, okay. So the taxi standards are such that -- we may have to ask for the details but the taxi standards are such that there are certain offenses that -- on a showing of I think it's good conduct or some kind of -- that they can still drive. And that's not the case under tncs. Is that correct? >>

That is correct. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Essentially the way that the city code addresses reentry allows for the completion of probation or patrol for certain -- parol for certain convictions or all convictions. >> Kitchen: So that's an opportunity. That has to do with reentry issues and that's a disparity or difference that we have right now between taxi drivers and tncs. >> Zimmerman: Cansky, is that clear to our tnc representatives and do they have any comment on that? It wasn't clear to me what that meant. That's why I asked so thank you for that. >> I would say based on platform there is no waiver or appeals process. If you have a violent conviction, drug or alcohol-related offense you're banned from the platform for at least seven years so there is a look. There are no waivers made for anybody, especially people who have been convicted of violent crimes. I'll leave it at that. >> Kitchen: And there's -- okay, I'd like to clarify that for taxis this is not allowed for all offenses. So if I'm understanding correctly. Could you tell us? >> So the Texas transportation -- I apologize. The Texas occupations code provides that a licensing agency such as ours consider the nature of the crime that was committed in determining whether a license is issued or not. So if a crime -- if an applicant was convicted of a crime were receiving this license would give them an opportunity to commit the

[5:29:37 PM]

crime again, we do not have to license them. >> Zimmerman: Is that an administrative decision that the Austin traffic department makes. >> It's in the city code. >> Kitchen: It's in the code. >> Zimmerman: It's in the code, okay. >> Kitchen: Okay. Are you all ready to vote on this? All in favor of this item. Okay. Opposed. Okay. The next item is add a fingerprint requirement. All in favor? >> Zimmerman: I'm opposed. >> Kitchen: Okay. The last item is authorize the transportation department to contract with a third party to manage the fingerprinting and background check process so that the process is completed quickly and does not create barriers for onboarding drivers. >> Garza: I just want to point out that this -- this one is a direct response to the concerns that, after speaking with tnc representatives, that that is an issue, the onboarding so I want to point that 09. It's been said several times that -- included in the combination you want to be more involved. This is a direct response to that is bringing forth some kind of language that meets -- that understands that situation and tries to get -- so it doesn't hurt your model as much as you say it's going to hurt your model, is to get drivers on board as quickly as possible, taking into account our concerns about safety. And I'm in support of it. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Zimmerman: Okay. Since this is the same point, when voting against this I'm going to note on the record that it is impossible for that process to be completed quickly. And it will create barriers. That's why I'm voting against it. >> Kitchen: All in favor of this last item? Okay, that's 3-1. [Applause] >> Kitchen: So for the record I think I need to read out the record for all four were

[5:31:37 PM]

passed three-one. So thank you. [Applause] >> Kitchen: Okay. I'm going to do a time check right now. It is 5:30 and we have two other items. So -- we do have another meeting in November. So I would ask my fellow councilmembers if we are ready to move on to the remaining items and we can pick up additional recommendations at the next -- November meeting. Is that okay? So I know that there's one -- one in particular that -- relating to record reporting but we'll take that one up in November. Is that all right with everyone? Okay. All right. We're going to move on now. And I do want to say thank you for everyone being here. And I just want to repeat what we said before, that this is the first step in a four-step process. We are here and we look forward to talking with you more as we move through this process. So thank you. [Applause] >> Kitchen: The next item -- we're moving on now to item number 7, a briefing by cap metro on the route study.

[5:33:45 PM]

>> Kitchen:okay. We want to get started. So hi, Todd. >> Yes, ma'am, thank you. My name is Todd, I'm the vice president for strategic planning and development at capital metro and pleasure to be here this too much give y'all a brief update on capital metro. A little bit about our service and our system overall and then I'll delve into a little more detail on the service plan effort we are just now kicking off. Capital metro is deliberating 30 years of service. We've delivered more than 800 million pertaining trips during that time period. Consistently seeing more than 30 million passenger trips per year on our system and more than 100,000 trips on a typical weekday. We were the first transit agency in the state to become 100% accessible with our fleet. We have 14 park and rides in our system today and scheduled to be back next month to talk in more detail about our park and ride program. We also operate metrorail service, on which since we launched that in 2010 we've seen ridership quadruple. One significant thing we've accomplished recently was to implement a realtime passenger information system. That's something that allows customers to see whether our buses are, to use our app or our web interface or other developers' app. We put this out as open source data available to developers to use the data, to share our information with customers, help them understand how the system works and hopefully make it easier to use. As I mentioned we do have our mobile app we've launched. We've had significant success with that, with more than 150,000 downloads to date and you can buy a pass and pay for

