

# Closed Caption Log, Council Meeting, 09/30/10

**Note:** Since these log files are derived from the Closed Captions created during the Channel 6 live cablecasts, there are occasional spelling and grammatical errors. **These Closed Caption logs are not official records of Council Meetings and cannot be relied on for official purposes.** For official records or transcripts, please contact the City Clerk at 974-2210.

Leffingwell: For the first time in I believe about 10 years. Of course, city manager marc ott, thank you for your help and cooperation in making this thing work. There was a lot that went into it. And of course, bob parsons led the way. He is on stage left over there. The project manager, parra and of course keith reeves, mark watkins, abel villareal, russ, gary, steven moore, john riggolotti, kay, myrna. Our clerks shirley gentry off to the right here, joe lavia, joe matthews and of course martin that works for me. We will now have the invocation from pastor fred krebs from the prince of peace lutheran church. Welcome. Please rise.

Elected leaders of our dynamic and growing city of austin, together with all citizens and residents who have elected you, together we are called to be community. Some are born and raised here, others come from many other places. Some move here as quickly as they can. Some are here for a brief period of time and will move on. Others will be here for a lifetime. Together we want to build the best community possible. So we ask for devine help and guidance as we lead and work together, as we vision and dream and plan, as we strive to bridge the gaps between rich and poor and among peoples and colors and cultures. Ringing across the me less than I can't come to us the words of the ancient profit jeremiah, seek the welfare of the city and pray to the lord on its behalf for in its welfare you will find your welfare. The root of that word welfare is shalom in hebrew and salom in arabic. It means well-being and and welcome and farewell. It's a marvelous word. It means all those things. These are also the meanings which jesus of nazareth was expressing when he said my peace, my well-being I give to you. For us today, now, in our beloved city of austin, this means that we will all be especially blessed if decisions are made which will improve the quality of life for all from the least to the greatest. This well-being justice message is both vital and urgent as decisions are made in this meeting today. City leaders, we as community leaders who vote and elect you together, earnestly ask you to seek the well-being of the city of austin for if you work toward the well-being of all the people, their shalom, their salom, their wholeness you will find your well-being too. So I invite us all to pray.

[Speaking spanish] god of life, lord of love, spirit of community, as our beloved city of austin experiences today, a huge degree of economic disparity which causes suffering for too many families and individuals, we are reminded of the need for real living wages, quality job training programs, equal educational opportunities, health care for all, affordable housing, good police community relations and just treatment of our immigrant community. Give wisdom, boldness and courage to our city leaders and to those of us who elect them so that this meeting may raise and strengthen the quality life for whole who live in our city both now and for years to come. Amen.

Thank you, pastor. Please be seated.

Mayor Leffingwell: A quorum of the council is present, so I'll call this meeting of the austin city council to order on thursday, september 30th, 2010. We're meeting in the george washington carver museum and cultural center, 1165 angelina street, austin, texas. We're called to order at 1005. 10:05. We'll go next to our changes and corrections. Item number 24 is postponed until august 14th, 2010. Item 31 add as a co-sponsor mayor pro tem mike martinez. Item number 5 will also be postponed until october 14th. Our time certain items 30 morning briefing on the city of austin's permanent supportive housing strategy and

second a report on taxi cab issues. At 12 noon we will have our general citizens communications. we'll take up our zoning matters. our public hearings. 30 we'll have live music and proclamations. The consent agenda for today is items 1 through 33, with some exceptions, which I'll read into the record in just a moment, but first I want to read our board and commission appointments, which is item number 20. To the commission for women, catherine henchin is nominated by councilmember morrison. In addition, we're approving a waiver of the attendance requirement of section 2-1-26 of the city code for david lunested service on the animal advisory commission. The waiver includes absences through today's date. Note that councilmember spelman will recuse himself on items 15 and 17 or 15 through 17, councilmember?

Do them all.

Mayor Leffingwell: 15, 16 and 17. Pulled off the consent agenda item number 10 is pulled by councilmember randy shade. Item number 14 will be pulled for a presentation by staff. The following items will be pulled off consent agenda because of citizen speakers. Item number 4, 9, 11 and item numr 18. I'll entertain a motion to approve the consent agenda. Mayor pro tem moves approval. Seconded by councilmember cole. Show me voting no on item number 31. Any further discussion? All in favor say aye? Opposed say no? The consent agenda passes on a vote of seven to zero. So now we'll go to our items pulled off the consent agenda. First will be item number 4. And we have several speakers signed up. The first is david murak. David is signed up against and you have three minutes.

Good morning, mayor leffingwell and board members, councilmembers, i mean. I'm david muralth speaking on behalf of taxpayers and bible believing christians, which I am both. We know what a taxpayer is, mainly one who wants relief from excessive taxation that we are forced to endure. Please do not give this building to planned parenthood, but rather rent it to someone else that would pay a fair amount of rent which would help us as taxpayers including yourselves. A bible-believing christian is one that is repen tent of sin and has received the lord jesus christ by his savior, one, he recognizes you're a lost sinner headed for hell, repenting of you your sins, believing the gospel, which is the death, burial resurrection of the lord jesus christ in payment of your sins. Believing that the lord jesus christ is the only way to god in prison. Rerepenting to the lord jesus christ to save you. A true christian will not support defying god by breaking his command means, thousand shalt not kill. Abortion is premed indicated, cold blooded murder in the first degree. We beseech you not to rent this building nor any other building to planned parenthood, but rather to someone else at a fair rent. What are you doing to support life affirming organizations? Please do not call yourself a christian if you support abortion. Thank you. Any questions?

Next speaker is deana meyer. Deana meyer, welcome. You have three minutes, signed up against.

Hi. My name is deana mayor, texans for life. We are a nonprofit pro life organization, dedicated to protecting innocent life from conception to natural death and we represent over 19,000 pro life households in austin. We oppose any contract with planned parenthood because planned parenthood promotes abortion as a means of birth control. In austin planned parenthood promotes and performs even late term abortions. We are already funding abortions with our tax dollars. Why do we need to continue to subsubsidize their operating expenses? To cover your budget shortfalls, you have raised our taxes and increased our costs. The costs of your constituents. You could sell this property and bring in revenue. Instead you're using it to subsidize planned parenthood. Please stop forcing your constituents, taxpayers of austin, to subsidize planned parenthood, the largest abortion provider in texas. Thank you.

Next speaker is christian gonzalez. Christian gonzalez also signed up against. Welcome. You have three minutes. mayor and councilmembers. I'm here on behalf of the roman catholic diocese of austin. We represent an estimated 200,000 roman catholics within the city limits. Last night I'm not sure if you received it, but our monsignor sent you a letter and just in case you didn't receive it, I would like to read that to you now. We have two principal objections to this lease. The first is under ethical grounds. And

that is that planned parenthood of the texas capital region is in the abortion business and abortion is morally objectionable to a large number of the citizens of austin. The city subsidized lease constituents taxpayer support for an enterprise that violates the ethical stance of a large portion of the city's population. Secondly we object on economic reasons. Planned parenthood is a profitable business. We question the fairness of the taxpayers providing a subsidy to an already profitable enterprise when there are so many other worthwhile uses of taxpayer funds. So on behalf of the catholics of the city of austin, we respectfully ask mayor and councilmembers, to reconsider this wisdom of this taxpayer subsidy. We would also ask that you would perhaps consider some life affirming options such as the catholic charities of central texas gabriel project life center which is across the street from this facility as part of our catholic charities of central texas. And one of my colleagues will speak to you more about that in a minute. Thank you.

Next is brett bullock. He is signed up against and you have three minutes.

Thank you, sir. Ladies and gentlemen of the council, thank you for serving our great community and thank you for hosting it at this great facility and thank you to all those that have showed up to participate today. It's very important that you are here. My names brent bullock. I'm speaking on behalf of the austin area pastor council, it's a broad coalition of bible believing churches, various dominations and crossing racial boundaries. We do oppose the continued lease that goes back to 1972. We look at this issue as subsidization of something that is morally objectionable as it's been stated by priest speakers. I would also ask you to consider that this is actually taking away the liberty and choice from the taxpayers of the city of austin. Charity is a personal matter. Charity is something that causes the citizens of the community to get involved. To help those that are poor and those that are needy and those that need counsel. And by the city council subsidizing these particular behaviors, life taking actions, you're robbing the opportunity for people to be participating and engaging and giving of their own money to the organization of their own choice. And so this is -- this impacts much more than just the budget. This impacts the personal liberty of individuals. I would also ask you to consider the fact that these issues are spiritual in nature. We can certainly tend to physical issues and those are pretty obvious. But the spiritual matters are much more complex, they're hard to see. And the church has been doing this for thousands of years, as you know. And we can bring light and hope to those in the most desperate of situations and so we ask your support in changing the agenda of the city to disengaging these life taking options. Again, I thank you so much for your time and for your service. Any questions?

Mayor Leffingwell: Next speaker is allison skinner. Allison skinner signed up against. When you reach the podium you will have three minutes.

Good morning, mayor leffingwell and members of the council. I'm allison skinner. I wanted to follow up on what christian gonzalez said. I am the director of the gabriel project life center for indict cease of austin and we are austin housing finance corporationed in the catholic charities building just one block away from this facility at seventh and chicon. I wanted to tell you a little bit about the services that we provide. We really feel like the services that we provide, we offer life affirming support for the women of austin. We don't offer them abortions, we offer them free services, everything that we do is completely free for any woman that walks in our door. We offer them free pregnancy tests, parenting and pregnancy classes to help them out when they find out that they are in an unplanned pregnancy. We refer them to -- for instance within catholic charities within the community and we provide material assistance and consulting services for these women. These are the kinds of services that women in crisis pregnancies and unplanned pregnancies really need and want. Again, we don't charge for this. We are showing them love, showing them support, and i really urge you to reconsider how the city council and therefore the taxpayers of the city support women who are in unplanned pregnancies. Do we want to send them to a place that urges them to abort their child or do we want to serve them in ways that affirm their lives and the lives of all the future citizens of austin. Thank you.

