

# Health and Human Services Committee Meeting Transcript

## 10/12/2016

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 10/12/2016 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 10/12/2016

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[2:03:30 PM]

>> Houston: Good afternoon. We're waiting on our quorum. I'm councilmember Ora Houston. A quorum is present. I want to thank councilmember Garza and mayor pro tem tovo for being here with us today. Councilmember troxclair is at home with Juliette Elizabeth troxclair so she is off the dais for this meeting. Today is October 12th, it's Wednesday, we're in the council chambers and the time is 2:04. I'm calling this meeting to order. I want to remind all guests that if you have a parking ticket and need to have it validated, if you would make sure that you come to this and get that done before you exit. You have to pay for it if you don't get the ticket validated. The first item on the agenda, the minutes. Has everyone had an opportunity to review the minutes? Are there any corrections? >> Move approval. >> Houston: Councilmember Garza moves approval, seconded by mayor pro tem tovo, all in favor? It's unanimous on the dais. We have one person signed up for citizens communication. Frank Martinez. Is Mr. Martinez here? >> I'm sorry, I might have

[2:05:32 PM]

signed up to the wrong place but I'm donating my time to miss Carasco. >> Houston: What number is miss Carasco signed up for? >> Number 3. >> Houston: Number 3. Just a minute. Okay. So there are no citizens communications today. Let me refresh this sign-up thing. Okay. Because of the need for the lead abatement people to present and go to some other event, we're going to move their presentation, staff briefing, up to now. So if the folks from -- Rebecca giaello, Rosie truelove, if staff would come up from neighborhood housing and community development, we'll talk about lead abatement. Councilmember Garza was the one that asked for this briefing to be held. >> Thank you, my name is Leticia brown. I am the program manager for neighborhood housing and community development. We always welcome an opportunity to come forth and talk about our programs. The mission of the department is to provide health -- healthy, safety and decent affordable housing. I'm waiting for the presentation. Thank you. >> Houston: The presentation is in the packet. >> The program that we currently have now for lead is our lead and healthy homes program. The goal of the program is to

[2:07:33 PM]

identify and eliminate lead hazards in owner and tenant occupied single-family and multi-family housing. We look for eight elements that tells us that a property is green and healthy. We have 29

health and safety hazards that we screen for when determining that a property meets the green and healthy homes initiative. The program identifies health and safe deficiencies in units identified with lead using healthy homes rating system, and that's the 29-point system that we use. Owner-occupied or rental units must have a child that lives there under the age of 6 or that visits at least six hours in any -- in any seven-day week. The property must have a combined family income below 80% median family income for the city limits of Austin and surrounding cities. Whenever we provide assistance to multi-family properties, at least 50% of those properties, the families have to be at 50% median family income or below. For a family of four, that's \$38,900 a year. Our other properties, the income can be 80% or below and for a family of four that's 62,250 a year that they cannot exceed. For multi-family units, landlords shall give priority to renting units to families with children age 6 or below for three years after assistance has been provided. The landlord is prohibited from increasing the rent on any of the units for which we provided lead abatement. The city will provide a

[2:09:34 PM]

landlord certificate of completion showing that the property is now lead safe and has been cleared. We consider eight things when we determine whether or not a property is green and healthy. We want to make sure that the property is dry, clean, contaminant free, pest free, well ventilated, well maintained and energy efficient. We have some before and after pictures here. The property that we're highlighting today benefited from more than one program. So lead abatement is the permanent removal of lead-based paint hazards. We remove and replace windows with low energy efficient windows, aluminum windows. We remove and replace interior and exterior doors. We remove and replace damaged and rotted siding and trim. We remove and replace soil and sod in the event any of these items have tested positive for lead. The outcome that we look for in these families and houses that we provide assistance to, 9 million families live in unhealthy homes. 14 million families miss days of school each year. 14 million miss days of work each year. Low-income families provide 14 to 20 -- low-income families spend 14 to 20% of their monthly income on utilities versus 3.5% in all other homes. 43 billion plus already spent on lead poisoning. That's how much has been spent on lead poisoning. 51 billion plus has been spent on asthma-related health

[2:11:35 PM]

issues. 19 billion plus already spent on slip and fall injuries. So we are in our fourth year of -- we are in our fourth grant. This is the fourth grant that we are administering under the lead program. Under the last three grants, we provided assistance to 453 units. That was between the years of 2004 and 2011. We expended \$7.8 million. Under the current program, which is the lead and healthy homes program, it's the most recent program and it's the only program that we're currently administering. We received \$2.5 million in program funding, 250 of that was for the healthy homes component. 83 units have currently been completed. The goal was 138 units. We've currently spent \$776,828 under the current program. So eligibility requirements. The funding comes from office of housing and urban development and the city of Austin, neighborhood housing community development is who administers the program. In the search of homes built prior to 1978, including multi-family units, have children under the age of 6 living or visiting the home at least six hours in a seven-day week. They must meet the 80% median family income. And I've already described that. And we can provide assistance in Austin and Travis county. We entered into an interlocal agreement with Travis county in order to be able to provide assistance in the county. So program services.

[2:13:35 PM]

Elevated blood levels testing for children, inspections done by state certified lead inspectors. We have state license risk assessors on staff in addition to those inspectors. We provide services in order to remove and store and professional movers provide those services. We provide temporary relocation. Removal of lead hazards from your home. Qualified state license lead abatement firms is who we contract with in order to accomplish these goals and services. We have an application online. You visit [Austin.texas.gov/empowerment](http://Austin.texas.gov/empowerment). You can mail your application to any CD. The address is listed above. You can contact 311. We have a relationship, a partnership with 311 where they will automatically email applications to people that call to 311 -- call to 311. Our department number is (512)974-3100 if you need information. We're open for questions. >> Houston: Thank you so much for that information. Are there any questions? Mayor pro tem Tovo and councilmember Garza. >> Tovo: Thanks very much for explaining this program. This is really helpful information. I wanted to ask you about the provision that landlords not raise the rent. Is that a requirement from the HUD -- for the use of H.U.D. Funding? >> It is written into the contracts provided for each of the landlords. >> Tovo: And I think that would be an interesting conversation, committee members, to have about our energy efficiency programs. We had the same discussion whether to locally funded energy efficiency rebates to make sure those apartments receiving rebates aren't

[2:15:37 PM]

raising rents and we couldn't get the vote on council to get that passed. So Austin energy is collecting that information now. We should go back and revisit the issue because I think it's really important if we are using these programs to create healthier homes for people if they then can't afford to stay there, we've not accomplished a lot of the goal. I think I had a few other questions but I'll come back to that. Thanks again for providing this really important information. >> Houston: Councilmember Garza. >> Garza: Back on slide 14, it surveillance the funding that we currently have. It says the current grant there's 2.5 million. Does that mean of that 2.5 only 250 can be used for the lead abatement program? >> That is correct, and the property has to test positive for lead before we can provide the healthy homes funding. >> Garza: Is -- does that mean 250 per home or -- >> No. >> Garza: 2.5, we can only use 250,000 for the program for as many houses as needed. >> That is correct. >> Garza: And then it says -- is that the balance? Because I'm confused what the numbers are. 776 currently mean? >> That means that is the available funding that we have now. >> Garza: We have 776,000 available for the lead abatement? Because it's been -- >> Yes. >> Garza: -- 250. >> So of the assistance that we -- of the funding that we received, 250,000 of it was for healthy homes. We have expended all of our healthy home funds. So we have none of that left, but for the lead piece we have the 776,828. >> Councilmember, may I provide just a little

[2:17:38 PM]

clarification. Rosie Truelove and I appreciate Leticia and Kobe's presentation. The grant is for lead abatement in 2.5 million. 250,000 of that was set aside for the healthy homes component, which we could use to make repairs to homes that was in addition to the lead abatement. They had to test positive for the lead abatement. We've expended that entire 250,000. What we have left is the 776,000 for lead abatement. >> Garza: Can you -- >> That's left of the 2.5 million. So an initial grant of 2.5 million was for lead abatement. >> Garza: So there's a healthy homes program that's different from lead abatement. >> So the healthy homes component and my staff will correct me if I am wrong, but the healthy homes was for additional rehab work that could be done to the homes that would be above and beyond what would normally be done as part of lead abatement. >> Garza: Okay. >> That was kind of a

bonus, so to speak, of funds that we could use to do additional work at these homes where we were doing lead abatement and those funds have been expended. The remaining 776,000 is strictly for lead abatement. >> Garza: Okay. And could you help me understand lead abatement, if I qualify -- let's say I qualify for this, what is lead abatement? Do they come in and scrape the walls and get all the old paint off? Do they replace panel or what is lead abatement? >> They do scrape and repaint the home. They replace doors and windows, internal and external and I'll let kobe add anything he may have. >> Kobe Ramirez, the lead program manager. Construction manager. Yes, the house has to test positive for lead and we have to identify lead hazards. Not all lead identified is a hazard so we look for peeling and chipping paint, friction

[2:19:41 PM]

and impact surfaces such as windows and doors. We identify those and we have contractors on staff that we -- our staff developed a specifications form and we assign them to the contract on a rotation list and they all are state licensed abatement firms. >> Garza: Okay. >> Councilmember, slide 11 in your packet is kind of a summary of the general work that's done as part of standard lead abatement. >> Garza: Okay. And so for the income eligibility requirement, my assumption would be just looking at those numbers, are the majority renters or homeowners? >> The majority have been homeowners that we provided assistance to. >> Garza: Okay. And how do they -- how does a family know -- I guess with real estate I thought you had to disclose certain things before you sell a house, but I guess if you are selling a house and you don't know if there's lead problems you wouldn't disclose that. >> I am aware that with real estate contracts it is required that people -- that the realtors provide some type of lead pamphlet. >> Garza: Okay. >> So I am aware of that. >> Garza: And then is there an active program to let residents know of the programs that are available that the city provides? >> We have marketing and outreach staff, neighborhood liaisons, and we show up at events in order to, you know, market our programs. We do advertisement through the radio and some of the news stations. >> Garza: My staff, I saw a map and it looked like we had done a survey of where -- it was a map with a bunch of red dots everywhere. If we know -- is that as specific as the -- that red dot is a house that we know