[5:35:46 PM]

service with the app, which takes one of the inconveniences of using public transportation, which is having to have the exact amount of change to put into the fare box, that's one issue we've directed directly. No longer need to do that. Few other things. For several years, running the Texas comptroller leadership circle awards. Our service runs nearly 24/7, run extended hour service until the early morning hours and then begin back in the early morning for our full day time service. We have about 3,000 stops in the system. One thing we've done over the past several years to address affordability issues is establish a basic transportation needs program. That provides low-cost passes to social service providers in a partnership structure so that they can in turn distribute those to folks to use our system at a reduced or no cost. We do have wi-fi significantly throughout our system, express buses, metro rapid and increasingly at some of our stations and stops. Then importantly we do have our metroaccess service, delivering about 50,000 trips a month for those unable to use our general fixed route service. One thing we want to -- as we talk about our system, these series of maps hopefully will give you some perspective on where we operate. Here is just generally the city of Austin and some surrounding areas. The area that just lit up there in yellow is the capital metro service area, areas voted in in 1985 when the -- 1985 when the agency was formed, includes all of the city of Austin, few of our outlying suburban jurisdictions and portions of unincorporated Travis county as well as small segment of Williamson county. Here is our local bus network. This is really the core of

[5:37:46 PM]

what we do. Our primer services, as you can see, we cover the core of the city of Austin quite extensively with some routes stretching out into some of the outlying areas as well. This just popped up there, the little purple -- excuse me, P indicators show the current locations of our park and rides. Red routes here show our express services, and these are routes that typically originate at park and rides and extend into the core of Austin, where we serve university of Texas, the state capital complex and the central business district. Our metrorail service shown there, again, 32 mild, nine -- 32 miles, nine stations beginning across downtown, near the convention center and descending out multiple stops

within the city of Austin, as well as up to Leander. Several years ago we implemented our metro rapid service. Hopefully y'all are familiar with that, very frequently service, faster running times with fewer stops, unique buses, unique stations, realtime information displays at our stops and other attributes. And then just this year we implemented a series of high -- what we call high frequency routes. Those are through the were already high ridership in our system. We upgraded those to run every 15 minutes all day long on the weekdays, slightly less often on the weekends, but we have seen an immediate response in terms of ridership. One of the things we're seeing as an industry best practice is to get the service up to every 15 minutes, where possible, and where the land use supports it. And if you get to that threshold, you really will see ridership gains and that has been initially -- we're very early in this, but so far proven that to be the case on these routes. Drilling down a little bit to

[5:39:46 PM]

the core of the Austin area, again, just looking at the overlay of all of the different services we offer, these are the fixed routes that operate throughout the central part of Austin. And outlying areas, such as oak hill and further up to the north and east and west as well. And one interesting thing that we consistently hear is that public transit overall in this region carries a relatively small share of commuter trips. These are trips to and from work or school. And if you look at the entire region, which is about 4000-plus square miles, which is how the census calculates this figure, we are a relatively low percentage but if you look at places where capital metro offers robust service the Numbers are significantly higher. Here's a few examples. One that was really surprising in fact was that in councilmember Gallo's district actually has one of the nodes that has the highest percentage of commuting by transit of any place in the entire city, which is partly an anomaly because we know that that census tract is made up -- tract is made up of apartment complexes housing UT confused we have significant service that runs from UT to that location. Yes, ma'am. >> Gallo: Can I ask you a question. >> Absolutely. >> Gallo: Yes, you're absolutely right, there are a lot of UT students on those buses. How does capital metro get reimbursed for providing that transportation. >> Thank you. We have a cost-sharing program with them that is really two parts. One part is they directly fund the UT shuttle system at 50%. And then for those trips made on our local routes, express routes for metrorail it's on a trip by trip basis. So those two are combined to receive reimbursement from UT.