Mayor Leffingwell: The following are signed up not wishing to speak. Jonathan saenz,

(indiscernible) mcknight, joe hodgeman, sin da vanna, chuck ashford. Kalely smith and rebeck that sneerly.

Now we'll go to those who are in favor. Kim lembreck is first, signed up for. Welcome. You have three minutes.

Thank you, mayor leffingwell. My name is ken lambbreck, I'm the president and ceo of planned parenthood locally. We thank the city for a very long, long-term support of our service to the indigent in this community. Our east seventh street clinic at seventh and chicon has been a partnership for almost 40 years. And in that site we have never offered safe legal abortions. That site is exclusively the services are all prevention in nature. We help women with breast cancer screening, cervical cancer screening, birth control services, education, and outreach in the community. The clients served are 73,000 that go to that health center locally. The vast majority are on a sliding fee scale and many don't pay for their services either. The location has been wonderful for us because as the city has changed and grown over the last eight years I believe there was something recently that said the city has grown by 32 percent or roughly over eight years. Planned parenthood has grown by 70 percent in the last four years in services to community. One of three women in child bearing years in poverty child planned parenthood their home. And this site is very important to continue the services. We've invested in the building and continue to do so. The past two years we've spent approximately \$85,000 on roofs and security systems and access for individuals with physical ailments. And we look forward to investing more. We're getting a new roof this year, which will be \$12,000. And have several other plans. If you have any questions, I'm happy to answer them. Thank you for your long-term support and continuing the lease to east seventh street.

Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember spelman has a question.

Spelman: I think it will be news to a lot of people. I'm glad you mentioned that it that you don't do surgical procedures of any kind, including abortion, in the planned parenthood site we're talking about here.

That's correct.

Spelman: A previous speaker said that planned parenthood staff were urging women to have abortions. I wonder if you could address that.

That's simply not true. Planned parenthood bases all of our services on evidence-based medicine. We provide women education regarding services. So if an individual comes in for a pregnancy test and the pregnancy test is positive, we tell them your pregnancy test is positive. If they're excited, we're excited with them and we do the first prenatal visit and give them their prenatal vitamins and we find community resources to help that individual carry to term. If they're conflicted, we ask why and how can we help. And if it is a spiritual issue, we have a very robust advisory group and we bring members of every denomination to work and visit with these women and counsel within their faith. We talk with them about their family and their support structures to ensure that they have all of the facts to make the choice that is right for them, whether it be carrying to term, carrying to term and choosing adoption or terminating the pregnancy. And as an adoptive parent we take very seriously the nature of unbiased scientifically based medical care and it's the individual's choice.

So if someone came into the planned parenthood who had no objections to an abortion, you could help them. If somebody came into planned parenthood who had objections to abortion and simply wouldn't have one, you would still help them.

Absolutely and we do that everyday.

Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember cole. Another question, ken.

Cole: Just a quick question, mr. lambert.

Forgive me. I was paying attention to three minutes.

Cole: I just have a couple of quick questions because we talked about the growth in austin. What are your strategic plans or do you have any for additional clinics?

You know, we looked at that in relation to care throughout the community. Since 2005 our governmental funding has decreased significantly by more than 60%. And the community luckily has stood behind us and our individual donors represent 22 percent of our total agency budget. So austinites and the generosity of austinites are what is helping us to serve. Our health care service has grown by 70 percent over the last four years and we anticipate it growing substantially over the next three as well. We estimate that one in two women living in poverty will call planned parenthood their medical home within the next three to four years. And it's obvious that individuals who are losing their health insurance everyday and having a difficulty time in our community are showing newspaper our health centers, our well women exams are up by 40 percent over last year simply because these individuals are educated to know they need to go for an annual exam and they don't have health insurance this year. So they're choosing to come to us for subsidized services. Subsidized by our economy and by individual donors.

Cole: I'm glad to hear that because I think as you know I served for two terms on the planned parenthood board and I was always struck by the number of racial minorities that you served and the efforts that you made into the community to provide religious counseling. And that you were always very, very careful to just not cross that line, but give them a choice and in particular to low income individuals. So I appreciate the work you do and thanks for coming down.

Thank you, councilmember.

Mayor Leffingwell: Sarah weed is also signed up for, not wishing to speak. Will answer questions. And I want to correct the record. Kalely smith and rebecca sneerly were signed up for, not wish to go speak. I believe I may have said against. Or including them in the list. So those are all the speakers that we have signed up who want to speak. I'll entertain a motion from council on item number 4.

Cole: Move approval.

Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember cole moves approval. Seconded by councilmember spelman. Discussion? All in favor say aye? Opposed say no. It passes on a vote of seven to zero. We will now go to item number nine. Which also has been pulled for a number of people signed up to speak. Excuse the delay. I'm trying to pull up this list on my computer. First speaker signed up against is david muralth. Welcome. You have three minutes.

God has built a premarital sex defense in every human being. Do you know what it is? Mod des city. When an adult authority figure stands before a class of students and teaches comprehensive sex education it breaks down this defense and there by increases promiscuity and that increases sexually transmitted diseases, pregnancies. It's like throwing gasoline on a fire. It's time we wake up and tell our young people that premarital sex, not premature, premarital sex, is wrong. The disastrous price that must be paid for it and the rewards of waiting until married. Now, I want to mention four schools here that have used abstinence, directive abstinence education coupled with character education. One of them is san marcos, california where they instituted this program in the junior high. Two years later in the high school there was a 90% reduction in the pregnancy rate. Spur, texas used the same curriculum. That curriculum was teen aid, the sex curriculum, the abstinence, coupled with character education. Character is very important. In the little town of spur texas using the same curriculum they

got an 89% reduction. In canyon, texas, using sex respect without the character education, they got a 68% reduction. And in jessup, wayne county, georgia, they got a 77% reduction using sex respect. Now, planned parenthood is using the wrong method. They only give abstinence tongue in cheek treatment and their whole emphasis is on contraception and we need to get away from that. We need to use programs that work. So I say don't give them any more money. In fact, if I was involved in about -- about 15 years ago where we had a two-million-dollar grant here and federal money came into the state of texas. Do you know -- and in the bill it said to preserve -- I made a speech to the senate education committee and brought up this modesty thing. And the bill read that in order to protect the modesty of the students the girls are to be separated from the boys. I don't know that that ever happened. But when the health department administered those funds and it said that the emphasis in the bill was to be on abstinence for those under 18, and what happened with the health department, they distributed the money to everybody but those that promoted abstinence. Planned parenthood and their ilk got 98 percent of that money. There was two percent of it that went to abstinence-based group, which was us. And so I was really dismayed over that to think that the bill came out with the emphasis on abstinence and it went to those emphasizing contraception. Don't give them any more money, please.

Thank you, david. Next speaker is christian gonzalez. Signed up against. And you have three minutes when you reach the podium. mayor and councilmembers. Again, I represent the roman catholic diocese of austin and I'll be brief in my remarks. As you know, we are opposed to any teaching, contraception or distribution of contraceptions that prohibits life. We support life affirming work that protects life from the moment of conception until natural death. It's our judgment that this program does not teach those things in a manner that we would agree with as catholics. We ask you to please not fund this program and look at some alternatives. Again, in a moment one of my colleagues will come to address some more specifics on this matter. We wanted to register as a church our objection to this funding. Thank you.

Mayor Leffingwell: Thank you, christian. Next speaker is brent bullock. He signed up against. And you have three minutes as well.

Thank you, sir. Again, speaking on behalf of the austin area pastor council. We object to the engagement of planned parenthood. I would like to address this from the standpoint of a youth pastor serving 12 years in round rock as a youth pastor. Teens are very amazing people. They rise to the challenge that you present them. They accomplish amazing things and I know you may well remember your teenaged years and how exciting that was and the memories that last from those days. It's also a time that devastating things happen to teenagers as well. And so what I would suggest to you is that planned parenthood teaches things that are contrary to what was previously stated as medically sound. There is a teen website hosted by planned parenthood that promotes anal sex as a safe form of sex. And if you've studied the data, if you're a medical doctor, you know very well that that is one of the most dangerous acts of sex that you can possibly engage in, especially the male-male form. And I apologize for the graphic nature of this, but that is an extremely risky behavior that is being promoted by planned parenthood as being sound. One of the things that is missing in the dialogue, we all know that sex is spicy and sex is hot and sex is fun and all this, pleasurable and all that, but do you know what? There's a fundamental truth that's not being taught, and that's sex makes babies. And if you're going to have sex, you better be prepared to raise a child. And we need to raise children that are godly, responsible citizens. They need to be brought up in such a way that they are accountable to their culture, they're accountable to their community and they are positive contributors. And plan the parenthood does not fully support that agenda. So the austin area pastor council and many god-fearing citizens in this audience as well as around this community oppose the engagement of planned parenthood as a service provider. Thank you very much.

[ Applause ]

Mayor Leffingwell: Next speaker is allison skinner, signed up against. I'll ask everyone to be very careful

coming down those stairs. They're steep.

Good morning. My name is Allison Skinner. Again, I represent the Diocese of Austin as the director of the Gabriel Project Life Center. And I just again wanted to reiterate that the Catholic Church has a moral objection to the use of contraception, both inside and outside of marriage. And so that's something that we definitely don't want to be providing, offering and supporting for our high school students in the community. And one of the large reasons is that the use of contraception really leads to -- opens the door for objectification of both men and women as -- treating sex as something that is only for pleasure and treating our fertility as something that we need to protect against. So as the church, we support programs that promote respect of both men and women, which means respecting their fertility, respecting sex as it was intended, as something only to take place between a married couple who is open to life, to express their mutual love to each other, to be open to life. And this is what we need to be promoting to our young people, a respect for each other, for their own bodies, their own fertility and for themselves as they grow up into responsible men and women. Thank you.

Mayor Leffingwell: The following speakers are also signed up against not wishing to speak, Deana Meyer, Joe Saenz, Chita Ashford. I'll go to those in favor. The first speaker is Ken Lambert. Three minutes.