[2:21:43 PM]

specifically what houses could possibly be contaminated by lead? >> It was my understanding that we provided a map to reflect properties that we've already served. >> Garza: Oh, okay. Has the city ever done a survey that -- that points out where houses could be that -- is it any house built before 1978 basically? >> That's kind of a guide post that can be used to make a determination on whether or not there might be contamination. We also have proactively gone out to different multi-family complexes to talk to them that we know were built before a certain time period to see if we can get in and do testing to, you know, try to be proactive on that side for abating lead when we can. But by and large we're relying on folks to come in and to request the services and we do as much outreach as we can within those communities where we see the houses of that age. >> Garza: Okay. One last question. Of the 776 that's left, once that's spent, is there no more money? Is that federal dollars? >> Yeah, it's a federal grant. That's the end of this grant. I think we would have to make a determination on if there is sufficient need to continue to apply for such grants. What we've seen is fewer and fewer homes coming through the program and so, you know, we're going to just need to do some analysis and weigh those options for gauging the need there. >> Garza: Okay. I lied, one more question, a followup. I guess I assumed that there was more need than money, but you are saying it's possible that there's more money than need? >> Right now we're not seeing the houses coming through the pipeline. Perhaps we

need to do additional outreach. Perhaps any partnerships we can do to get word out about these programs, that would be beneficial. But that's what we -- we just

[2:23:44 PM]

want to make sure as we go forward with looking whether or not we're going to apply for the next round of this funding that we're going to have sufficient houses to meet the performance standards that is expected of the city. >> Garza: Okay. I guess it would be important for us to note, if there's a way to weigh the need, so then we can determine if we indeed need more funding. But how would we -- how could we do that? >> Leticia, please. >> Well, what we've done in the past, we have pulled from the tcad system all properties that were built before 1978. Our planning and policy division has taken those maps and layered it with low to moderate income neighborhoods in order for us to try to identify how many properties that we could reach out to. We've done a mass mailout of about 6,000 in 2015, and we received a pretty good response from that. But what we really notice was that the areas that we thought we would get a lot of lead applications from, the -- there has been a kind of shift in the demographics for the areas. Like over in the east 11th and 12th street area, the area is no longer a low-income area. So on the previous grant those are the areas, some of the areas we were looking at that didn't turn up so good. >> Garza: Okay. >> If I can add to that also, the age of the homes we've identified, the incomes, the third component and criteria is the children so a lot of times there are young families have moved into these areas, that's one of the requirements and they are just not there. >> Garza: Thank you. >> Houston: So I have a couple of questions. On slide 5, it -- regarding the landlord is prohibited from increasing the rent up to

[2:25:46 PM]

a year, is that a federal guideline or is -- is that -- could it be two years or five years? >> That's what the grant -- it's a grant requirement. >> Houston: The one year. >> Yes, ma'am. >> Houston: And that's put in the grant by the federal government. >> Yes. >> Houston: Okay. And then you probably have told me this already and I just need to be reminded, when did this particular program, the one grant that we're operating under now, when was it -- when were the funds available? >> 2013. >> Houston: 2013. Okay. Okay. Thank you. Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: I just have one last question. I know because I've researched it what some of the impacts of lead are, but I thought you might spend a minute or two talking about what the dangers of lead are for young children. I'm not sure that it was -- did you actually do that? >> I did not. Learning disabilities. >> There's a number of -- learning disabilities. A lot of times lead symptoms are mistaken for add and that type of behavior, but it does cause learning -- again, learning disabilities in young children, especially -- that's why it's targeted for children age 6 because the lead dust that's created in these homes becomes -- the children, they are more vulnerable to them because of the children normally don't wash their hands all the time, a lot of times the toys they play with, so it's ingested by the younger kids more. And so it's just a struggle in school. It can be so severe as if they start eating some of these paint chips that why in some of these homes at the older homes, it could even cause death, it's that serious. >> Tovo: Thank you. >> Garza: I have one more question. >> Houston: One question. Who does the lead testing on the children? Certified

[2:27:48 PM]

inspectors. >> A partnership with -- >> Oh, the blood? We have a partnership with a lab company that we send these families to -- have the children tested. I'm sorry. >> Houston: Okay. Thank you. Councilmember Garza. >> Garza: Is there a process, for example, there was a tb exposure at my

daughter's day care so, you know, there was all these alarms that went off and all these things that went done. Is there a similar process for if a child goes in for symptoms and they determine it's lead poisoning, because I'm wondering if there's a way to partner with other agency -- if our health community finds out -- sees some statistics or numbers going in a direction where there's a lot of lead poisoning or one and follow up, I wonder if that's a way to find out where the homes are and the families. Is there any partnership with health agencies about when children have a lead contamination? >> That is something that we're trying to accomplish. I am looking for someone that has worked in the health industry. >> To work with our, like, central health. >> Well, even to work with us and to identify other health agencies that can make referrals to us. We used to go out to children's clinics and leave fliers, but we think that we need to do some more aggressive marketing to health agencies and also have partnerships with health providers. If they will refer children to us. >> Garza: Yeah, I think that would be a really good idea. Okay. Thanks. >> Houston: Mayor pro tem tovo. >> Tovo: Do you advertise the program through aid or any of our other school districts? That would seem to me another way to get the word out through some of our schools. >> We have participated in events for elementary schools. We have done block walking in

[2:29:50 PM]

areas where elementary schools are, but we do try to participate in, like, national nights out and things of -- events like that in order to promote the programs. We do the backpack where we put fliers and information on lead in the backpacks that the city provides to students. >> Tovo: Good. I just wonder if there are other opportunities within our partnerships with those school districts to post things on the school bulletin boards, all the schools have bulletin boards. They send voluminous information home every Monday. That might be another way you could communicate it out. >> We're open -- >> I think these are great ideas that we can certainly explore and as we look to provide additional outreach on these grants. >> Houston: Councilmember Garza. >> Garza: I guess a lot of our -- this I guess is a problem that's systematic outreach and budget basically, so if there is a need for budget, a budget adjustment or something like that to help with that outreach, please let my office know and we'll see what we can do. >> Certainly. We appreciate that. >> Houston: Is that all? Any more questions? Thank you so much for that information. If you have a little link or something that you could send to all the members including councilmember troxclair where we could send it out on our distribution list in the districts that we represent. >> Would that be a link to the lead program only? >> Houston: Uh-huh. >> We'll develop a blurb that you can send out on your mailings. >> Houston: That would be helpful. Thank you so much for coming. Okay. Next on the agenda is item number 3, discussion of animal center survey.

[2:31:51 PM]

And as regarding spay and neutering. Just as you all are coming up, let me give some people who don't know some background. This topic was referred to this committee from mayor Adler and it was based on feedback and observation over the past year. It was something he thought we need to needed to have more open discussion on and we've been working on this a while now ourselves. I want people to understand that one of the reasons that I ran for city council is to ensure that our citizens had an opportunity to be heard and to be -- to express their concerns at the right place at the right time. And so we have animal advisory commission that sometimes people have felt uncomfortable or felt like they were not being heard and so now it's coming up to the health and human services council committee so that we can ensure that people will have a safe place where they can express their concerns about some of the issues. And so today we're going to have a study -- Mrs. Tawny Hammond will talk about the study regarding spay/neuter and then conversation and we have some people signed up to testify. Miss

Hammond, would you like to come on up? >> Good afternoon. My name is tawny Hammond, chief annual services officer for the city of Austin and also I have with me today the deputy chief, Kristen arbuck who may be answering questions or assisting me. Just to back up and put everything in context, back in February 8th at the meeting of the animal advisory commission, the commission

[2:33:54 PM]

chair, Mr. David lunstedt made a recommendation regarding this subject. He introduced that topic. March 14th at the animal advisory commission meeting Mr. Lunstedt asked the -- asked the commission to vote on proposed language for a code amendment that would change it from a mandatory spay/neuter on second. At that time I asked for time and opportunity to conduct -- actually to gather more information before we made a decision and I asked to conduct a six-month survey of stray pet reclaims in which the owners declined to have their stray pet that they were reclaiming altered. Of exactly six months, we conducted a survey, information gathering survey issuing surveys to owners who claim to claim their impounded pet, dog, and declined to have it spay or neutered. We collected 94 forms during that study period. One second. Let's flip to something else. The purpose of that survey was found you're find out how many stray immaterial partly sunnied dogs were being reclaimed by owners who declined to have their pets spayed or neutered prior to reclaim. Information included age, sex, self-identified breed or type of dog as well as reasons owners declined to have that's pets spayed or neutered. During that period of time, we impounded a total of 3,847 dogs. Impounded for the first time but not spay or neutered was 3,002. So the percentage of first-time impounded dogs unsterilized 78% for perspective. First time impounded dogs spay

[2:35:54 PM]

or neutered and returned to owner were 407. First time impounded dogs returned to owners not spay or neutered was 209. Of the 209 dogs released unsterilized, 94 declined to have their pets spay or neutered. So, remember, the purpose of the survey was to gather information so we have these numbers. Out of all of those, 94 declined to have their pets spay and neutered. 24 were declined due to medical problems identified by the vets at the Austin animal center. 16 reclaimed by paying a spay/neuter deposit for later surgery. 63 were returned with vouchers for later sterilization. And the rest were reclaimed by rescue or had owners who said the dog was already spayed. What it did highlight for us and brought to our attention is out of the 3,002 dogs that were impounded for the first time and not spayed or neutered, 80% of them were not claimed by anyone. The majority of the dogs coming into the Austin animal center, approximately 80% of stray dogs are never reclaimed by the owners. It kind of highlighted something we kind of knew already but really put numbers and statistics and data behind that. At -- one of the reasons I think driving the original code change was -- well, that's the survey. That's what we found. And that's what I wanted to share with you today. Now, what happened at the commission meeting on September 12th is animal advisory commission did not vote unanimously to bring that to health and human services committee or to recommend a code change.