[5:41:47 PM]

>> Garza: I want to make sure I understand that. I'm very familiar with that process. If a bus route is going specifically between UT and a certain area like it does off of far west, we're only being reimbursed 50% for that? >> Yes, ma'am. >> Gallo: Is there any discussion of increasing that to more appropriately pay for the ridership? >> Sure. That's been a discussion for years in fact and that's something that we've -- we have regular discussions every time our contract with university of Texas comes up. Part of the thinking there is that those UT shuttle routes, the ridership is so high, as I mentioned, as the data indicates, we would -- in the absence of an agreement with UT, if we were prioritizing where to put our transit services, that would be one of the places we'd put it because we generate so much ridership there. So in the absence of an agreement with UT, the -- there would be no subsidy but we'd still be providing the service. So from that perspective, a 50% subsidy is well -- well, basically is a pretty good deal for us. It works out quite well. And if we didn't have that subsidy, then some other service that didn't carry as many riders may go away to continue to maintain those services. So it's been a delicate balancing act for a number of years. With utwith UT overit's been a great partnership. They do comprise a significant portion of our ridership. So I understand the question and the basis for it, but I think overall -- and I'd be glad to discuss in more detail with some more data in hand, but overall we think it is a good

partnership. >> Gallo: How long has it been since UT had their own shuttle system? How long has it been since they shut that down and gravitated to using capital metro. >> I do not know at this moment but it's been decades, yes, we've had that partnership for many, many

[5:43:48 PM]

years. >> Gallo: Thank you. We can talk about this later. I'd be interested in other areas that are a specific route to UT and back. >> I'm sorry, I missed the first part of it. >> Gallo: If there are other bus routes in Austin that are similar to this one, which are specifically to UT and back. >> Right. We have several, obviously, in the west campus area, Riverside area, and couple other areas where there are the dedicated UT shuttle services. >> Gallo: Perfect, thank you. I know the ridership is very strong. >> Yes. >> Garza: I was going to say, it seems like three of these five could be strictly attributed to UT. Because the southeast one is the Riverside route that is a bunch of UT students. >> In that case that's a portion of it but we have significant ridership in the example overall from the southeast area, not just UT students. >> Garza: Okay. >> Similarly even in the north and west campus example, there's quite a bit of ridership. Obviously students predominate there but there is other ridership there as well. One other thing -- and preparing for the presentation we looked at some data that had just been put together and kudos to city of Austin staff for putting this together but this was an interesting map that looks at where residential development has occurred in the Austin area over the past several years. You can see the three real hotspots, and I thought -- I wanted to include this today because I think there's the correlation is pretty striking in the sense of where this growth is occurring is also strongly linked to where capital metro has predominant relatively high level of service. So the first area up near the lakeline transit -- where we have a transit center, major park and ride, metrorail and significant express bus service in that area. Second, in the domain area we're seeing tremendous residential development there as well, and similarly we have a metrorail station with the

[5:45:49 PM]

Kramer station, as well as one of our two metro rapid routes serves that area and actually tempts in the domain area. So frequent service and some of the hot transit service in the region are basically where this growth is happening. So we don't think that's a coincidence. As you all know with the passage of the ordinance a number of years ago and then the boom in west campus development and, once again, we have significant levels of transit service there as well. That -- just a little background I wanted to move into, the major initiative we have coming up, and that is called service plan 2025. What is that? Well, it's -- the net result is a document that will guide the expansion and enhancement of our service over the next ten years. We did the first effort of this was done in 2010, and since that time we've been using it consistently as a guide for how we make changes to our system to improve service and gain efficiencies and effectiveness in our service. So given that we know that this is one of the fastest growing communities in the country, there's been tremendous change just since that 2010 time period, and we believe it's time to update this, and that's what we will be doing soon. You all have seen these Numbers before. But just as a brief reminder, 11th largest city, significant congestion, rapid growth, all of these are reasons to not only regularly but periodically bring in some outside fresh set of eyes and perspective to kind of examine our system comprehensively. We make changes on a 3-time-a-year basis but typically they're smaller scale. This is really take a thorough