Thank you. And we again appreciate our participation at the city. We have tried to stop the epidemic of teen pregnancy in our state. Texas has the fourth highest teen birth rate and the highest repeat teen birth rate in the United States. A teen is more like likely if they get pregnant before the age of 20 to get pregnant a second time in Texas than anywhere else in our country. We believe that this is a very unfortunate statistic and we believe the only 100% effective method of keeping teens from getting pregnant is abstinence. And that is why all of our programs begin with abstinence, not just the discussion of what it is or what it means, but how to say no. So our teen peer educators that this funding would support are educated on how to talk to each other the way teens do, text to each other the way teens do and teach each other how to the to give into peer pressure. Even -- and we all know that with the teen pregnancy rate the way they are and with the repeat teen pregnancy rates as high as it is, the information needs to be comprehensive and scientifically based. So while we begin with abstinence, we provide accurate information about other methods of birth control as well. Parents are a critical key to this and we have a very robust parent education program. For individuals that have active parents, opening that dialogue between parents and their children about their family values, their religious values and the science related to sex is very important. And we try to teach parents to talk first, to talk with their children when they're young, to talk with them throughout her life and to become askable parents in the solution. And for those in our community that don't have parental involvement, we try to encourage that with a responsible adult, whether it be a grandparent or an aunt or uncle or a teacher and we try to provide that support to individuals because we must work together to get the teen pregnancy epidemic under control. I'm happy to take any questions you may have. And I'll pause.

Mayor Leffingwell: Thank you, Ken. Councilmember Spelman.

Spelman: Lambert, just a couple of things. You've talked for a moment for awhile about why -- about your offering comprehensive sex education. You start with abstinence, but you go beyond that. What do you think would happen if you started with abstinence and just stopped and didn't go any further?

What we've seen, and I have some statistics. But what we've seen is that teens may prevent sex for up to a year and then are more likely to have unprotected sex when they do become sexually active. So the evidence is not proven that abstinence only education has the best outcome.

Spelman: Has the evidence proven that comprehensive sex education has better outcomes?

Yes, the scientific evidence has shown that comprehensive sex ed does have better outcomes and all of our programs have an outcome focus and an evaluation piece.

Spelman: Go ahead.

And of course we're investing more in trying to always assess the outcomes of our education efforts.

Spelman: My apologies for asking this question, but it did come up, so we ought to deal with it. A previous speaker said you had on the website, planned parenthood was advocating anal sex. I wonder if you had a comment about that.

We do not advocate anal sex or any form of sex. We advocate responsibility and we advocate that individuals make choices that are educated.

Spelman: Okay. Thank you, sir.

Thank you.

Mayor Leffingwell: Next speaker, sarah weed has signed up in favor, not wish to go speak, but will answer questions. And signed up in favor, not wishing to speak, are kalely smith and rebecca sneerly. Those are all the speakers that we have. I'll entertain a motion on number -- item number 9.

Spelman: Mayor.

Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember spelman.

Spelman: If the best evidence available on how to prevent teen pregnancies suggested that abstinence only programs work better, i would happily support them, but the best evidence available, I actually had a class working on this with an entire year with travis county a few years ago and it was clear the best evidence supports comprehensive sex education programs as being by far the most effective. With that I move approval of item 9.

Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember spelman moves to approve item 9. Seconded committee councilmember morrison. -- Seconded by councilmember morrison. All in favor? Opposed? It passes on a vote of seven to zero. Next we'll take up item number 10, which was pulled by councilmember shade. Councilmember shade.

Shade: Thank you, mayor. This is an item that we were briefed on at our last council meeting. It's been something that the public health subcommittee has been working on really for the past couple of years, certainly since 2008. I want to thaj the staff -- I want to thank the staff if their hard work. They may have a few items they want to share with you, but I did want to call to your attention, colleagues, the handouts that you received on this item. David, are you plan to go make a few comments on this? I know he has a presentation I've seen. The bottom line is that after more than a decade of status quo funding for our health and human services contracts, this is an opportunity for us to open up the process to allow all of our current contractors to write proposals that match what they might be interested in doing today, what our cities priorities are. It allows them for the first time in a long time to be able to form new collaboratives. It allows all the organizations that have not had a chance to compete for social service contracts that opportunity. It -- I think it is just -- it's high time that we're able to do that. Again, all current contractors will be eligible and encouraged to apply in this process. All the contracts that we're talking about are going to be for the timeline that we're approving today would be so that these could be completed this year so they could be funded in the next budget cycle. I just want to remind folks that currently the pot of money that we're talking about in social service contracts is roughly \$13 million. By next budget cycle that number could be higher, it could be I hope at some point it will be higher, and I think that the quality of the proposals that we see will help drive that as well. So I really want to thank staff and I'll call i guess -- I know david wants to do his presentation. I know that my colleagues will have



questions and so forth.

Mayor Leffingwell: I'd also want to tell you we have seven speakers signed up on this item.

Morning, mayor and councilmembers. You will recall we went through an extensive discussion of this last week and I think councilmember shade has hit on the major points here. Specifically the action we're requesting today from council is approval to proceed with the process as outlined and recommended by both staff and the public health and human services committee for contracts to be effective in October of 2011, beginning with fiscal year 2012 -- 2011-2012. I think councilmembers were given a good summary of the intent here and why we're recommending proceeding on this basis. I would mention there's one slight adjustment to the recommendation that we presented last week. You may recall that we had proposed among our threshold criteria a minimum amount of \$50,000 for all contracts. Our current minimum is 20,000. And we were looking at issues of efficiency, certainly looking for proposals that would have significant impact, magnitude in terms of that impact, and also wanting to promote partnerships, but during this past week we received a good bit of feedback regarding that specific issue and at this point we would recommend revising that part of the threshold criteria back to the existing minimum of \$20,000. There are a number of agencies that are currently funded between the 20 and 50,000-dollar level that are leveraging other resources and felt that this might be problematic. I think we have the support of the subcommittee members on this revision. You have the scoring matrix. We presented that last week as well. As you're aware, we have included a weighting system that reflects the priorities within the comprehensive plan in priority order. Again, the timeline, we would intend to release this this month with proposals being due in January, bring it back to council in the spring, again focused on October 1, 2011 as a start date. And also in the spring we would include a transition plan looking on a case-by-case basis with the potential impact would be because we don't know at this stage how significant the changes may be. In some cases it might mean some reduction in funding, in other -- [ inaudible ]. Sort of a reprogramming of services within specific agencies. We want to look at impact on clients, impact on the agencies and what might be needed to assure that we have a smooth transition. And the other thing I would emphasize in terms of the matrix that you see on this slide and was clearly stated at the subcommittee is that we are committed to addressing all five goals by awarding a mix of contracts to provide primary or secondary services collectively, that is, addressing all five goals. We did get some feedback this week from one voice in terms of the outcome measures that we had proposed. We've made some changes. I think the key message here is that we will include in a range of outcome measures, potential outcome measures associated with the goals, but those are not intended to be strictly active. We would encourage proposals if they have other measures that they want to include in their proposal and they can demonstrate how those line up with the goals and it will help us be successful in terms of the outcomes, but we've got a flexibility in terms of those measures. And in fact, I think that will provide you with a very good tool when we get to the end of the process to look at the proposals, look at the scoring, look at the outcome measures that are proposed and then be able to make some informed choices in terms of the mix and the portfolio specifically related to the outcomes and the outcome measures. So with that, mayor, that concludes my comments. We'd like to request council ask request to proceed. Thank you.

Mayor Leffingwell: Thank you, Mr. Lurie. I want to say briefly that this process was begun over two years ago when I was on this subcommittee and we talked about how the way contracts were awarded back then and up to now basically on auto pilot. There was no in-depth scrutiny as to the effectiveness and the appropriateness of these awards. So we asked for this process to be done and the reason it took over two years is not just because you guys were really slow -- [ laughter ] -- but because we wanted to allow a long period of time for those folks who might be affected, those organizations who might be affected to make that transition to start looking ahead and know so that they could plan ahead and know that things might change in the future for them and know what the new criteria would be. So I just want to make that comment. Councilmember Morrison.

Morrison: Thank you. I know we have speakers. I'll save my comments for later. But I do have a question, David, if you wouldn't mind. When you're speaking about the outcomes and comments that we got for one voice, I appreciate you taking the -- making the comments that you did. Should I then

understand that in the proposal preparation instructions and evaluation factors where we have previously the outcome measures, there were six and we had listed here that one of the six measures below must be included. So I gather from what you said just a moment ago that that must be -- that that's going to change and that folks will be able to suggest the outcomes that are most appropriate for the programs they're offering.

Yes, councilmember morrison, that's correct. We have changed some language, byron may want to comment on this, where we have provided the option for proposals to not only address those particular outcome measures, but other outcome measures that they feel would be more appropriate in their instance. So we're not mandating these specific outcome measures. We're offering these as some possibilities, but we're also open to other outcome measures that the proposers would want to put forward.

Morrison: So if a program does not offer one of these six, but another, they are still in the mix for consideration.

I think the key point is to demonstrate that what they're proposing and how they're going to measure that relates directly to the primary or secondary goal that they've identified in their proposal.

Morrison: Great. Thanks. I think that's a big improvement and I appreciate your work on that.

Mayor Leffingwell: Okay. We'll go to our speakers now. The first is kendra peters. Kendra peters is signed up against. And you will have three minutes when you reach the podium. You don't have to hurry.

I'm actually isabel hendrick signed up to speak right after kendra and I'm speaking on behalf of kendra and myself. Is that all right.

Mayor Leffingwell: So kendra, are you donating time to isabel?

Kendra is probably not present.

Mayor Leffingwell: Our rules say they have to be present in the chamber to donate time. So isabel head drik is next and you will have three minutes.

Thank you. Good morning, mayor and councilmembers. My name is isabel headdriks, I am the executive of black land community development corporation. We're an affordable housing nonprofit here on the east side that additionally offers transitional housing program for homeless and near homeless families. I'm here to address the social service contracts. We currently have a social service contract with the city for \$21,425 to provide case management for these homeless families. I'm here today to request that you support the proposed amendment to the process as presented lurie to reduce the minimum contract amount from 50,000 to \$20,000. The city benefits from the size of the contract that they have with blackland. While our contract is only for 21,000, our actual costs of the program are almost 80. So the city is actually leveraging about 50,000 out of the contract with blackland. And additionally as a general statement I just wanted to request that all councilmembers aggressively seek to expand the pot of funding as we go into this competitive cycle. I think social service needs are vast and they are vastly unmet in the city. And anything that can be done to expand the total amount of funds available would be greatly appreciated by all social service providers. Thank you very much.