[2:37:55 PM]

So that's where we're at today. >> Houston: And so it wasn't recommended because of what? Was the vote -- can you tell me the vote because I don't remember the vote. >> It was 6-4 and four against. Is that correct? >> [No microphone on]. >> What's that? Five for and four against. >> Houston: So there's a pretty close vote, right? 5-4. So does that preclude us from bringing it up and talking about it again? >> No, it does not. I just wanted to talk about what the survey was and the animal advisory commission

vote and today it was my understanding I would be presenting on the survey. I can certainly offer more information if you had questions. >> Houston: Are there any questions? Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: Thanks very much for the information from the survey. Can you remind me the number who were -- the number of dogs that went back to their owners who declined -- was it 94? >> 94 dogs. >> Tovo: And you said a certain number of those were assessed by the vets -- assessed by the vets -- >> 24. >> Tovo: There was a certain number or two groups of dogs that were released, one with vouchers to do it later and one with commitments from their owners to do the spay/neuter later. Was it their owners felt they were too young? >> If I could clarify, councilmember tovo, if we back up, it's 209 dogs were released unsterilized. 94 declined to have their pets spayed or neutered 24 declined due to medical problems -- it was decided not to spay or neuter them because the veterinarians thought

[2:40:03 PM]

they should not have the procedure. 63 were returned with emancipate vouchers for later sterilization. The bottom line 94 individuals out of the 3,002 dogs that came in declined to have their dog altered. And 80% of these dogs are not being reclaimed. We're dealing with a small percentage of dogs that aren't being reclaimed and of them 94 declined. >> Tovo: We're dealing with a small percentage of dogs who are being reclaimed. Is that what you meant? >> Yes, I did. Thank you. >> Tovo: And so the numbers -- the ones who are being released and not spayed or neutered for medical reasons and the vouchers and those who had paid deposits and with a commitment to do it later, those are not counting -- they are not within the 94. >> No, ma'am. >> Tovo: Because they are making a commitment to do so. >> Yes, ma'am. >> Tovo: Were there any discussions with those owners about their reasoning? >> Yes, there was. They filled out the survey and of the 94 who declined spay/neuter 34% said they planned to breed their pet, 15% believe spay/neuter is unhealthy for their pet, 14% believed spay/neuter will change their pet's personality, 10% said they don't believe in sterilization, and 10% said their pet is elderly or has a medical condition, of the 94. >> Tovo: And you had offered us a figure of people who believed that their pets had already been spayed or neutered. Are they within the 94 who -- >> It's of the to the. >> Tovo: So they are in the -- they are outside the 94. >> Yes. >> Tovo: All right. Thank you very much. >> A very small amount.

[2:42:04 PM]

I think it's a couple of people. >> Tovo: Okay. Thank you. >> Houston: I have a quick question about cats. Do we keep that same kind of data on cats? Because we're focusing on dogs, but we have a large number of kittens -- well, we can't do kittens, but a large number of stray cats. >> The survey was just for impounded dogs. We can certainly pull information together for cats. I will tell you less than 2% of cats are reclaimed by their owners. And it's kind of a national phenomenon. Austin is not unique. Some communities are higher than other communities, but we're about 2% or less. >> Houston: So I yes, sir -- I guess for me as a pet owner, I have a cat now, who runs the house -- [laughter] -- The complaints and the concerns I'm getting from people in district 1 and other parts of the city is about stray animals that are loose and just overpopulating, continue to have litter after litter after litter. It's not healthy for the dog, it's not healthy for the community. And so I know we've talked about education is one of the ways that we do that, but what is it that you think, in your professional opinion, prevents the city of Austin to initiate spay and neuter for cats and dogs on first impoundment, still giving you the same latitude you have now on second impoundment, but just moving it up so we don't release them back. If 80% are not claimed, then they are going back unsterilized. So what -- what seems to be in

[2:44:06 PM]



your opinion the difficulty in trying to enact something that for some in this community feel that spaying and neutering on first impoundment would do a couple of things, it would have a healthier dog because they are not having litter after litter, and would also reduce the number of loose dogs and cats that are in our communities? >> Thank you forgiving me the opportunity to answer the question because it's an important one and I think as your chief animal services officer, what -- my professional advice is that we look at this holistically and don't misrepresent -- we don't misidentify or kind of lump together a number of problems, that we kind of untangle them, unpack them, peel back the layers and figure out exactly what we're trying to change or what our concerns are, and would that change give us the intended results that we want to change. I want to answer the question, but if I could just comment, one of the one of the concerns for us as a no-kill community in the life of an animal for space or convenience, we don't want to do anything that would change the amount of time that a pet stays in the building or the space. We operate at capacity frequently if a pet is guaranteed a live outcome, we want to make sure that happens then and there. So I think anything we do moving forward should take that into account. And that's really our main concern is that we continue to be no kill and that we don't make a change hoping to affect another outcome, but it has a domino effect that might increase intake. People may say no, you can get another dog, I'll keep that dog. So there are some other things that I would want to be looking at. One thing I want to say about spay-neuter, because I think people don't realize how robust the city of Austin and Travis county's spay-neuter program already

[2:46:09 PM]

is. We are spending about half a million dollars on spay-neuter annually. The city is spending \$400,000 out of the general fund annually, we're doing 40,000 out of the donation account and Travis county spends about \$100,000. What I would say is that we put a finer point on our spay-neuter efforts in the high take efforts in the city and county and it's a more targeted approach and that's our plan moving forward. We have a meeting coming up soon with emancipet, they're a wonderful partner. We'll be working closely with them, as with Austin animal center -- excuse me, Austin humane society, that wants to be part of this initiative, and Austin pets alive. So we'll be look at a targeted approach of the intake areas in the city and county of where we want to focus our efforts and that way we can actually deal with what you just described rather than trying to get at it when it's at the building. Because at the building that may or may not change the concerns that we have and what we're seeing out in the community. Because if they're running around on the street they may not be in the animal center and we're not going to be affecting change where we really need it the most. I want to make sure that there's no misunderstanding that we think spay-neuter is not important. It's a very important tool in our toolkit. It's already healthy, already robust. We want to make it more targeted, put a finer point on that so we get measurable results. There's grants out there that if we do a targeted approach and Austin humane society is interested in this, there's grants that we can be eligible for if we target our efforts. So we've got some work in front of us. We've got some homework in front of us that I think we can be really thoughtful in the impact we make in certain parts where we're seeing these hot spots, if you will, high activity areas of concern. >> Houston: So chief, when do you think that this targeted approach might start? >> Well, we're starting the conversations with our partners, Austin humane

[2:48:09 PM]

society is very eager to get going. And emancipet is always a great partner in wanting to work with us. That's something we're doing over the next 60 days. Another thing to point out is the animal services, we're getting ready to launch. We're kicking off between now and end of January conversations within

each district within the city and within the county in kicking off some strategic planning initiatives that didn't exist in the past. We want to get out into the community, we want to talk to people, find out what it is they think we need. What does animal services need to look like, by the people, for the people. Number one maintaining our no-kill status, but really kind of answering people's concerns. And that's something we're really excited about. So I'd like to have a completed strategic plan by June 1, but when it comes to this subject matter, this is something that we're immersed in right now, I wanted to present to you today with the results we have. Can I make one more point? >> Houston: Yeah. But again, I'm not sure you answered the question that I originally asked. I've gotten a lot more information, but the concern that is expressed in district 1 in some of the other districts where the number of stray animals is probably higher than any other places in this city is that whatever educational opportunities there are -- and we all know emancipet and they know when they're coming to Dottie Jordan and they take their pets there. They know when they're coming to places in govalle, the place on 51st. Everybody knows that. But pits -- the efforts need to be embedded deeper into the community because the ages are getting run over. They're getting killed by raccoons, possums.

[2:50:15 PM]

So the people are not -- they are concerned that we stay a no-kill city, but the impact of loose animals -- even with our feral cat problem, which most people think is great, you fix them, release them, that doesn't cause any increase in the animal population that we're having to deal with. So I'm still trying to understand -- I understand all that you're saying about unintended consequences and making sure you have all the data, but the data in most of those communities that I'm talking about is there. They're overrun by stray cats and dogs and they can't be picked up because they don't pick them up if they call. And some of them are dangerous. I mean, I have talked to a lady on Monday night who had a pit bull that is loose in the neighborhood and she's called 311 several times on this pit bull and no one comes out. And if they do, it's not until three days later, whenever the priorities are. Those are the real concerns on the ground. I know emotionally and professionally you have some other issues, but the real concerns on the ground is how do we have animals that we know we can't care for and they keep reproducing in our communities and yet we say that we want to keep this no-kill status. We can't get them into the shelter if we pick them up. I saw a litter of kitties the other day I knew if I took it they are already overpopulated with kitties, so I hoped their mom would come back and find them. So those are the real issues that community is grappling with. I appreciate all your saying and I look forward to all the outreach you will be doing and the work and strategic planning. And I hope it helps us figure out how these dogs and cats who are out there on the street are not continuing to create new dogs and cats. That's our bottom line. >> I understand completely.

[2:52:15 PM]

I think one thing I wanted to point out is that I asked for 10 additional animal protection officers in this budget cycle. I believe in the end we'll be getting three additional animal protection officers. We got less than 20 officers on the streets at any given time. I think we have 15 to choose from. And we have two officers on the street for 900 square miles. Having more animal protection officers on the street will answer some of those concerns and some of those issues that you talked about. Yes, my professional advice about mandatory spay-neuter on first impound, and I don't think that that -- well, I think that -- that we've got multiple concerns that we've talked about and the concern that you just identified I actually addressed when I asked for those additional animal protection officers because I understand what you're talking about. People want more facetime with animal protection staff. They want to problem solve together. They want -- public safety is our number one priority right there with keeping

our no-kill status. One thing that I do want to point out too, though, is that is the animals that are at risk now of losing their lives are the medium and large dogs that aren't being reclaimed by people and that are staying there. And those are truly at risk of losing their lives. And those are thousands of animals. We're talking thousands of medium to large-size dogs, 80 percent of the people that have lost those dogs are not coming to get them. And that also is very important for us to consider and think about. And that's why my professional opinion on not changing to mandatory spay-neuter on the first impoundment, that's what that's based out of. We have to decide what animals are going to lose their lives if we're going to drive up impoundment of animals. And also too our puppy intake has decreased from 2500 in 2013 to 2,000 in 2015.