[5:47:50 PM]

look at the whole network of service. Importantly as you'll hear in just a community to bring in the

community and key stakeholders to get their input as well. As I mentioned we did this in 2010. The board adopted the plan. Excuse me. I jumped ahead there. Most recommendations have been implemented. We did have some that required additional revenue and up until recently the agency had not been in a position to expand service, so we were essentially taking lower ridership service and realigning those resources to put them in places where we expected to gain more ridership. So we made some very difficult choices during that time. Eliminating some of our poor-performing routes but we did make some significant enhancements as well. So what happened, we have the frequent service network was one product of that study effort that I mentioned. More frequency, higher ridership. In some cases what we call one-seat rides meaning you don't need to make a transfer. In partnership with the city we established for 91st time in central Texas history the transit priority lanes right here on Guadalupe and Lavaca. One specific example was route 100. We have limited stop service that formerly ran on seventh street connecting the airport to downtown. The study looked at that, made a recommendation that if we shifted that over to Riverside, that we would get more ridership, better productivity, and better overall results. We did that, and we did in fact see an 80% ridership gain on that route and productivity was just passengers per hour also went up by more than 20%. What would be the goals for such a planning effort? Those are ultimately set by the board and, again, with significant stakeholder and public involvement. But generally we'll look at some of the trade-off issues that we face with public

[5:49:51 PM]

transportation. Generally, one of the key ones is kind of been of spreading your service out so that there's coverage throughout your service area versus more of a focused effort, where you concentrate your service on those higher ridership areas. Generally speaking this is something transit agencies across the country face. You can't do both with limited resources. So you -- the board and the public helped guide the decision onto which one makes more sense for your community, that meets the values of your community, and meets the needs as well. Increasing ridership was a common goal. One -- you all heard the discussion earlier in your meeting today and the related things with Rocky Mountain Institute. Uber, Lyft, autonomous vehicles, all these things. This study will look at how transit fits in with all of these emerging mobility solutions. And overall creating a more effective system. Up some of the things we'll be doing in terms of the specific tasks, as I mentioned significant public involvement of a variety of forms, specific outreach to low-income or limited English proficiency audiences, web-based tools, pop up meetings, open houses, stakeholder groups, everything we can think of in terms of gathering public input we'll be doing over the next year. The public input component will really kick off in 2016. >> Kitchen: Todd, can I interrupt you for a second. >> Do you want me to hurry up? >> Kitchen: I'm sorry we have to take one vote before 6:00. >> I will move quickly. >> Kitchen: We have someone that has to leave at 6:00. >> Let me wrap up then. As I mentioned I think I've covered most of these. We will be doing significant data in this process as well. So it will be a marriage of strong data and analysis with public input. We'll come up with a response -- fiscally responsible plan. The team we've picked to do it

[5:51:53 PM]

has done over 756 -- 75 of these studies across the country. We feel confident they know how to do these and produce good results. Again, here's a summary of the time line, about a 1-year effort, can extend longer if that's what our board wants to do but that's the goal we're setting, to wrap this up by next fall so we can begin implementation in early 2017. That's the end. >> Kitchen: So I would just say thank you, and I think there will probably be opportunities in the public engagement part of this to work with the councilmembers. >> Yes, ma'am. >> Kitchen: For their districts. So I'm sure that a number of the councilmembers would like to, you know, work with the public engagement portion and maybe can be

helpful in helping the vendor to reach out. >> Yes, ma'am. >> Kitchen: In their districts. >> We've specifically included that in the scope of work. >> Kitchen: Yes, I know. That's great. Do you guys have any questions? >> All right. Thank you. >> Kitchen: Thank you very much for being here. >> You're welcome. >> Kitchen: Okay we're now going to go to agenda item number six that relates to the appointment to the cag. And I'm checking real quick to make sure we didn't have a speaker on that bun. Did we? Okay, David. >> I'm going to be very brief. >> Kitchen: Yes. >> I have to go to the environmental board meeting. >> Kitchen: Yes. >> So, anyway, I'm just here to urge you to please consider appointing Jack or Jim to the code advisory group. You might have expected know say that. I know sometimes when we're making these appointments to the boards that it's hard to, you know -- because this is dynamic, it's hard to know what we're going to end up with on a particular board and