Mayor Leffingwell: Thank you, isabel. Councilmember morrison.

Morrison: Isabel, i just wanted to thank you for speaking with us. I know our councilmembers also over the past week. I think that in talking with you and about the advantages of a small program or the small

funding level really brought to light that we needed to have that flexibility. And while there may be advantages to having larger minimums, what this really -- what I really -- we need to keep in mind that there are also advantages. One of the things that we always like to look at it is what percent of the funding comes from any given source for a program. Because if it's too dependent on one source, that can be a little bit risky. So there's the push-pull of that and I think with your conversation we got to a better place. So thank you.

[01:56:48]

I really appreciate the openness and I really appreciate staff's willingness to be flexible in this also. Thank you.

Mayor Leffingwell: Next speaker is mark. Councilmember shade.

Shade: Isabel, so now based on that change, are you for this now? Yes, you are for this. And I just wanted to echo your comment. I tried to make it earlier, but I'll reemphasize it. I think that this process will hopefully give us a great argument for why we need to have a much larger pot of money than is currently there. So that's one of my personal goals, but I know that my colleagues share that. We're spending so much time on housing and so much of the success of that goes to the success and strength of the services that we provide, we have an incredible nonprofit sector in this community and any way we can actually address what father krebs said earlier, which is to help people transition out of poverty, that's really our mission here. So a big part of our mission here. So I appreciate y'all's work on that. Thank you.

[ Applause ]

Mayor Leffingwell: Mark mellier-smith. Correct my pronunciation if I'm wrong. Mark. Apparently mark -- there you are. Welcome. You're signed up against and have you three minutes.

Good morning. Mayor leffingwell and members of the council, my name is mark mellier-smith and I'm the ceo of molecular imprints, a company in north austin. I also serve as the board , on whom I'm speaking for today. I appreciate you giving me the chance to talk to you today. I understand the need for council and staff to develop a process to rate the social service contracts you have each year. And ask that programs with different objectives be rated in different ways. I also understand and applaud the needs with people with no other place to turn for food or shelter. But capital idea also helps the disadvantaged by lifting working families out of poverty by education. And serve both the needs of the poor and also the economic development of the city. With the generous support of the city council for more than 10 years we've been able to graduate over one thousand people from our programs. These graduates typically earn three times what they did before training and we also matched the train to go the need of employers in high demand areas like health care and it. Because capital i.d.e.a. Participants have deep roots in austin. And have known poverty, they make very good employees. They have also started to show that the programs have a high rate of return for the government since the graduates now pay significantly higher taxes and contribute to the economy. We also as an organization have worked hard to ensure that our programs are well run, our participants do well in school and we try to more than match city of austin funding from other sources. I would also like to emphasize that this is an investment in the returns over several generations. One of the most important things we have found is that the children of our participants don't need this program. They see their parents working hard at a remedial education and they stay in high school, go on to graduate and most of them go on to college. The program really does break the cycle of poverty and provides the city of austin with significant economic returns. We do not in any way oppose the concept of ratings or competitive biddings. In fact, I feel comfortable enough about our programs that we can match anything that others might produce. But I am a little concerned that our long-term training programs when matched with other desperately needed short-term programs may end up with a loss of this important program, which attacks the root

causes of the poverty, not just treating the symptoms. Thank you.

Mayor Leffingwell: Next speaker is olivia

(indiscernible). Signed up against. You have three minutes.

If I may, mayor and councilmembers, it's too dark in here. I can't see my paper.

Mayor Leffingwell: Can we turn up the lights? Kind of limited. It is this is a theater.

Oh, I can't see it. Here we go.

I guess that light in front me is blinding me -- in front of me is blinding me more.

Could I go ahead and go ne?

Mayor Leffingwell: Eric holloway and in the meantime -- well, we have a flashlight if you want to go ahead. It's up to you.

Okay. Yeah. Eric holloway is signed up neutral. Are you eric?

I'm eric.

You're signed up neutral and you have three minutes.

Thank you very much. My name is eric holloway. I'm a leader with austin interfaith and I am from the david's episcopal church and I'm here to represent the position of austin interfaith on capital and their continued funding as well as represent some concerns that st. David's episcopal church has. Our idea on funding is this, we expect the city council to maintain or increase the current level of funding of 2 million in total funding, which includes child care dollars, which we believe that this program deserves, and has earned with a proven track record of return on investment. We're not afraid of capital competing for city dollars. Again, this is a great program both in david david's episcopal church which has a lot of members that are on the boards of and direct employees of a lot of social service agencies. We're all aware of capital's importance of moving premium from lower jobs to very good jobs. Now, we would -- we believe it is competitive, competitive against other long-term training programs, and we are -- we're nervous at the idea of competing against short-term training programs and direct service programs such as in st. David's, we have a program that gets money from social services and we don't want these two kinds of thingz have to compete for money because they believe they're both necessary. david's and in many christian traditions we have the sort of saying that's better to teach someone to fish than just to give them a fish. And you know, there are people in austin that need fish and we give out a lot david's, but we also need this program. It's a vital part of this. And we are -- you know, we're concerned about where the funding is going to come from and making sure that that funding increases to support this program. And we think it supports the city in a number of ways and deserves funding from a number of different sources to continue it at the level and that it can compete against similar programs. And shouldn't compete based on metrics for direct service or short-term training programs. Once I'm, I'm eric hall representing the opinions of austin interfaith and st. David's episcopal church.

Mayor Leffingwell: Thank you. Are you ready?

Yes, sir, I think I'm ready.

Mayor Leffingwell: You have three minutes.

At this point I would like to recognize all the austin interfaith leaders that are with us this morning. If they could stand with me. I'm a member of the san jose catholic church and a leader with austin interfaith. Nearly one of three austinites lived in poverty in 2009. Roughly 30% of all children in austin live in poverty. This is a shame. takes adults which earn an average of \$11,000 a year before training and trains them for jobs which average 40,000 a year. In four years capital participants paid back the money invested in them through increased taxes paid. Because we value the city's investment in capital , we approach our local legislators and comptroller susan combs in 2009 with a proposal. Could the state provide matching dollars that cities and counties invest in long-term job training. What resulted was the creation of the jet fund, a 10 million-dollar competitive long-term job training grant program for a successful programs like capital i.d.e.a. We were able to pass this legislation in part because the comptroller certified that it cost the state zero dollars over time because of the return on investment. Of the first six million dollars awarded across the has \$750,000 for participants in central texas. We are leveraging city dollars to draw down more state dollars. We are training more adults for living wage jobs. We are not afraid of capital competing for fi stars, but like with the jet fund it should compete against other long-term job training programs. Not against short-term training programs or direct services. Programs like capital idea return an economic development by lifting people out of poverty, by training them for -- for in-demand jobs. Our expectation is that the council does not turn back from fully funding capital i.d.e.a. at \$1.2 million. Even if it -- even if you have to take dollars from multiple pots of money. Thank you very much.

[ Applause ]

Mayor Leffingwell: Thank you. Next speaker signed up against is jacqueline sinks. Note in the chamber. We'll go to gus pena. He is signed up for. Gus, you have three minutes when you get here.

Good morning, mayor, ott, gus pena. Before you can look for a job, you have to have a house, a roof over your heads for your family, if you have a family. You can't go look for a job without the wraparound services needed. I agree with councilmember shade's statement -- going back 26, 27 years that more funding is needed for social service agencies. I left a message in your voice mail, councilmember morrison, didn't receive a that's okay, I'm used to not receiving phone calls back from you. That's cool. We hold an accountable process out there in the community. But the issue is this, that your statement came out in the paper stating about the need for increase in funding for social service agencies, food, rental, I thank you for that. I want the public to know thaw came out in the paper and this is your statement. You did it last year also. I thank you for that. Ladies and gentlemen, there needs to be oversight on how the funding is allocated to social service agencies. You need to find out how much money is being spent on direct services. Bill spelman, chris riley, you know what I'm talking about. I called y'all personally. I'm not going to go further than that. But the issue is this, that there is poverty out there. Somebody said the recession is over with. We've been nine months out of it. That's -- I better not say that word. It's wrong. We have maybe at the most -- I'm going to say it and it's going to shock you, three years. I called the recession in november and december of '07 and everybody said no, gus is wrong. My good friend said no, gus, you're wrong. The newspaper in february said we had been in recession as of november, december of '07. Listen to us werks noavment the people are hurting are needing direct services now. Here are examples of the need and I understand about job training. It's very important. But you cannot go out to look for a job if you have a family. You don't have a roof, food, medical care taken care of. It is difficult. You can call caritas. You are on the phone for an hour, you cannot get in there and put your name on the list for case management. I am a former counselor. I counselor marines returning for vietnam. I am going to speak on item number 11. I am going to tell you ladies and gentlemen of the council, we are hurting out there in the community. People are losing their jobs. \$11 An hour is not going to get a family fed, much less have a roof over our head. You have a lot of people in motels. They depend on elected officials, military veterans, organizations, other people's kindness to maintain a roof over their heads. Be considerate. I know y'all are. You have a heart. I know it's tough. I've been in many more budget sessions than y'all have put together. I guarantee you back through -- through mayor roy butler, may he rest in peace. But there needs to be an accountability

process of who gets funding and how it's spent.

[ Buzzer sounds ] please, I am in favor of the process. It's difficult, but keep up the good work. We need that very much.

Mayor Leffingwell: Thank you, gus. Those are all the speakers we have send up to speak on this item. I'll entertain a motion from council. Councilmember shade.

Shade: I'll move approval.

Second.

Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember, does that include the proposed amendment?

Shade: Yes. Just exactly what the staff presented to us. I appreciate that amendment.