[2:54:15 PM]

Puppies don't lose their lives at the animal shelter. And animal shelterlings, it's your large dogs, these dogs that aren't being reclaimed. That's something when I talked before about kind of a holistic approach to figuring out are why is this happening and what different can we make on that? >> Houston: But tomes -- I'm I'm sorry, you have some questions. The issue to me is some of the large dogs that have been there three years maybe, some a few years longer, how long do dogs live? Do we just keep the large dogs -- they're not adoptable. When I went through the kennel I saw the older larger dogs that people are not adopting, the rescues are not -- rescue partners are not taking them. So I think we have to find a balance in this city because we cannot build our way out of no-kill. We have to do some more creative kind of thinking. And I'm sure you're doing everything you are trying to make that happen. But to those people who live in the community, if we could just stop the pro creation of dogs and cats, then they think, they think -- they're not professionals, but they live in these community. They think that the intakes to the shelter will over time be reduced. That's all I'm asking. I appreciate your comments. Mayor pro tem? >> Tovo: I want to be sure I understand your recommendation. Your recommendation would be to leave it as it is right now, not adopt a requirement for spay-neuter on first impoundment. But take a more targeted approach to spay-neuter efforts that are going on throughout the city, but target those especially to areas where there's high intake numbers. >> Yes, ma'am. I think we need to use the resources we've been using, the half a million dollars into a targeted approach to the high intake areas. Animal protection officers coming on will certainly

[2:56:16 PM]

help us out on the street when it comes to prevention and resource sharing and education, and just interfacing with the community. >> Tovo: And part of the reasoning -- part of the rationale for that is to do spay-neuter on first impoundment would require some of the animals to remain longer at the shelter and increase the capacity issues that you have there currently. >> Yes. >> Tovo: That was my understanding of the rationale for that. >> They would have to stay in the facility longer, so cost to the city. There would be stress on the animals and we would definitely have to make some -- it would force us to have to make some hard decisions. >> So could we increase the number of vouchers that we give to those animals that are released back to their owners? Do we have enough funding in the funds to give vouchers to go to emancipet? Can we increase the number of options for people to get their pets spayed and neutered once -- the the few that come and pick them up? Because there's not that many that pick them up. 80% are unclaimed. So they remain in our custody intact. Until they go to a partner. Is that correct? >> That's correct. >> Houston: And then the partner agency is supposed to spay and neuter them before adoption. >> We spay and neuter in our facility. If we transfer an animal to rescue, they spay and neuter that animal. >> Houston: So do we give them a voucher to spay and neuter those animals or do they do that out of their own non-profit funding? >> That's the contractual obligation. It's

the best practice of transferring to a rescue that they will spay and neuter that pet. >> Houston: I'm asking if we have additional funding because you're only going to get three animal services officers in this budget cycle. If we have additional money available could we target that for those areas where we know we have problems with loose dogs and cats and

[2:58:21 PM]

vouchers and other kinds of funding sources so we can increase the amount of spay-neuter that occurs in the community? >> Absolutely we could do a voucher system. I think what we would need would be a position would need to come with it to manage it and to monitor it and to follow up on it. >> Houston: A physician? >> A position. >> Houston: I thought you said a physician. I almost choked. [Laughter]. I thought my god, we need a physician to go -- >> We need a position for the chief animal services officer. >> Houston: Thank you so much for helping us kind of think through this. Councilmember Garza, did you have anything? Thank you so much. We've got five people signed up, and sir, who were you donating minutes to? >> [Inaudible]. >> Houston: Okay. I see her. So Sarah Shannon is the first person to speak. And you have three minutes. >> Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Sarah Shannon. I'm a volunteer and mentor at the Austin animal center with the animals -- with the center's large dogs. I speak today in opposition to spay and neuter on first impoundment. While I support spay and neuter, implementing this measure risks exacerbating, not relieving shelter population numbers and could lead to unintended consequences such as increased periods of closed intake or killing healthy adoptable pets for space. Supporters of the spay and neuter initiative hold up Waco and it's 2014 spay and neuter on first impoundment ordinance on proof this is a solution to stray animals and shelter overcrowding. Yet in August of this year Waco's shelter management sent out an urgent call to its citizens requesting that they come foster and adopt because their shelter was at

[3:00:24 PM]

capacity. And this after a 3.1-million-dollar expansion. The shelter's rescue coordinator was quoted as saying, "We're packed. We're full to maximum capacity. We're in a pretty critical state right now." He we had more animals were coming in each day than were being adopted. Sound familiar? I urge you to take the time to properly identify the issues contributing to shelter volume and to stray animals and to act based on available data, day-to-day generated at our shelter and in communities tackling this issue. To do otherwise risks missing true opportunities to keep animals out of the shelter and reduce the number of stray animals in our districts. Those opportunities include programs that target high intake areas with clinic sites offering low or no cost spay and neuter clinics, microchipping and education. And -- and this is very important. Funding additional animal protection officers who act as community liaisons and who work in those high intake areas to return animals to their owners. And identify issues that allow the animals to stray in the first place. I want to reemphasize that I absolutely support spay and neuter and I know each person speaking this information wants to find a way to free kennel space at the shelter and decrease or eliminate those periods when intake is closed to healthy animals. It a frustration for all of us. We should just be sure we are taking the right steps to do that and not steps that unintentionally action sass certify bait the problem. Thank you. >> Thank you. Next we have Mr. Delwin Goss. And you have six minutes because is Caitlin Summers

[3:02:25 PM]

here? Thank you. >> Councilmember Houston, [indiscernible]. >> Liz Whittington, she was going to originally donate to Liz car roscoe, but they wanted to donate to me. >> You have five minutes. >>

Everything I have heard -- this is not a part of my preprinted speech, tells me we need to do what the Austin neighborhood council asked us to do five years ago and not just pass spay and neuter on first impound, but pass a general ordinance that says pet owners spay and neuter unless they have a good reason not to. Seattle Washington passed -- king county, Washington passed a spay-neuter ordinance in 1992 and did rigid enforcement. During that time their animal shelter intake fell from 22,000 a year to about 10,000 a year. What's really important is the number of strays that were run over in their streets decreased 90%. 90% decrease in stray animals hit by cars. That's a good measure of how many animals they have on the street there. Over the next 10 years the number of animals in their shelter dropped 75% from over 22,000 a year to less than 5,000 a year. No-kill proponents say that the shelter program is a failure because now they euthanize about 15% of less than 5,000 animals as opposed to less than 10% of 22,000 animals. That 10% number needs to go away. It doesn't take enough things into account. So there's some simple facts for you. I have the data in my packet over here. When I hear the term no-kill it makes me cringe because what it is in Austin is euthanasia by proxy. We shouldn't call ourselves a no-kill city we should

[3:04:27 PM]

call ourselves a euthanasia by proxy city. Leaving them on the streets to die is just wrong. Years ago a neighborhood council asked the city council to pass an ordinance that would require owners to spay and neuter their pet or register pet as intact as pay an animal intact fee. We did that because we think it's only fair that the ones who have an intact pet, the ones who keep breeding, pay for the animal shelter, because they're the ones that are causing the surplus. Last year the Austin neighborhood council renewed its support for that concept. The ANC was joined with letters of support from the Austin humane society, animal trustees of Austin, emancipet, the Texas federation of animal care societies, the south Austin Democrats, the [indiscernible] Democrats, a number of neighborhood associations and a number of animal rescue groups. A petition in support ordinance has gathered over 10,000 pen on paper signatures from Austin residents, mostly. [Lapse in audio], over there. Unfortunately the previous mayor and city council felt [lapse in audio]. There are a number of reasons for asking for this ordinance. Over time the reasons have become much more clear and everything we predicted would happen without the ordinance has happened. Costs to maintain the current no-kill policy have increased much more than was predicted. Originally the Austin neighborhood council was told putting a no-kill policy in place would take a one time shelter budget increase of \$650,000. That cost has increased 1,000% and it's still climbing. The cost of operating our city's shelter was \$5,200 -- 5,000,200 a year and this year and next year I believe

[3:06:27 PM]

it's set to exceed \$13 million. And that cost is still climbing at a very steep rate. We predict that our shelter would become overcrowded and it has. So far by allowing Austin pets alive to use the overflow from the new city shelter we have more than doubled our kennel space. It hasn't been nearly enough. Under the last city council the city voted to build an additional 80 kennels. The day that vote was taken the shelter was 163 kennels short. So it still won't be enough. The projected cost for those new kennels is over \$6 million. Judging by what we've seen with water treatment plant number 4 and the waller creek tunnel project they will increase by the time the new shelter is built. That's above and beyond the current 130% increase in the shelter budget under no kill. We've had over 40% increase in dog bite reports over the last five years. That's far and above the 15% increase in Austin's population growth. Under no kill, under euthanasia by proxy, public safety has taken a back seat to maintaining an under 10% euthanasia rate. In six out of 10 of our council districts loose dog complaints are in the top seven

complaints in the 311 center. Humane treatment of a very significant number of Austin's unwanted and stray pits is also taken a back seat. The current version of no-kill is great for those animals that are allowed admittance to the club, but it's an inhumane disaster for the other animals left on the street so we don't have to euthanize them in the shelter. In Austin it's easier to surrender custody of a child under two months old than an animal. The legislature passed the safe haven law for children because they realized very bad things can happen to unwanted children. Can you imagine what happens