[5:53:54 PM]

we might end up with more from industry than you might want to have on one board, you know, or we might run into a situation where the code or the city charter doesn't allow that number of folks from, you know, industry to be on a particular board. So I would hope that as you're considering appointments that you're looking to see -- that you're keeping an eye on that as well so we don't end up where we've overloaded with too many folks from industry and have to backtrack and change it. Thank you. >> Kitchen: Thank you. Okay. >> Kitchen: Did we have someone else signed up to speak on this item? Oh, okay. If you could, do you mind keeping it to a minute or two? >> All I have to say is my name is Bo, I live in south Austin. I'm here to state my interest to be a part of the cag, representing the mobility committee. I have emailed you my statement of interest. If there's any questions or you guys would like to ask me anything, I'm here to answer any questions. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Gallo: What district do you live in. >> I'm in district 5. >> Gallo: Thank you. >> Zimmerman: I'm sorry. I didn't get the email. Can you tell me in 30 seconds who you are. >> Again, I've lived in south Austin for seven years and I'm a traffic engineer. Consultant here in town. I have worked on various traffic projects from zoning applications to site plans. I've worked on multimodal projects. I have a strong relationship with atd, with txdot, I have a intimate understanding of our condition here and have very out of the box solutions that I've come up with on various projects. I feel I'm qualified and I feel that I would be able to provide a very good input and it would make me proud as a citizen here to provide

[5:55:56 PM]

solutions and input on how we're going to move forward on transportation traffic. >> Zimmerman: That's all good but you could have just told me you're a Texas aggie with a civil engineering degree and you would have had me. >> I am a taxi aggie, December 2007. Thank you. >> Kitchen: I also would want to say if we're not in a position to appoint you today, there are other appointments to the cag and also there are other ways that we can work together. I'd love to sit down and talk with you. >> I understand. Great. >> Kitchen: Okay. Do we have a motion? >> Troxclair: Yeah, I want to thank anybody who sent me -- my office an email wanting to be appointed to this committee. I -- I'm going to make the motion to -- that we appoint Terry Mitchell. I really like his extensive background in development and in transportation. Issues. He's also a member of the capital metro board and so that would be my motion. >> Kitchen: I -- >> Garza: I will say I know he's really busy but apparently he could commit to the time commitment for the cag. >> Gallo: Did he. And I agree with you on the assessment of him. His background is so diverse and, you know, kind of everything he touches he does really well. And really commits himself to it. So I think he'll be a good -- he was on our tour of affordable housing. He does -- he understands the affordability issue and I think that's going to be a good voice as we talk about this, but also he has a lot of expertise in transportation and I love the contact and the connection

with capital metro. I think that's a really important part of this conversation. >> Zimmerman: Remind me the term again, what's the term for. . . >> Kitchen: I believe it's an annual term for the cag. Do we know? Does anyone know?

[5:57:57 PM]

Is it a year-long-term? I don't know that we can answer that, councilmember Zimmerman. So. . . Oh, okay. Mm-hmm. >> Hi, my name is Pauline, planning and zoning department, I'm the staff liaison for the advisory group. I believe the resolution states that this new group would be serving through September of 2017 or until -- unless the project is adopted and finished first. >> Kitchen: Okay. So it's for the life of the project. >> Mm-hmm. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> If it's done by September 2017. >> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you. >> Zimmerman: One of the questions, is this one we're recommending to full council or do we just make -- >> Kitchen: No. We have to recommend it to full council. >> Zimmerman: We do, okay. >> Kitchen: So -- >> Zimmerman: I'd like to call the question. >> Kitchen: Okay. All in favor of the motion? Opposed? I'm. All right. All right. With that, it's -- we had one last item, which we're going to defer to November, and that was a staff briefing on the five most dangerous intersections, including the immediate improvements made to manchaca and slaughter intersection. Let me just say that I know that we all really appreciate how quickly y'all were able to put an interim measure into place on October 1, the first day of the new putting session. So that's very much appreciated and I understand that you guys are also looking at potential interim measures for the other -- the other four intersections so we appreciate that too, and so I'm sorry that we're running out of time right now, but we would -- >> Let me just say it was great staff work. Eric, head of our traffic engineers and our folks that signed the markings, that worked with Jim, that really did a great job. We'll get the powerpoint to you that shows the other

[5:59:57 PM]

locations and what we plan to do on an interim basis there. >> Kitchen: Y'all have to leave too. So, again, we really, really do appreciate it, and I know the public really appreciates it too. We've gotten a lot of feedback. And we've got a lot of feedback. In fact the first day, I was getting tweets from people, texts from people, saying that they -- saying that they really applaud -- they noticed it immediately. So thank you all very much. Okay. With that, we're going to adjourn. Thank you. [Meeting adjourned]