Mayor Leffingwell: Motion by councilmember shade to approve the item with the amendment of the threshold being reduced to 20,000. Seconded by mayor pro tem. Discussion? Councilmember morrison and then mayor pro tem.

I wanted to thank by thanking the mayor and all of our predecessors that are part of kicking this off some years ago. It's definitely moving us in the right direction. I had to express some concerns about some of the details of this program, but I know we have a learning experience and a learning opportunity in front of us. And I know that everybody is really committed to service to our community in the most efficient and effective way that we can do it here in this city. So I'm definitely supportive of this. I want to thank all the folks, the stakeholders that participated in the process. And I also want to mention that it's great that we get accountability and transparency with our matrix. The bottom line is there is going to be some work done by the staff and a recommendation and in the end by council. It's not by the numbers. It's going to be somewhat subjective because we need to take all the proposals and in addition to making sure that we're selecting effective proposals and programs, that the combination of programs that we select covers not only all the priority areas, but within a priority area we need to make sure that we're not just having redundant services. So there's a lot of work to be done. One of those -- one of those areas will be workforce development. And long-term workforce development and short-term workforce development are two different areas I fully expect to see those two areas covered in the recommendation or at least what council finally looks at in the end. I want to again thank everybody. It's maybe not going to be perfect. We're going to learn about this as we go forward. But I think that with the commitment that we have from everybody the stakeholders, the staff and the council, that we're really on our way to a better process.

Mayor Leffingwell: Mayor pro tem.

Martinez: Thanks, mayor. I want to echo some of the comments that have been made, but specifically I want to thank staff. This actually started, mayor, three years ago when -- as you mentioned when you and I and mayor pro tem dunkerley served on health and human services together. It's been a long process. I also want to thank the austin interfaith leaders. I would expect nothing less from you all. You advocate for your purpose and your cause, but I will say this, I think that some of the fears that I've heard I believe are unfounded and I hope that bears to be true. I think that the services you provide and in the wraparound manner that you provide them, you will be probably one of the top proposals that would come in because of the service that and I expect to do nothing but continue and expand on those incredible services that you provide this community. Lastly what I'll say is that under -- this is health and safety. And so while we may be process where it's specifically lines out how you competed and where you ended up in the peculiared order under health and safety, we as a council retain the ability and the right to adjust the overall ending outcome. If we feel like it's not the appropriate mix for the needs of the

citizens of austin, we as a council will retain the authority to make some adjustments if necessary. So I appreciate the community input. We need to keep it coming in so that we can get this right, but I do believe that this is absolutely an appropriate step as it relates to providing to our most needy citizens in the best possible manner. And that's really what we're trying to do. I want to thank my colleagues on the health and human services subcommittee, councilmember morrison and shade for all their hard work and patience. Thank you, mayor.

Mayor Leffingwell: Thank you, mayor pro tem. I'll just saying again going forward instead of it being a process that was on auto pilot is going to be a competitive myriad faced process and that is something that I believe is essential with limited dollars. We cannot -- we don't have enough dollars to fund every project that is -- that makes an application. So obviously it makes sense that you have to fund the ones that are the most effective that are doing the most good and that's what this process will do, i believe. Further discussion? All in favor say aye. Opposed say no. It passes on a vote of seven to zero.

[One moment, please, for change in captioners] .. dedicated community stakeholders, hard work from your staff team that is focused on this issue and certainly our consult at we are pleased to report the city of austin permanent supportive housing strategy. To develop a comprehensive set of strategies for permanent support of strategies. The specific target was to go after the most vulnerable populations. As we work through this formulation of this report, we took a number of things into consideration. A holistic set of strategies with a goal of targeting the highest need, the less served and most chronic individuals within the system. And also to present you data which is based on national cost studies that is evidence based with a particular emphasis on proven models that we can implement. And more importantly to provide you with a very clear set of recommendations that's going to shift our model from what we would term as a revolving door approach in the way we offer services to one where we begin to affect and measure an actual reduction in our most severe, chronic and vulnerable populations. You will see that this report recognizes the value of the community, governmental and private partnerships that have worked -- that we believe need to work in unison to bring to bear every possible resource because it is a community plan. In order to bring you the best, mayor and city council, we engaged a consultant on board, the corporation for supportive housing. Csh is a national nonprofit and community development financial institution that helps communities create permanent supportive housing with services to prevent and end homelessness. Csh has particular expertise in helping create an expanded supply of supportive housing for people including single adults, families with children and young adults and particularly those that have low incomes. So mayor and city council, it's my pleasure to introduce our consultant who is doing a tremendous job for us in a very short period of time, the director of csh, miss diana lewis.

Good morning. As burt indicated, my name is diana lewis and I'm director of the texas office for supportive housing. I'm extremely pleased to have been engaged by the city of austin and to be here with you this morning. As I move into the brief, i want to say that you are going to be hearing what we believe is an overarching strategy around permanent supportive housing that is both realistic and we think transformative in the way the city approaches homelessness. The word you may hear most in this presentation is partnership, and there will be partnerships that are needed at the level of public entities and other jurisdictions as well as many critical partnerships with service providers and housing developers, et cetera. The specific substance of those particular partnerships will be something that we will be continuing to work on through the implementation stage, so just so that you know, we will be touching on those partnerships going on, but there's much more to come. Just to give you an overview of what our agenda is today, we're going to touch briefly on how we got here today and how the council moved toward the resolution that you passed in march. Then we want to spent a little bit of time talking about the process that the city has engaged in to solicit public input into the permanent supportive housing strategy that you will hear about. We'll give you an overview of the strategy in its entirety and then speak to what we believe to be the most important immediate implementation steps moving forward. So how did we get here? Our primary approaches to dealing with homelessness have focused around emergency and short-term intervention like shelter and transitional housing. It's important to say these approaches do work for many homeless folks. However, there is a small but important proportion of people who experience homelessness who have chronic issues and multiple barriers to housing

stability. Using those short-term tools for these folks doesn't tend to be effective. And we end up with a situation that is familiar to you all, a small but persistently homeless population that absorbs a disproportionate share and capacity of our emergency resources and shelter resources in particular. So over the past couple of years, folks on this dais have taken incredible leadership really in beginning to take a very thoughtful approach to how we can do things differently in Austin. And this is involved research at the council and staff level as well as site visits to cities like Miami, Phoenix, San Antonio. In the context of this exploration permanent supportive housing emerged as one of the key effective strategies in dealing with long-term homelessness particularly for the hardest to serve individuals. Also as we talk today, I don't want to lose sight of the overall community context. Permanent supportive housing is extremely specific as a targeting tool for housing persons homeless for a long period of time but it should be thought of as part of the overall strategy to reducing homelessness in our community as a key development in our community development strategy, in our human service approach, and also in our economic development. Plans. So the good news about supportive housing is very simply it works. We have over 20 years of evidence now that shows us that permanent supportive housing is very effective, that people who are placed into permanent supportive housing stay there over 80% of residents are in that housing a year later. And these are folks who are often considered really people who cannot be housed. We have many cost studies that range across communities including recent cost studies published in the "Journal of the American Medical Association" about projects in Seattle and Chicago, Los Angeles has recently published a cost benefit analysis of its work around permanent supportive housing. First of all, we see market decreases in burden such as incarceration rates which tend to decrease around 50%. We see emergency medical services -- excuse me, emergency room visits decrease by almost 60%. And then one of the concerns that we get when we start to talk about siting permanent supportive housing is a concern on the part of community members that it could impact property values. The Furman Center recently did a study of over 2,000 shunts of permanent supportive housing over 20 years and found in fact the property values of tracts surrounding permanent supportive housing were equal to or better than their counterparts in other neighborhoods. And that's usually because the providers are so invested in excellent management of these properties, we know what's on the line, we know that we have to be good neighbors, that very often those buildings from a physical standpoint are the nicest building in the neighborhood and from a management standpoint really serve to stabilize neighborhoods. In the spirit of thinking about permanent supportive housing as part of an overall homeless services system, last year the health and human services department did an analysis of where city resources were currently being targeted in that continuum. So as this continuum - - excuse me, diagram demonstrates, we can think about homeless services in three general areas. One in prevention services, second in short-term services that give folks sort of that temporary assistance they may need to get back on their feet, and third in long-term services for those folks with more chronic issues. And this is, of course, where permanent supportive housing would fall. Go to the next slide. When HHS did its budget analysis last year, it determined that only 10% of the overall investment was going towards long-term support around homelessness. And in fact, that 10% of funds was actually -- were new dollars that recently came down through the states. So that's just I think to underscore that historically the way that we have invested in homelessness has really not addressed this longer term issue. At around the same time the city was really assessing its continuum, Corporation for Supportive Housing was engaged by the task force monitoring committee, the Austin-Travis County Reentry and Echo the need for permanent housing in Austin. When we did so, we came up with an overall need of almost 1900 units. And mind you, this was based only on those who were literally homeless, not including those at risk for homelessness. Based on analysis of the resources that were available, we were recommended that the city set a goal of 350 units in place by 2014, and that those units primarily be targeted to the chronically homeless. In the following months, council passed the resolution that you see an excerpt here in front of you, and that resolution, as you know, directed the city manager to give priority to funding permanent supportive housing while continuing to fund other kinds of housing, to work with NACD and HHSD to come up with a strategy for producing 350 units of housing by 2014, and to present this strategy to council by October 1st of 2010. So we're coming in just under the wire here. Part of council's resolution asked staff to engage in a community input process to make sure that we were really getting all of the best ideas from folks in the community. And staff did this through a multi-pronged approach. First of all, HHSD asked Echo to assemble a working group of service providers to really look at the service component of PSH. 34 Providers participated in that process which entailed nine meetings