[3:08:28 PM]

to unwanted kittens and puppies, cats and dogs, if their owners have to wait six months to surrender them? Anybody? It's just unimaginable to me that -- unimaginable on what can happen to those pets. These impediments have led to pets being abandoned on the streets, pets being dumped in the county, it's led to people taking their Austin, Travis county pets to high kill shelters outside of Austin. The current version of no-kill has become code word for euthanasia by proxy, euthanasia by disease, euthanasia by parasites, euthanasia by predators or euthanasia by letting another high kill shelter do our dirty work for us. That's just wrong. I honestly don't understand why some people are so proud of being a no-kill city. We're not a no-kill city. We're a euthanasia by proxy city. We leave them on the streets to die. We don't have the space for them. We need more than that. Over 62 towns, cities and even states have put laws in place which mirror what the Austin neighborhood council has asked the city to pass five years ago. If it had been done then we would start to see the numbers fall by now. If Seattle can do it, there's no reason we can't do it. Considering what happens, don't you think it's time for the current city council to listen to the voice of reason? And at the very least adopt spay-neuter on first impound. It's only a tiny amount of dogs and just a baby step in the right direction, but at least it's in the right direction. And for what it's worth, I hear all this talk about that will just lead to increases in owner surrender and we'll have that many more pits. I'm sure when the state passed a requirement that said you will provide rabies to vaccines to your animals people said the same thing. I think when the state passed requirements that said you will treat your animals humanely, you will have to provide food, water and shelter for them, there

[3:10:30 PM]

were naysayers that said that would serious just lead to an increase in unowned animals. I know because I was here when the city passed its anti-leash law, antitethering law enforcement all we heard from Dorinda Pulliam, the director, and other people, said all that will happen is people will end up surrendering their animals if we passed that anti-leash law. I talked to Dorinda later and it never happened. If people want to surrender their pets because they don't want to spay or neuter them, that's only a tiny percent of the population and I question whether these people should have pets because they don't want to do the right thing for the city. They don't want to do right thing for their pets. Thank you and it was nice not to get cut off for a change. And I would be happy, happy to meet with any one of you and show you the statistics from other cities. [Applause]. >> Tara Stirman. Did I pronounce that correct? Anywhere close to it? >> Thank you for asking me -- having me up here today. My name is Tara Stirman and I'm an aggress specialist and I'm a founder of stepped in. Stepped in is a training are program for low income communities where we go into the low income communities and provide free training, education for the citizens in order to help reduce or lower stray dog populations and shelter surrenders. I'm here today to ask you to please change Austin's code to allow the staff at Austin

[3:12:31 PM]

animal center to spay and neuter on first impound. We are not asking for mandatory spay-neuter. I have heard that probably four or five times already. We're not asking for mandatory spay-neuter. We're not saying that we're going to knock on every door, pull every dog out of their residence and ask them to spay and neuter. We're simply asking to spay and neuter the dogs that come in on first impound. A lot of opposition to spay and neuter on first impound is saying that it will increase shelter intake, decrease reclaims. We just heard from the director that closing the doors right now we're closing the doors, right? We're closing the doors and the director said 80% of the dogs are unclaimed. We already have an 80% unclaimed rate. Spay and neuter is not going to change that. It not going to make it worse. We also heard our shelter director say that they need more aco to get into the communities, the high intake areas, to mention that think need the aco's to get some education out there. I ask you if you close your doors to the shelter, aren't you stopping the ability to talk to the community? You close the doors to the shelter the cats and dogs cannot get into the shelter to get spay and neuter. People bring their dogs into the shelter, we spay and neuter on first impound. So you're already taking care of part of that budget that we're talking about. Yes, I do believe that we need more acos, but not to go in and communicate. Sure you can educate. A lot of rescues educate. Closing the doors stops the community from actually coming in. It stops the community from going into the shelter and saying I need to surrender my dog. I'm not going to reclaim my dog. Apparently 80% aren't claiming. So we're already in the weeds when it comes to reclaim. Right there in front of you I gave you a list of 783

[3:14:31 PM]

names. 7 of those names are local residents. Those are citizens that are concerned about overpopulation problem we're seeing here in Austin. Citizens that are concerned about our doors closing and the loose dogs that are in our neighborhoods. Citizens that are paying for our shelter with their tax money. Their concern, as is mine, is that limiting intake does repeatedly close our doors because of overpopulation. What happens is with closed intake we're forcing people to have nowhere else to turn. [Buzzer sounds] Ty. The other handouts that I handed to you are pictures of dogs in my community, east Austin. In east Austin we have packs of dogs roaming? We have loose dogs roaming. I almost killed a kitten coming back from Austin animal center in my road. This happens repeatedly day throughout the day. 311 in October received 293 loose dog calls. 213 dead animal calls. 38 animal bite reports were created, created. >> Houston: So let me ask you a question. Does somebody want to donate three more minutes? Because you've gone over without finishing your thought. Did you sign up? >> It's Christine case. >> Houston: Hold on. >> According to aac, 69 intact males were returned to their owners. This alone worries me since 93% of the dog bites that happen come from intake males. Nine intake males were adopted out. 36 intact females were returned to their owners. And 10 intact females were adopted out. These are all dogs that are prime breeding age.

[3:16:32 PM]

We're already sending dogs out of our shelter intact. If we close our dogs and don't allow people to bring their dogs in, we're keeping those intact dogs on the streets and they're going to keep reproducing. They're going to keep being an unsafe community, and our community's alone, our east Austin community are right on the cusp, Austin colony. We call up 311 and we're told call the sheriff. That pack of dogs when we call them, we were told to call the sheriff. So we're putting all of our problems over on to the sheriff's department because we don't have space. Three days later those dogs will be gone. They're in another neighborhood. Those dogs were chasing cattle. I'm proud to say I live in a dog-loving city. That's why I live in Austin. But in order to keep it this way and keep our communities safe, spay and neuter on first impound is a very big step towards a sensible solution to our

overpopulation problem. Thank you very much. [Applause]. >> Houston: Thank you. The next person is Liz carrnskco and you have nine minutes. >> So this -- is this my clicker -- okay. I do support no-kill. I'm sorry if I'm making anybody cringe right now, but I will support it as long as it is ethical and humane. Thank you, councilmember Houston and councilmember Garza for taking the time to meet with me regarding my concerns about the Austin dog and cats. Thank you for this opportunity. I support councilmember Houston's initiative to support permissive, not mandatory, spay and neuter on first impound.

[3:18:33 PM]

The money is available and this is a matter of common sense. Dogs and cats are born by the litter, but they only get homes one at a time. It does not make sense that we can stop the euthanasia by adopting out dogs and cats one by one when they are produced in litters that can be 10 or more. There's a picture of how many puppies can be important to one female. Unfortunately some people do not act responsibly without some urging by city code. The solution is presentation prevention. Many financially and self sustaining models, including partnerships with practitioners, exist in the country. It is humane and cost effective. I live in district 9. I grew up in a low income community in Texas. As a child I was terrified of loose dogs. They were aggressive, I thought. Now that fear has turned into compassion and at some point I started advocating for these aggressive dogs. Spay and neutering is the simple solution. It is -- it is a sensible solution to our problem. We have have a crisis and I have here -- I got a note from social media from somebody that works for Apa and she says, here's what we have to figure out, how to stop people from dumping them when they are turned around at the shelter. Unfortunately I'm the ones that gets the calls and emails from the people turned away. And while I agree with our shelter's choice of only taking in emergencies rather than killing, and I think tawny is the best thing that's ever happened to our shelter in a very long time, we have a public issue that we need to find ways to resolve. I know some of these dogs are being turned on the

[3:20:34 PM]

streets when the people get turned away from the shelter. I'm pretty sure I had a girl dump her five dogs yesterday after being turned away. She had emailed me because she was evicted and has nowhere to live. I sent her to aac and told her to let them know she is homeless. Last night she emailed me and let me know they were unable to take them. And she hinted that she had no more options left. Then she went silent on me. I've been doing this long enough to know when people aren't invested in an animal's welfare and I got that vibe from her from the start. I have emailed her and called her several times today asking her where the dogs are, and she won't reply. These are dogs that won't have a clue how to live on the streets. That's just one case. I get several. I take 650 to 750 calls and emails per month on pass. And for the ones who are homeless and have other serious situations their choices are very few. We've got to figure out a way to help the public more so the animals don't end up paying the price. Here is what happens to dogs that end up dumped in the -- on the east side. This came from the east side. This is to -- these dogs get shot and get lined up next to the street to show the people that this is what will happen to the dogs when they end up on the property. The little black dog that survived is currently at a rescue and he's been at a rescue for over a year. An estimated 4.7 million dog bites occur in the U.S. Each year. Of those, around 8,000 -- 7,800,000 Americans seek medical attention. Around 386,000 of those require treatment in an emergency room at an average of about 5,000 each.

[3:22:36 PM]



Approximately 16 bite victims will die each year. Intact male dogs are involved in 76% of cases, while a complex set of circumstances are involved when a person is killed by dogs, approximately 92 percent of fatal dog attacks involve intact male dogs. It's a safety issue and our communities, our low income communities here in Austin are the ones that have to deal with it. I live in district 9. I don't see that. My foster dog ran out of my yard and within five minutes my neighbor had him. That doesn't happen in east Austin. So I'm not understanding why our shelter is letting intact dogs leave. This is a list of 1,897 animals from this year that were sent to Austin humane and Apa. Only 97 of them were fixed at our facilities. This is a list of how many intact animals were adopted out this year. It is state law that dogs from a shelter are to be spayed and neutered before adoption. So what's going on here? Something is not right. I also went around and collected signatures. And I have over 100. I'm going to say 90% of these people didn't know that we did not spay and neuter upon first impound. Everybody believes that because year no-kill we don't kill a single animal.

[3:24:40 PM]

I've talked to people who were turned away at the shelter as well, and allowing animals to leave unaltered it just adds to the problem. We're not the fixing it, we're creating more. And it's not right. It's not humane. We have the opportunity to help these animals and we should do it. Thank you. >> Houston: [Inaudible]. And then Adella -- last name is quintana. Then you are up next. >> All right. Good afternoon, councilmembers. My name is will McKinney. I live in district 10. Although Austin has taken amazing strides in saving and protecting our animals, we are not immune from irresponsible pet ownership. No city is. As I said in the last meeting I was a foster to two amazing female pit bulls who were overbred and neglected. Sadly there are too many dogs in Austin that suffer from the same neglect and abuse. Backyard breeding is all too common. You can see evidence of it everyday on Facebook pages such as atx sell/trade your pit bull. On this page you will see people trading things such as cell phones, watches, even guns for pit bulls. Litter after litter up for sale. The momma dogs and stud dogs are seen as nothing more than baby factories. They need your protection. If they are spayed and neutered, they would be considered useless by their owners and would be freed from a life of neglect and abuse. Austin animal centers will give these dogs a chance at a second life and an opportunity to be in a loving home. When dogs come through the

[3:26:41 PM]

doors of Austin animal center we need to do what we can to protect them. Last month the majority of the animal advisory commission voted in favor of spay-neuter on first impoundment. In a 5-4 vote the commission pro claimed that this is the right thing to do for Austin animals. But due to a technicality is failed and I want to point out that this was a unique circumstance because two of the members that were figured in, they had not had a chance to be appointed, those were the two Travis county officials. Or members of the Austin animal advisory commission. I also want to say with all good respect, I do question the an hose any of the questionnaire recipients that declined to get their pets spayed or neutered. It is a shameful practice. If you ever have seen cops, cops come up and they talk to suspects and a lot of times the subpoenas are not -- they're not the most forthcoming and honest people and that just happened when you're doing lawful activities. So I do question that. I thank you for your time and ask you to move this item forward. [Applause]. >> Houston: Thank you. The next person on deck is Susie Swindle. >> Hi, my name is debt quintana. I run a small rescue in the Austin area on the east side. I do think it's really important to point out that 78 percent according to the study of stray dogs that came into our stealth were not spayed and neutered.

[3:28:41 PM]

I think this is an important point. If we're spaying and neutering them, look at the small number we'll have roaming the streets right off the bat. According to the survey the people who declined spay and neuter the reasons seemed to be reasons where some education they may change their mind, thinking it's not healthy for the animal or not right. I think a little bit of education I've changed many minds just by letting people know the actual information rather than old wives' tales or opinions that may just need a little bit of information. From experience I can tell you dogs that are dumped that aren't accepted into our closed door shelters out on the east side I'm at the Travis county-bastrop line. It's hell. It's so bad for them. They are out there to brave the elements. They attack each other. They starve, they get hit by cars. They have very horrible fates. Most of them to do survive, they are so fearful when someone stops to find them and help them, they are almost impossible to catch. I've had quite a few we've put up traps and they've been killed before we can get them trapped because they're so scared. I think that spaying and neutering on first impoundment would be a big difference in our city. These dogs need our protection. So I'm not advocating for killing healthy dogs and cats, I know what it means. I know how many animals are out there that need homes. I'm just advocating for the expense I believe solution. We have to remember that one plus one can equal thousands and that's what we need to prevent. We need to use common sense and do the right thing by spaying and neutering. It's really the only thing. Thank you. >> Houston: Thank you. Next would be Jennifer Carroll. Is Jennifer Carroll here? Okay. Thank you. >> Good afternoon. I came to speak about the

[3:30:43 PM]

spay-neuter initiatives that are before the committee today I've been working in animal rescue for more than 20 years I'm a foster and volunteer with blue dog rescue, which is an aac partner. I volunteered with the animal trustees of Austin, a low cost spay-neuter clinic for 15 years, and I've volunteered with several other Austin area rescue groups. Over the past 20 years animal welfare and rescue has dramatically changed. The in no-kill movement has saved thousands of lives and brought awareness to the plight of shelter animals. While there are many strategies involved in becoming no-kill, the two main pieces are less animals coming in and more animals going out. While the adoption piece of the puzzle has had great success, I believe Austin and Travis county need to take a serious look at how they approach spay-neuter. Spay-neuter is ground zero in this equation. With the shelter constantly operating at full capacity, coupled with the stealth closing intake several times throughout 2016, there is serious concern if Austin's no-kill status is going to be sustainable. The bottom line is more animals need to be sterilized. The initiatives we would like you to consider today are permissive, not mandatory, like it is now. Spay-neuter on first impoundment instead of second. Using the unclaimed spay-neuter deposit fund, on spay-neuter, not on other items, and more rigorous follow-up on spay-neuter contracts for adopted and rescued pets. The bottom line with Eckert spend resources spending vetting homes for a mom and five to 10 puppies or kittens or we can find a home for one spayed female dog or cat. It seems like common sense to me. Thank you. >> Houston: Jennifer Carroll is next and again, pat valles-trellis. I will get it right some day. >> I'm Jennifer care local.

[3:32:45 PM]

I run a non-profit dog rescue just outside of Travis county, Blanco county. I'm too tall. Okay. So I wanted to share some perspective because I've lived in Austin almost my entire life and we recently moved Blanco county to run a dog rescue there. There's no animal control, no 311 to call. It's us and some police officers we've made really good friends with in the community. And I guess in the last six months

or so, we've had a number of our adopters from Travis county calling us in blanco county because they can't get an animal they found to Travis or they found a box of kittens and they can't get it intake or they've called 311 and they won't come. And I totally understand that there's constraints around all of that, but it seems a little bit crazy that residents of Travis are calling small underfunded counties and small rescues to try to pick up the pieces when we don't spay and neuter as much as we can and when we close intake. These animals need shelter. They have to go somewhere and unfortunately where they go it's not a good ending for many of them. We've also seen an uptick in the number of dogs that I've picked up in blanco county, dumped in our rural county, with microchips from Travis county. I think that's remarkable and I think that good people do bad things when they don't have an option to take them to the shelter. We've seen this. People might find a dog, want to do the right thing, want to bring it to shelter, but when they can't get it to the shelter and that dog ends up having eight puppies in their yard we have a case we're working in blanco, they ended up chaining up the mom and they called and we're getting the mom and pups. These things don't have to happen. If there's an option to bring the animals to the shelter no matter what and everybody gets spayed and

[3:34:45 PM]

neutered, as many animals as we can get our hands on get spayed and neutered, I know people want that. We've started a program in blanco county where we'll go and pick up any animal at nine A.M., get it spayed at our clinic, drop it off that afternoon. I know we talked about space and recovery time. We've had zero incidents with that. We bring them a crate, we let them know it takes a day. All the stitches dissolve. I think there are other options. And this is a really important step towards that end goal. Thank you. [Applause]. >> Houston: Thank you. Next will be -- after pat is John Hubbard. And then our last speaker will be Paul karagas. I'll call him again. >> Thank you, councilmembers, for giving us this opportunity to speak on this important issue. I do believe this is important not only for our pets, but also for our city's residents that care about pets and who also need the safety that will be provided if we have fewer intact dogs running through the streets. I want to repeat what other people have said. This is not mandatory spay-neuter on first impoundment. This is permissive spay-neuter on first impoundment. You're giving your shelter director the authority to spay-neuter at her discretion. I cannot understand why a director would not want that discretion. I would want it. If you look at the reasons that people gave, 34% say they plan to breed, 18% they want their pet back today. 15% believe spay-neuter is unhealthy. 14% believe it will change their pet's personality. 10% don't believe in sterilization. And the only one that's valid, I think, is that 10% is elderly or has a medical

[3:36:47 PM]

condition. We're already giving her the discretion to waive that 10%. The other ones I would love the authority to go to that person and say "I'm not making you do this, the city wants this done, the city council gave me the authority to do it because the residents want this done." And you give her a way to talk to people about it, instead of letting them go home with a pet because they think it's unhealthy when in fact it's not. So I would want that authority. I don't agree that spay-neuter on first impoundment will result in us having to kill animals. I just don't agree. I want us not to kill animals. I want you us to be no kill. I just don't agree that spay and neuter on first impervious cover will help on any pet. The council has funds that are discretionary. It is not general fund money, it is discretionary at the director's discretion to use however she sees fit. Of hundred of it comes from Maddie's fund money that has sat there for three years. I think the money was awarded in 2013 and we've only spent like 400 of it. We still have about 600,000 we could use. The other thing is we have a 400,000-dollar balances in the donations fund and about 100,000 of that was generated by unclaimed spay-neuter deposits. So

when animals came to the shelter and necessity weren't fixed, the owner paid a deposit and didn't come back to get it. How could we not use that money for spay-neuter if it was generated by us not doing the right thing and getting them fixed while they were there, let's use it to fix a different pet. Let's use the unclaimed spay-neuter deposit for spay-neuter. If you take that million dollars, you can create a program -- [buzzer sounds] -- Where -- may I finish? Take the million dollars,

[3:38:49 PM]

create a program where when there is a pet that needs to be sterilized you transfer them to a clinic, you pay for the sterilization at that clinic and the owner picks up the pet there. You save -- you know, you don't have to kill any animals. You don't have to -- you don't have to pick one or the other. You can do both. Thank you. [Applause]. >> Houston: Thank you. Did you want to speak, sir? Paul karagaas. Where are you? >> Yeah, I do have some things to say. >> Houston: You can speak from that mic. >> I appreciate you listening to our concerns. I do support having what I consider a very minor spay and neutering ordinance. Every city I've lived in since I've been an adult, Austin is the very first city I've ever lived where every apartment and every home I've occupied came with resident feral AT&T center. I've lived in several states and that's never happened. Both of those cities have spay and neutering ordinances and had them for probably decades. And I just -- it just blows my mind that given the overwhelming problem we have in this city that we have people here that are fighting it every inch and nail. And that's pretty much all I have to say. >> Houston: Sir, could you give us your name for the record? >> I'm sorry? >> Houston: Your name for the record. >> Oh, Paul karagaas. >> Houston: Thank you, sir. [Applause]. >> Houston: Those are all the speakers that I have signed up. To speak on agenda item