and the report that was released August 31st and is included as an appendix in the full report that you have received through your offices. In addition to the echo process, corporation for supportive housing worked with the city to carry out five public input meetings. At these meetings we really focused on getting to some level of consensus around guiding principles that would inform the specifics of the plan and we'll look at those in a moment. We did four of these meetings and we had a fifth meeting that targeted service providers and housing developers to vet some of the technical questions about implementation, how it would work, what would cause problems for them in terms of development or what would remove barriers for them. These sessions were supplemented by a home enron survey, an email address, a phone number housed at nhcd, and I think I very importantly council and staff have carried out very substantial outreach to our likely partners in the community. So I mentioned the guiding principles that were really the subject of the -- of the community meetings that we carried out, and I want to summarize these. I won't spend a whole lot of time on them because I think you will see them expressed throughout the plan that we detail for you. But we came up with a number of principles that we generally agreed made sense after much tire kicking. First, housing produced under the strategy should be smart housing compliant. Second, we should be building our strategy based on system straighter results. So really focusing on what evidence based practices are for this population and when something doesn't rise to the level of an evidence based practice, at least really looking to practices that have data that back them up. We wanted to strategically target these units. We're talking about 350 units out of an overall need of almost 2,000, and so we wanted to be really clear about who we would serve. We wanted to take a diverse development approach so that we're combining leasing strategies and new development with acquisition rehab, not just taking a one size fits all approach. Here's the p word that I said you would be hearing a lot. The city strategy needs to be structured to promote real partnership and that applies to service delivery and housing development, but frankly also to funding. The city simply cannot fund these units all alone and we will need to work to garner needed support from other entities. Our approach should be scalable and cost focused and these two things are very interrelated. We want these 350 units to be the first units we do, not the last, and to do that we need to be very clear that we can demonstrate the cost effectiveness of the approach. We want to promote geographic dispersion. We're not talking about 350 units in one neighborhood or in one project. Additionally, we want to really promote integrated housing. So that we have multiple choices for prospective tenants which would include mixed income environments and environments where those who live with disabilities live alongside those who do not have disabilities. Finally, an overarching strategy, the deployment of ps a to the tools if our arsenal shouldn't occur in a vacuum but rather as a part of an overall effort to transform the system from one that addresses the symptoms of homelessness to written that really seeks to end homelessness for individuals and reduce it overall in the community. So overall we would summarize the rationale as follows: First of all, we want to have we want a discernible reduction in long-term homelessness. We want to tell what costs we've avoided and we want to market improvement and quality of life. We want to employ proven tools, chief among them permanent supportive housing in general, and we want to understand those tools. So in this context, we understand that psh can be broadly effective for a variety of populations, but it is most effective for the long-term homeless with multiple barriers to stability. It's resource intensive, but it can be cost neutral or better with the right tenants, and that return on investment tends to be here, again, with the longer term homeless. We want to acknowledge and address our constraints and it won't be any surprise to you the chief among them is probably fiscal. So we'll focus on populations that are of shared interest with jurisdictions. And really focus on delivering early results and demonstrating that cost benefit. To really crystalize our strategic approach we will focus primarily though not exclusively on long-term homeless people and on frequent users of public systems. As well as really thinking about implementing this psh strategy as part of an overall system redesign effort. And I think the items on the agenda today point to the fact that that really is happening as we look at our social service infrastructure overall. So as part of the public input process, one of the things that became very clear is we need to do define a couple of things. One is what is permanent supportive housing for the purposes of this program, and then secondarily who are we intending to serve. This is the program definition weigh came to through that participatory process. First of all, permanent supportive housing is targeted to households earning under 30% of median family income, and just as an example for a single person that's somewhere in the realm of \$15,000 a year. We would in fact expect most of our target tenants to earn substantially less than that. The units are deeply affordable. So tenants pay rents that are 30% or less of their income, even if

their income is little or nothing. And what that means in practical terms is that the units need to have rent subsidies attached to them, either vouchers or similar subsidies. Residency the based on a lease. This is really important. I think from the perspective of fair housing and also from the perspective of the community's concern that the units be well managed. So the tenant and the landlord have legally enforceable leases. They enjoy the rights and responsibilities that those leases imply, and their tenancy is not limited by anything except the terms of that lease. In other words, we're not saying happy to be live here, in two years you need to move. As long as they are meeting the conditions of their lease, they may stay. Services are really the piece that makes permanent supportive housing different from other affordable house. So we're focusing on a broad array of services that are really focused on folks maintain their housing. Finally we're focusing on the housing that's managed through a working partnership between service providers and housing providers even when those housing providers are nonprofits that are mission driven. So we can go to the next slide. So again, I think we've -- the last slide spoke to what permanent supportive housing is for our purposes. We then wanted to think about for this initial four years of -- of the program, who are we targeting, who is eligible. And we came up with four primary categories. First is chronically homeless 's act, and that now includes families as well as individuals that used to just be single adults. In addition -- and that we think will be the bulk of the population. There is a small population who don't qualify as chronically homeless because of extended stay in institutions. That might be hospitals, might be incarceration, et cetera, and we want to allow for serving those folks. We want to be able to serve unaccompanied youth and families who might not otherwise neat some of 's definitions for homelessness but who have displayed substantial housing instability and where the families have chronic issues that really tell us that they will continue to face those. So persist went health care issues. You know, inability -- very limited job history, et cetera. This is in keeping with the hearth act. Finally the fourth category is youth aging out generally. We're talking about youth aging out of state custody, whether that be foster care or the juvenile justice system, and this is because we know that these young people are extremely high risk for becoming those chronically homeless adults as they age out of the system. Within this eligible population, we really wanted to talk about how we prioritize units and who we're targeting. There are two approaches that the strategy contemplates. The first is a frequent users approach which we've talked about a bit and we do anticipate will be the primary approach for targeting tenants. These are folks who are frequent users of multiple systems or who may be extremely frequent users of a single system. We're talking about emergency , the court system. The second approach that we want to employ as part of this strategy is something that I'll loosely call a vulnerability approach. That's because there are a couple of tools currently being used or being contemplated in the community that really look on risk factors for, a, early morbidity while on the streets, or b, for folks to be victimized while they live on the streets. I think this is an important way for us to focus really on the folks who are hitting our system and also creating what we hope will be substantial cost avoidance, but also not for getting those folks who may not be engaging in services so much but who desperately need housing. In terms of what those numbers look like, when we talk about the tenant selection method, we would expect to have about 225 of the 350 units screened under the frequent user approach. 75 Under the vulnerability method. In terms of household composition, we are talking about the bulk of people being single adults, but we want to make sure we set aside some units for families and unaccompanied youth. So we're proposing small set asides for those populations. And again, within the various types of household composition making sure that we are setting aside some units --

[buzzer sounding] -- for youth aging out. And part of that is that we know that when particularly young people age out of the foster care system, many times they already have children of their own. Additional population targets and really goals that we have, one is an overarching goal to make sure we are serving folks with -- who live with mental health issues well, something that we think we've perhaps fallen short of previously in terms of the housing we've provided in the community. And that we within that subset of population want to make sure that we're screening in folks who live with co-occurring disorders. Finally, because it's a priority for us as a community and also because it's consistent with priorities is setting forth, we want to explicitly set aside units for veterans. And finally, I would add that one piece we want to be cognizant of although we not necessarily hold to a unit goal because of fair housing issues is that we want to make sure that our single women are being proportionately served through this program because one of the things that we are hearing in the community is a real concern

that while women make up a much smaller proportion of this population, there are really very few resources for them. Next slide, please. So, before we move into the plan itself, I want to take a moment to contextualize what we mean by frequent users. We've gathered information that is intended to be illustrative of the kinds of costs incurred that we believe could be avoided if these individuals were placed into permanent supportive housing. As to the romance of this week, we're calling these vignettes. This isn't a fully projected cost benefit analysis, but rather an exercise that points us to the location and potential magnitude of costs that might be avoided under our strategy. So city of Austin e.m.s. Identified over the course of a year 76 homeless individuals that produced nearly 900 trips costing almost \$600,000. We typically see a decrease in utilization for psh residents of about 50%. So we're talking about cost avoidance of \$300,000 a year. You guys have spent a lot of time thinking about downtown Austin community court and what we do about the frequent flyers that present there. 50% Reduction in arrest rates and incarceration rates are also fairly typical. If we look just at the 100 mostly cloudy frequent downtown Austin community court users and actually back out the jail costs because we'll look at that separately, in court and field booking costs alone, we think that there's about \$140,000 in cost that could be avoided. So I alluded to the jail cost. Last year Austin-Travis County Reentry Roundtable did great analysis with many partners on board looking at the homeless population within Travis County jails. They identified 800 inmates that were homeless and were screened for mental illness during 2008. The 45 most frequent users produced -- of those 800 produced 25% of the arrests. So very likely I think there's substantial overlap with the downtown Austin community court. If the cost analysis holds per person, we would anticipate that those people cost \$750,000 in jail costs over the course of the year. And that's before we add in the extra costs actually of what it costs to serve folks in the jail who have mental health issues. Again, average 50% decrease in days of incarceration. For those 45 people alone, we would estimate cost avoidance of \$375,000 annually. So this is a cost obviously that hits primarily Travis County though not solely. There are some other populations that we think are important for Travis County as a posteriorly partner, frankly. One is the city and county have a shared interest in chronic people who have been served through project recovery, through rehabilitation services but are do not have housing at the end of the treatment period. Permanent supportive housing has shown really fabulous results with folks who are and aids in terms of their health outcomes and frankly in terms of recent transmission in communities. And then, of course, we would be looking at veterans and specialty courts that we've been setting up to deal with special populations. So on the primary care front, we look primarily at emergency room and inpatient care and so these are costs that would primarily impact central health. National data varies a bit more when we talk about primary health and permanent supportive housing, but usually see decreases of 30 to 60% in costs. Looking at data central health was able to provide, among homeless individuals enrolled in the medical assistance program, so these are only the enrollees and there are many who are not enrolled, the 112 frequent users generated 4 million in emergency room costs in the course of a year. In charges, I should say. Of those, the 49 users who had the highest inpatient costs 3 million in inpatient charges. So if the math is fuzzier here, add \$7,000 annually per homeless individual, I think we see there are substantial opportunities here for avoiding some important costs to the community. On the mental health side, we think that there are -- there's potential for impacting our system on a couple of levels. One is that our crisis system deals with homeless individuals who are decompensating fairly frequently and we also have been dealing with shortage of mental health crisis beds in the community. In addition, we usually see extremely high reductions in -- in psychiatric hospitalization for permanent supportive housing residents, and we know that many of the chronically homeless have cycled in and out of psychiatric hospitals. So reductions between 80 and 95%, in some cases in the first year nobody was rehospitalized. This is typically a state-borne cost, but it impacts central health and our local hospitals when the state hospital, Austin State Hospital goes to diversion, as it has frequently of late, and those mental health crisis patients present in our local emergency rooms. So again, before we go into the specifics of the plan, I just want to focus us a bit on permanent supportive housing as an element of systems redesign. Our overall goal is to reduce homelessness and avoid the costs that we've just touched on, but as we design a system to achieve that goal, you'll be hearing about the city's intent to weave permanent supportive housing into its overall approach both on the housing and the services side and also to make sure there's sufficient linkage between the two. So I'm going to talk about four things around the strategy. One is the cost, which is probably the item -- the tie on your list of interests. What will it cost us in terms of capital, rental, subsidy and services. Second, what strategies will we

employ to get the services out the door and to develop the units. Third, how will we evaluate our effectiveness via the strategy. And then finally what we think the most important upcoming implementation steps are. As an overview, we're projecting \$9 million in city of austin investment over the four-year period that the strategy covers. That \$9 million would leverage \$34 million in other funds, local, state, federal, private. After 2014 when all of the units that we are including in the goal are operational, we expect annual operations and services to cost around \$7.3 million. But the city of austin contribution to that 3 million is on the services side somewhere between 600 and 800 thousand dollars because the bulk of rental subsidies for example typically flows through federal sources. And again, while the investment is substantial, when we do the cost benefit, we typically are able to show that on an annualized basis, we are at break even or better. So this slide just is a summary of the city of austin leverage, which is four to one. So of the 20%, roughly, that comes from city of austin funds, 15% corresponds to locally -- local revenue funds and the other 6% are federal formula funds. Next slide. Of the \$43 million total for the initiative, about half of that corresponds to bricks and mortar, so about 22 million. About a quarter to services. A little over a fifth of it to operating or rental subsidy. And then there is a small sliver of that pie, a little over a million dollars over the four years that corresponds to systems improvements and other ancillary costs that we think are necessary to get us as a community into a place where we're really deploying this strategy well. On the services side, our key strategy really centers around intense service engagement of these individuals. So we are setting a threshold of a low case management ratio of one to ten for families and somewhere in the realm of one to 12 for individuals, at least for the first year of tenancy when we know the service needs our most -- our greatest as folks get settled in. We expect providers to provide on site services where -- where feasible. We do expect that to be true I believe in most cases. And the city will incentivize best practices and evidence based practices like housing first, harm reduction, cognitive behavioral therapy for folks engaged with the criminal justice system. A very important part is we have to maximize our leverage of medicaid. That means that we're going to have to identify local match. Austin care will be a critical part in that effort as they are the primary entity that is drawing down medicaid dollars for behavioral health services locally, so we really want to think carefully as they have been about what the partnership structures might look like both with housing providers and with other service providers in the community. Finally as a piece that really speaks to how we link the service side to the housing side, we really want to promote formalized relationships with property owners, be they private or nonprofit, so that service providers going into housing have a memorandum of understanding with the property owner and they know what policies that property owner has in place that enable them to effectively serve the population at hand. On the capital and operating side, again, we are looking at a mix of units that would be at least 250 units that would be new construction or acquisition rehab, and probably 100 units that would be leased in the community out of existing stock with no long-term use requirements. We would anticipate funding new site specific projects which would be primarily dedicated toward permanent supportive housing, although they could have a mix of units. In addition, we anticipate getting some of our target number by setting aside permanent supportive housing units, modest set asides in deals that come before nhcd for taxpayer geese, for other deals where a provider may not be their mission to do all permanent supportive housing, but they may be comfortable setting aside ten or 20 of a 100 or 200 unit deal as part of permanent supportive housing. We think that we can employ this last strategy somewhat retroactively by offering a potential equity buy down or to buy down debt on affordable housing units that have already been financed in the community and that would get us toward our goal more quickly in this first year. Finally, I think that it's important and really critical that we spend a little bit of time today talking about the importance of partnership with public housing authorities for the permanent supportive housing effort. Public housing authorities provide critical, critical operating subsidy in any city that has an effective permanent supportive housing campaign. In addition to rental subsidies which can be project based or attached to particular units, housing authorities sometimes look at their own portfolio to see if there are units in that portfolio that would be prepared for permanent supportive housing. And then finally housing authorities very commonly engage in development and management of their own units and they can do that as permanent supportive housing as well. One footnote to the public housing authority conversation, I think, is that a critical resource for us in this effort will be the veterans affairs supportive housing vouchers which are but administered through the local housing authority. Those also may be project based so finally, I think really key to nhcd's strategy going forward is engaging with developers in the community, primarily nonprofit, but in some cases for property to identify and assess

deals already in the pipeline and clearly communicate the model that we're proposing. So how will we measure our success? The primary measure of success at the project level will be housing stability. Are we getting people in housing or are they staying there. We'll be looking at turnover and eviction rates to give us some nuance. Secondly rates of employment and income. That income could come from earned income and very often comes from disability benefits because we know that many carry-on beingly homeless people probably should receive disability benefits but because of their homelessness they have had a difficult time accessing them. Finally we will look at social indicators of what's happening in folks' families, are they staying in their families. If they were fragile families upon entering housing or potentially reunifying with family members, and outside of the families are we hearing folks are experiencing social connection. At the initiative level outside of the individual service providers, this is where we really want to look at that cost benefit analysis that we spoke to earlier. We're going object tracking the change in carry-on beingly homeless in austin, track the enough units that we have operational and tracking our demographic targets, but we definitely are going to be looking at the changes and costs associated with these -- these indicators that we show here probably looking one year pre and post-placement, likely through a partnership with an academic institution, and we would anticipate this being complemented by qualitative evaluation. So in terms of our next action items, from a global perspective we need to solidify the partners with other local jurisdictions. Get folks on board and really clarify what those roles will be. To that end the city will convene a psh leadership group to identify that specific funding and monitor the pipeline of housing that's to be developed. And again, this is a group that we anticipate to be at a leadership level of folks with influence at the funding and policy level from a variety of jurisdictions. On the funding mechanism side, the city will really investigate the possibility of a dedicated tax or fee around homeless services. Some cities have used hotel-motel tax, other cities have instituted fees around food and beverage. Never a comfortable proposition but it is one that has worked well for other communities. On the philanthropic side, we want to make sure we the possibility of vehicles that will allow for that private contribution. In fort worth, for example, the united way ran a specific campaign around their initiatives, and then in some cases a community foundation might set up a fund that would form the corpus an endowment or fund ongoing services costs. We want to make sure phs is funded but also at the federal level. To this end I would say that perhaps the most critical piece is that we keep the homeless housenning and services program that last session was funded through tdhca and has provided us with really our first bit of money to work with around permanent supportive housing. Locally on the service side. And finally in keeping with i think the spirit of this overall system redesign, not only be looking for new resources but really be thinking about how we can repurpose resources both financial and human resources within the city structure. At the hhsd level for systems improvement, we'll be looking specifically at the role of the arch and how we can leverage the city's investment there to the benefit of the initiative. We want to really think about the technology needs that we might have to improve or complement the existing hmis or homeless management information system. Particularly because we're talking about a more sophisticated jeaning of tenants than we've done -- screening of tenants than we've done previously. We may need tolls. Hhsd has \$100,000 set aside for fiscal year 2011 and we would hope be a part of this ing the social services contracts going forward. Hhsd would work to develop the tenant screening and selection tools, would lead the evaluation and really take leadership role in thinking through policy issues around leveraging medicaid particularly in the context of upcoming health care reform. Neighborhood housing community development expects to continue to be a really key player in this effort, and so to that end nhcd proposes to establish a new program for permanent supportive housing. We would set aside permanent supportive housing funds, acknowledging that some developers will -- will access both permanent supportive housing funds and funds that are governed under the existing rental housing development assistance program. We're looking at potential requests for proposal for those funds rather than using only the rolling application process. And really the difference, one of the key differences in this program and the city's other programs will be a deeper subsidy per unit, and that's because what we see as best practice is it's very difficult for permanent supportive housing to sustain permanent debt. Finally, nhcd through its policies will also be went sent I haveizing the developers to build relationships with service providers just as we did wither is rise providers on the other side of the ledger. And as we move forward, we hope to increasingly link the operating and service funds she potentially through a joint r.f.p. process. Nhcd would support neighborhood and community education and I call those out as two separate things because I think they are very related, but it's important to do both. One is to generally

educate the community about what permanent supportive housing is and how effective it could be. Ideally before we attempt to site a deal in a neighborhood, and then secondarily working with nonprofit develop hers and hows providers to make sure they are engaging the community around permanent supportive housing deals. Nhds would incorporate capacity and revised goals annually into the h.u.d. Action plan. So finally in summary, what rerecommend is that staff move forward with the steps that we've loud in the city of austin phs tragedy that is in council's hands. That we really focus on the system's redesign approach and move toward a goal of 350 units of permanent supportive housing by 2014, year end 2014. This would require \$9 million in total city investment which would leverage, we believe, \$34 million. With ongoing city funded costs of between 6 and 8 space hundred thousand a year primarily for services. We would be tarting the most in need and individuals most costly to our system currently and establishing infrastructure to make sure this moves forward effectively including the establishment of a psh leadership group, establishment of new program guidelines through nhcd. Incorporate race of phs into hhs's funds prophecys. Keeping the community involvement in mind throughout. Evaluating our success as we move forward, and then annually reporting to council on our progress as well as progress updates at council's request.

Thank you. Thank you, miss lewis. I want to thank you for that excellent work and I little want to thank the city -- want to thank the city manager for all the work they did and in particular for preparing not just the study, not just the plan, but a study and a plan and the dollars to get us there. With that, it is time for citizen communication, but we're going to take a 10-minute break and I'm going to ask you to stay until after citizen communication so that my colleagues and myself can ask you questions.