[3:40:49 PM]

number 3. Sir, did you sign up? I didn't see your name. >> My name is John Hubbard. >> Houston: John Hubbard... I'm so sorry, Mr. Hubbard. Please go right ahead. >> If that's the worst thing that happens to me today I'm in pretty good shape. Thank you for the time. I'm here in support of mandatory -- excuse me, not mandatory spay-neuter on first impoundment. I want to take a slightly different perspective from everyone else. You've heard a lot of statistics, you've heard a lot of stories and anecdotes, all of which I think has been good and informative to approximate the discussion. But I want to come at this from a different perspective. I've been involved in forming public policy for over 25 years now. I've been fortunate enough to be educated in public policy schools both in the U.S. And in Europe. And what you have before you with this initiative is good public policy. There are four basic tenets to good public policy. It provides good policy direction, it's clear in what it's trying to accomplish. It provides flexibility. Number two provides flexibility. Three it addresses a problem. And four, has broad public support. What you have with this initiative is a clear policy that we're trying to minimize unwanted animals in this city. It provides flexibility because it is not mandatory. It's not mandatory. And in fact, provides discretion to the staff. Something that I think staff in any organization appreciates flexibility and if they see fit to not implement this, then they have the authority to not do that. It helps to address the problem. And in this case we again are trying to address the pet overpopulation issue. We clearly have an overpopulation issue in Austin because we are managing intake to our facilities. And it has broad public support. The broad public support, we've got everyone that's -- all but one of the people that have talked to you, at

[3:42:51 PM]

least so far, -- I'm not sure there's anyone after me, but everyone with the exception of one person has been in support of this initiative. We've heard of two separate petitions who together from by my count -- I might have done the math wrong, but well over a thousand signatures in support of this initiative. A majority of the animal advisory committee voted in support. Now, we can talk about whether or not it passed and the rules of how the commission -- the animal advisory commission works, but the fact of the matter is a majority of the commission voted in favor of this initiative. So we've met the criteria of good public policy. I hope you will listen to the support that has been here today, the support of the folks that aren't here today, make that public policy a reality and help to keep Austin on the forefront of good animal control and management. Thank you. [Applause]. >> Houston: Thank you, sir. That does conclude all of the speakers that we have signed up. We're back on the dais. This motion -- this opportunity can be moved forward from this community -- from this council committee to the full council for further discussion. Is there a motion to be made? To allow the shelter director permissive on first impoundment to spay and neuter? I'll second that motion. Any discussion? Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: Thank you. I'm going to support moving this forward to the council. I definitely -- I certainly heard from people in favor of it. It's not clear to me -- I think I want to go back and hear more about the animal commission and some of the concerns they may have had. I suspect they may have aligned with other director's concerns as well, but I am

[3:44:51 PM]

going to be weighing it. I'm going on the support it today, continue weighing it when we consider it at council. I take seriously the recommendation of our staff. >> Houston: And I just want to clarify, and chief if you will make sure I'm saying this right, the vote was five in favor and four against. >> Yes, members absent. >> Houston: Five in favor, four against. I just wanted to make sure what the commission's position on this. Any other comments? >> Garza: It was five in favor -- >> Houston: Of spay and neuter on first impound. If there are no more concerns, let's take a vote. All in favor of moving this forward to full council let it be known by raising your right hand. [Applause] The vote is three -- it's unanimous on the dais with councilmember troxclair off the dais. Thank you so much for your attention to this matter and we'll move to the next agenda item, status update on the proposal for the development of the Brackenridge tract from central health. There is in your packet, I believe, miss -- you are here, did you want to speak? >> If there are any questions I'm happy to answer them. >> Houston: Pearl cavasas is the governmental relations person for central health and there was some information in the packet. I don't know if we got it enough in time so if you will come up and let's -- I just -- if you all could move your conversations out in the atreatment yum, I would

[3:46:51 PM]

appreciate it because we're going to try to get out of here in a timely manner. In your backup there is some information from central health and I just wanted -- because this is in district 1 and I've been having conversations with central health about some of my concerns and I didn't see them addressed here so I just want to put them on the record so that people are clear about where I'm coming from. In the request for qualifications, it's really critical to me that when we talk about housing on that tract, we talk about housing for the workers who work at the medical center. Not just the people who can pay the big bucks. But that's the part of affordability that we don't talk about. In every development there should be some opportunity for cafeteria workers, janitors, all the people who keep that hospital going at night to have an opportunity to live close to where they work. And then my other issue is about -- well, it's kind of like a Ronald McDonald house for adults. >> Right. >> Houston: If you have an adult family member, mother, father, adult child in the hospital, there needs to be somewhere close by where

they can go have a respite. So I think as long as those pieces are in that request for qualification, then I'm willing to go forward with it. It's so important family members be close by so when there is something wrong they don't have to come from Seton back to 15th street to check on their loved one, they can just walk across a walkway. That's really critical that we have a place for adults to be able to stay. Doesn't have to be a lot but some space. That's all I have. >> We hear you and I've taken your input to staff who is working on the rfw and -- the

[3:48:52 PM]

rpq is basically step one in the process. We expect many responses from developers and we're going to evaluate them and invite those individuals to do -- to rerespond to the rfp, which will have more details. And I also wanted to just let you know that after a master developer is selected, which we expect will happen late next year in 2017, there's going to be more opportunities for community engagement and feedback into what should be in that -- located on the redevelopment of that site. >> Houston: I appreciate it. Any questions for Ms. Cavasas? Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: It's not really a question, I just wanted to thank my colleague, to thank our chair, councilmember Houston, because that is really an important consideration and I appreciate you continuing to bring it up, bolt of those issues and especially about having housing on site for the workers, the lower paid workers at those facilities. I think that is really critical and I would just concur with you that so it's important to set those expectations at the outset. I appreciate you continuing to raise that as an important issue. >> Houston: Councilmember Garza. >> Garza: And I'll just third that. If that's a thing. Yeah, I think it's important to make sure that we're securing -- we only have certain ability to put affordable housing in certain areas and I think it's really important that we use this opportunity from the get go to secure as many community benefits as possible. I'm curious, what is -- do we hear this update just I guess as a courtesy? >> Houston: We request that they come once a quarter and give us an update. Central health, Seton and the

[3:50:53 PM]

Dell medical school. >> Garza: Okay. And -- but we have no purview over the final decision. Is that right? >> Not really, but I mean your input is definitely taken into consideration. >> Garza: Okay. Thank you. >> And I'll be taking that back to staff and our board of managers, one of whom is here, Cynthia Valadez. And if you would like us to come back and, you know, give more detailed information as we move along in the process, we're happy to do that. >> Houston: Thank you so much. We're willing to have you come back any time and we'll be asking for those updates. We don't want to lose track of this. That's a big deal and so we need to be a part of that. >> We're happy to do so. >> Houston: Can you hold on because mayor pro tem is going to have to leave. I need to get to the financial report before she leaves because we all want to hear that, okay? Then I'll bring you up after it's over. I know, but miss Valadez, I'll bring you up -- miss stiller -- Seiler, please come up and talk to us briefly or as long as you need to about updates on health and human services budget. >> Good afternoon, I'm Diane Seiler, deputy budget officer here on behalf of Ed van eenoo who was unable to attend. Per your request we pulled together a brief presentation on health and human services budget changes for fy 17. For a little context, we've included three years of data on this slide. The fy 15 amended budget, the fy 16 and fy 17 approved budget. You can see that year over year for the last two years the health department's budget

[3:52:53 PM]

has grown by 13.7% and 9.5% since the 10-1 council has taken effect. Even more significantly when you factor out the grants portion, the green, and focus on the general fund portion, the red and purple

boxes, you will notice that group was 14% both years. Looking at the increases by programmatic area, you can see that while all the service areas in the health department are receiving the benefit of the growth in the health department, the -- the area receiving the biggest benefit is the social service contracts. And a large portion of this is attributable to the decisions made by council during budget adoption. So the next four slides will talk about the individual changes to the budget that informed the previous slide. So what is not included in these slides are the \$2.4 million that were just the base cost drivers. Those were the things for the salaries, the health insurance, the internal service funds transfers. The personnel changes, you had a half a million dollars added just to annualize the cost of the 32 positions added in 2016. Those were funded in '16 for nine months, this represents the three months of salary and benefits. There's a healthy food access program coordinator added by council during adoption. Another environmental health officer that we added per the Travis county interlocal. The vital records assistance was a conversion from temporary to permanent but that's 100% off set by

[3:54:54 PM]

revenue. The following two items actually have no net impact to the health and human services general fund budget. The two environmental health officers to assist with expedited reviews are funded via the development services budget and the two grant positions funded via grant funds. -- Grant positions. This list are the changes to the social service contracts. \$1 million was added to fully fund social service contracts that were approved in prior years. And an additional 600,000 was added to provide an inflationary -- inflationary increase to existing contracts. Another 600,000 was added for the permanent supportive housing, sobriety center was included at 380,000. The child care continuity programs for 176, and then finally we had the aid program support at \$2.2 million. I will note that the asterisk indicates that one-time funding has been used for this item and so there is no expectation at this point this is going to be continued in the fy 18 budget. And the final two slides list out the different quality of life initiatives and the health -- >> Houston: Could you hold on just on moment? Councilmember Garza has a question. >> Yes. >> Garza: The one-time funding for parent support specialists, at the very end of budget discussions, I think it was councilmember Casar, if there was ability to find a way to not have that one-time funding. Have you gone through the process to determine there is no other alternative? >> The budget office has not undertaken that. I would defer to the health department to see if they've done that analysis within their budget. >> Garza: Okay. >> Also, was there a budget rider specific to that? >> Garza: I thought there was, but I could be wrong.

[3:56:56 PM]

Maybe it was just a discussion. Okay. All right. Thanks. >> So the next two slides, again, are the ones for the quality of life initiatives, plus I threw in the \$400,000 for the healthy retail initiatives. I'm not going to read them out. You have them on the list. Again, I will note that in the very last slide the only two items that were funded using ongoing funding were the \$10,000 for the flu vaccine and the amount for the healthy retail initiative. So basically where does that leave us with regards to the two active resolutions related to health and human services funding. I have resolution 94 from 2014, November of 2014, that requested an additional million dollars was added to the social service contracts, and that was fully funded in fy 17. We talked about that on slide 5. And resolution 2016-01-21-68 it's a little more complex. It called for a flat increase of \$22.3 million with -- spread over -- up to four years with \$12 million going to the social service contracts and another \$10.3 million going towards the health and human services department. In addition, there was the -- staff was instructed to increase the social service contracts by 3% annually and to increase the health and human services department budget by the population increase. And that was -- that resulted in an additional one point -- a need of \$1.7

million. How did we do with that overall? When you factor out those base cost driver items, health and human services budget increased by \$6.5 million, 5.5

[3:59:00 PM]

going to social services and one million to the health and human services department. Are there any questions? >> Houston: Any questions? Councilmember Garza. >> Garza: That outcome for fy 17, I'm trying to -- was the 5.5 million for social service contracts in the manager's proposed budget? >> No, not all of that. That's a result of the actions from the proposed budget and all the actions council took. Whether you combine all of that together, basically everything that we just talked about comes to 5.5. >> Garza: Oh, so you are adding the quality of life initiatives into this number. >> Yes. So when we looked at the resolution, it did specifically say factor out the base cost drivers, but it didn't say to factor out anything else so -- >> Garza: Okay. >> -- I put them in. >> Garza: Because I thought that most of the - the goal of that resolution for social service contracts was more capacity building for the current contracts and not specifically, but I understand the -- that it could be also -- we did increase funding for some social service things. Okay. >> Houston: Any other questions? Thank you so much. This is very helpful and we can now begin to explain to our constituents what happened. It was kind of crazy there at the end. >> It was a little crazy. >> Houston: Thank you so much. And please tell Ed that we extend our sympathies to him. >> I will certainly do that. >> Houston: Thank you. The next briefing is on the montopolis -- at the end. At the end. Montopolis briefing on the

[4:01:00 PM]

montopolis recreation and community center. David was just here. I just saw him. Cynthia Valadez, if you will come up. >> I just wanted to clarify. Councilmember Garza, you asked whether any of this was in your purview. The only thing that is within your purview is the ability to appoint 4.5 members to the central health board of managers. 4.5 members. That's half our board. We're going to be the people who are going to be overlooking those contracts, making a decision. And also looking at what's proposed. And if you just saw the newspaper, senator Watson is also looking at expanding the mental health and behavioral health component and tiger it to the sale of the Austin state school. So you are going to see an innovation zone that's going to take -- that's going to forever change not only the face of city of Austin but Travis county. So your appointees are going to be over -- over -- monitoring and making decisions based on those things. It would behoove you all to stay on top and communicate with your appointees. Thank you. >> Garza: May I ask her a question? >> Houston: Of course. >> Garza: What is your take on the current rfwp -- the rfwp as a board member? >> The rfwp is out. The responses are due October 21st of this month. And at that point they will be evaluated, tallied, weighed and recommendations made to us. We were looking at the -- we were told by staff that the rfp coming out of the rfwp would be let sometime in January. >> Correct. >> So things are moving very quickly.

[4:03:01 PM]

That's why it's very important that you communicate with your board members. >> Garza: Was it -- was it -- was the rfwp created purely by staff with no board input or did the rfwp take board input? >> No, the staff was diligent and including the board of managers' input and I know one of the things that it's a big deal for me is I want to see what the community benefits are going to be. As a matter of fact, I have actually pursued and asked that they look at or we look at as a board of managers seeing whether or not we could create community benefits agreement that could be drawn up legally so that we can tie those things to -- and hold them accountable. >> Garza: Okay. Thank you. >> Thank you. >> Houston: All right.



Thank you for that information. We have Rosie Mendoza is going off at the end of this year. We have time set up to talk about the joint city-county appointee in the next couple of weeks and then we have Dr. Dr. Zamora, he goes off at the end of this year too. There are three appointments coming up fairly quickly. Mr. Smythe. >> Thank you, madame chair. >> Houston: Item number 6. >> Murphy's law. Good afternoon, councilmembers. My name is David Smythe-Macaulay with public works and I'm the project manager for the Montopolis and Community Center Recreation Center. And I'm here to give you a briefing on the current status of our design and where we are and where we're going to be going. And what's happened previously. The Montopolis Rec Center, as

[4:05:01 PM]

you can see, is located off of Montopolis Drive and it's highlighted by the little black building amongst a lot of green land in the park, and it's also in District Number 3 and in Councilmember Renteria's district. Right now we are in the design phase of the project and we're looking at completing that in the summer of next year and going out for bid and then hopefully we'll begin construction in the winter of -- of 2018 or in this case that project update is a little wrong, in the winter of 2018-2019. Also budgetwise we had a bond approval of 15.5 million. Of that amount the 11.5 million is going towards construction, and of that 11.5 million five or half a million is going towards contingency, which is an allowance or risk insurance for things that could happen during construction to keep the project moving forward. The project scope, after long two years of deliberations with the community and staff, we finally came down to the parks and recreation staff having multi-sport gymnasium, a boxing and fitness room, a multipurpose activity, learning and exercise rooms, teen space, fitness areas, a track, a three-lane running track and several meeting rooms. Also on the health and human services side, we will have a youth and adult council, community neighborhood center and Austin Health and

[4:07:01 PM]

adolescent Barack Obama. -- Program. With that I'm going to bring up my architect, Al York, with McKinney York Architects, to go over briefly the outreach that we've been doing previously and when they came on board and we'll continue to do as we go through the design phase. >> Thank you. We've met beginning early in December of 2015 with the community to ask for really initial ideas and descriptions of how the community would like this project to be described once it's completed. We call that an add -- a adjunct exercise. We met in January earlier this year and again in February to get community input on how the project should sit on the site and how the pieces that David mentioned were in the program should relate to each other. We then went and responded to that with a schematic design which we presented to the community on -- at their Cinco de Mayo event on May 4th. And we also earlier, prior to [indiscernible] We created three options of how the buildings would sit on the site and relate to the adjacent community. And those were posted during the months of March earlier this year for the community to respond to, and those were factored into the design process.

[4:09:08 PM]

So the project sits -- in keeping with the goals of the city of Austin, it sits along Montopolis Drive. We've worked the building into the existing trees on the north and we're using the -- site and we're using the building to shield the parking from Montopolis Drive and we are able by the placement of the building to keep the existing playground and keep -- reuse that vital resource as part of the facility. It's a two-story facility. The ground floor houses most of the activities including the big multi-sport gymnasium. And everyone enters whether they are walking or coming by public transit, riding a bike or driving a car into

the same lobby, both from Montopolis and the parking lot. And then from there they make use of the services in the building and can go out and there's a grand -- I won't say grand, but a dynamic stair that encourages people to go upstairs where the fitness loft is and on the other side is health and human services has services there and, of course, the track on the upper level of the gymnasium. We listened to the community and the kinds of characteristics they were hoping to see in the building, and kind of the impact, this is the entry along Montopolis, and kind of friendly, open, inviting facility that they would like to have in their community. And this is an aerial view looking at the rear courtyard

[4:11:09 PM]

which can be used for a lot of public events and it communicates with the big gymnasium as well. We are beginning to develop the project materially and we're looking at colors and textures that are appropriate for the facility, and those will be decided over the next phase in the design. So David, do you want to talk about the next steps? >> Yes. And so to wrap you 'the next steps for our design team and for this project is we will continue solidifying the design and getting it ready for construction and also we have a design commission meeting at the end of this month on the 24th and we've also planned a couple of meetings with the community to introduce them to the final design just before it goes to construction and also the grand opening of the facility. And then finally just before we go to construction we will be going to council for their approval to award the contract to hopefully a very good contractor. And as I said before, construction should begin in the winter of 2017-2018. If you have any questions. >> Houston: Councilmember Garza. >> Garza: I'm sorry if I missed it. What bond program -- what election was this? I'm just curious. >> This was the 2012 bond program. >> Garza: Thanks. >> 2012. >> Garza: It looks really good and thank you for the public engagement that you did. >> You're welcome. >> Houston: And we did invite councilmember Renteria to come, but he's probably watching it on TV.

[4:13:11 PM]

>> Okay, good. >> Houston: Very good. I love the design and how you are combining everything so I appreciate that. >> Thank you. >> Houston: Thank you so much for coming. >> You're welcome. >> Houston: The last item is the discussion of future agenda items. Our next meeting will be held on December the 14th. Do you have anything that you need to -- we have two resolutions from the human rights commission that we will probably be bringing forth at that meeting. And I just want to alert the members of this committee that there may be a joint meeting with public safety on Monday, November the 28th at 3:00 to discuss the vision zero recommendations. Some of those you might have heard the public safety commission had a meeting on -- was it last Monday night or the Monday before -- it was Monday before. It was about -- let's see, how do I say this? It's about people who do not have driver's license and they are stopped for a warrant or a citation and how do we deal with them. Vision zero says they need to have their cars confiscated, and there was a 5-5 vote or something. There was no recommendation from the public safety committee. Rather than each of these committees looking at that differently, we're going to have a joint meeting on the 28th at 3:00 to discuss the vision zero recommendations. Anything else I'm missing that we need to put on the December agenda? >> Madame chair?

[4:15:11 PM]

Health and human services. When were we going to get to or need to do call a special meeting regarding the central health joint appointment? >> Houston: I think Dana is working on that and I think we're

having the joint working group the same day that the mayor has now called a special session -- do you have that date? >> The 21st. Friday the 21st. >> Houston: Friday the 21st is the first time the working group comes, and then we will schedule a special called meeting for this committee to ratify that or talk about it and then we also have to talk about filling the vacancy for Rosie Mendoza on central health board of managers. What I would like to ask the members of this committee, look through and you the ones we've had because we've had a couple of them that we looked at and any new applicants, miss Estrada will send to us so we can be on top of that last city appointee and get that done before December 31st. Okay? Seeing no objection, this meeting stands adjourned and the time is 4:16. Thank you so much for all your time.