My pleasure.

Cole: Thank you. Ood afternoon, mayor and councilmembers. It's refreshing to be addressing you here in this pleasant neighborhood setting. It's most appropriate because water fluoridation is implemented largely in the name of minority children but damaging health effects without reaping any of the promised benefits. So it's my privilege today to announce a great east side event coming up in the near future. On tuesday evening, , paul kinnett, director of the fluoride action network will sp on the houston-tillotson campus. He's a toxicology professor whose long experience trumps the very limited understanding of the self-styled experts who promote fluoride in drinking water.

[One moment please]

his principal co-author of the book the case against fluoride, how hazard days waste ended up in our drinking water and bad science and powerful politics that keep it there. I think that title says it all. Thank you very much.

Next linda green and after that william doyle.

My topic is about fluoride in our water and dillo dirt so it's going to be a bit difficult. I'm wearing my fruit and vegetable skirt to remind you we get fluoride also from pesticides in our fruits and vegetables, not to mention the fact that the city has been adding fluoride to our water, fluoride waste, not pharmaceutical grade fluoride, for about 38 years and we've been doing a recycling of sewage sludge for about 15 years where we add this toxic soil back into our parks and sell it at home depot full of heavy metals and everything you can imagine that goes down your drain. neal carman wants to know how is it that a city council voted to add this fluoride waste, scrubbing liquor waste product from the phosphate fertilizer industry containing cyanide, arsenic and mercury to our water about 37 years ago rather than add maybe some kind of natural fluoride, and we're still asking that question. But this fluoride and dillo dirt is based on old political science and very poor ethics and has come back to bite us in the butt. And also we cannot have organic gardens with fluoride waste and dillo dirt spreading all over a city that floods every so often. I pray to god you are not adding this dillo dirt to our parks this weekend for the acl fest because as we all know last year when the acl fest got a lot of rain, the kids were wallowing around in toxic mud and breaking out in rashes and getting sick so please don't add the dillo dirt to the parks. I

gave you a 30-minute film the borrow the last time i spoke and I just took some random notes. This will let you know if you org, anybody else can order this movie, professional perspective on fluoride. I'm just going to read you some of the notes in case you haven't had time to look at this movie. This is medicating us without informed consent. Fluoride is a neuro toxin and it's really obsolete. And it's based on old science. There are hundreds of studies now and 2,000 professionals who are calling for an end to worldwide fluoridatio of our water. It's not used to treat water she it's used to treat our human body, and one size does not fit all. Individual response to different levels of fluoride in our water are not the same. Babies, small animals are getting high, high doses of water and it accumulates in our body. We also get fluoride in our sodas, just, soup, beer, not to mention the fact that topically added applied to our toothpaste, sometimes we swallow it.

[Buzzer sounding]

Cole: Thank you, ms. green.

Go to. Fluoridealert.org.

good afternoon. I'd like to discuss health and nutrition secrets. On page 93 he quotes robert carlton, fluoridation is the great he -- he quotes william marcos, toxicologist regarding should act immediately to protect the public. Not just on the cancer dated take but on evidence of bone fractures, arthritis and other effects. bans fluoride at its headquarters. The doctor states as it stands there is in fact no credible evidence of fluoride added to water supply reduces cavities at all and several states have demonstrated the incidence is higher in fluoridated areas. Cancer, in the journal of cancer research, the doctor demonstrated the fluoride -- could induce cancer. Other research found exposing animals resulted in 25% increase in tumor growth in mice. E former chief chemist at the national cancer institute compared the cancer death rates in the 10 largest fluoridated cities with the rates in 10 matched unfluoridated cities and found the fluoridated cities 10% increase in cancer deaths. A review of three major studies found the incidence of sarcomas in young males increased 70% with fluoridation of drin water. One part per million reduces to repair itself 50% and when occurs the damage was passed to children as well. Fluoride causes skeleta florosis and fractures and broken bones. Eight studies demonstrated increased hip fractures with fluoridation. One study increased incidence of hip fractures 27% in men and women, 41% in men. Fluoride in the brain. Studies in china have shown an overall 10 point drop in iq in medium [indiscernible] compared to low fluoride areas with the number of children HAVING I Qs BELOW 70 Increasing 21% and well as the number of children in higher range. The incidence of down syndrome 30% higher in fluoridated communities. 90% Of europe does not floor communities have either refused or stopped using it. Let's make austin the next one to do so.

[Applause]

Cole: Thank you, mr. doyle. Ailana laron.

Hi. I have this -- these are my notes behind you. They are a big sketch. I would have done them better, but I live at 85 trinity across from the four seasons, and this is my third time I've been here. I lived in disabled housing for the elderly and the disabled and so one, our street has been narrowed and I've got -- it's in the handouts from the officer. Gives you some input on that. So we've just increased the number of people coming down our street, 34 stories worth of people plus trucks that is dumping into a narrower street. And we're going to have more trucks because we're starting the waller creek project, two days ago we started with the bridge, andthat's going to go on for -- till 2014. You've got a lot more traffic coming down a street that's narrower. Okay, I've got a petition filed already that we would like an arrow, a green arrow from cesar chavez on to trinity, we're sitting three, four lights before we can turn and most of the time we're risking our lives to dash across the traffic. It doesn't stop. Also, golly, when the trucks are there, traffic is backed up on caesar chavez because you can't turn into so we've got really high curbs now that the disabled can't get up and down because it hurts our legs. You've got a lot of really nice wide sidewalks and put a bunch of benches in them and they are uneven, the streets are

uneven. Here all this is uneven, so we can't go down an incline. We can go up an incline and all this mess here is like three different ways the street is tilting while we're trying to walk. Right here we come out of our way and there's a huge curb so we can't turn, the street is narrow. You put parking here so if they put a big truck or one of THOSE S.U.V.s, WE CAN'T SEE Because there's still cars coming out of here. Our handicapped transit buses can't get out. Our grocery buses can't come. Here's the rowing club. They park in the parking lot and we can't get through so we have to get across the street. We navigate and stand and cry how do we get across the street. We try to get across the street. Over here there was a huge chunk of cement, somebody fixed it the other day, but that was our way. To get to here we had to come this way, get through cement we couldn't get through. Over here you got handicapped parking and parking in front of it so there's cars parked in front of the handicapped parking access. Right here is where we're supposed to get through so we come from the hike and bike trail, the runners do, most of us need another helper. I got a friend here, she can't see going down those little hills so I try to help her and they stuck this garden here so we can't get through. And they say it's wide enough, but you know, it's this big, but it's not big enough for a person and companion. And we put our canes down, we fall into the garden. Right next so it is two exits from the four seasons parking garage. We don't know when cars are coming. These people on the street drive clear up to here which is where the handicapped parking is, access, so we can't get across the street because they never stop before the line. They come up here because of all this blind corner here with garbage cans and benches and trees that they just put in and so they can't turn right so they -- it's dangerous for them. And I've seen people falling off the curbs here and the curbs are uneven and high. We were standing here talking to the foremen from the four seasons and watched almost seven accidents happen at the same time.

[Buzzer sounding] the truck couldn't get back up. The state borders were trying not to crash us. These people from the park were trying not to hit us. There were cars blocked here and we were trying not to fall in the garden and that's the new plan for austin and it doesn't work for us.

Martinez: Thank you.

Morrison: Mayor pro tem, thank you for bringing up those issues. I know with the four seasons condominium construction it was the -- the nighttime caused a lot of trouble for you all. And thank you for writing up these notes that have been provided. You raised a lot of issues that looking to be safety issues as well as we're looking toward the construction, how that's going to impact you all. So I wanted to ask the assistant city manager to see if we can get a staff member to work with you and then to report back to me on how we can manage all these things. I'm particularly concerned, I've been to your place, it's a wonderful community, but entering on the street there certainly looks substandard compared to what we have around the rest of the city so hopefully we can address the safety issues.

And we have rowing -- we can fall into the garbage on our wheelchairs.

Martinez: Thank you, miss larson.

Morrison: We'll see if we can have a staff member get with you. bray to get with you.

Martinez: If you could get back to entire council since it was brought to the council, I think that would be appropriate. Our next speaker is susana almanza. Welcome. You will have three minutes.

Good afternoon, mayor and city councilmembers. My name is susana almanza but I come before you as the chair of the montopolis neighborhood team sanctioned by the city of austin. ON MAY 13th, WE HAD A Meeting regarding the roy guerrero park, what was going on there talking about the lift station and we had, as you can see, fred from the parks department and mark there from public works. Next slide. At this community meeting where they had been issues about what was happening at roy guerrero, but what I want to -- that was my last slide. What I want to talk about was that on june the 22nd with the montopolis group had a meeting and we talked about different issues, the lift station, the roy guerra park and other things we had on the agenda. And then all of a sudden we got a flier in august



saying that there was going to be a meeting on august 31st to talk about the roy guerra park. What many people called me and said, well, we already had an update meeting in may about roy guerra park. I send an agenda. They didn't consult us about having this community meeting so we were pretty outnumbered by all the -- we had very few members there and I think only one of the contact team member that was there. Yet this was being presented as a community meeting on an issue that we had already covered in may, but little did we know that at this community meeting the whole thrust of this meeting was not only to talk about issues that we have already presented before the contact team, which was the reclaimed water proposed tower on grove boulevard, montopolis drive, but the disk golf. The main meeting, the whole thing about this meeting was about disk golf. And I think this is a very important issue that should have been up front and clear about what that community meeting was because a lot of people didn't come because we already had a meeting about the roy guerrero colorado park, we had already been getting updates just in may.

[One moment, please, for change in captioners]

mayor pro tem and gerrard kinney, I'm here again to speak to you after some time about the very really serious now need to reform our signage ordinance. As you all -- well, recently you I think that I sent you a message, you probably learned that -- that the scenic cities awards happened here in austin. It was a wonderful event and embarrassing to me, though, that austin was not even eligible to be a scenic city. Because of our ordinances, of allowing the -- the building of new billboards becalled it a re-- we called it a relocation ordinance, but of course new billboards within our city. The city of austin had a great start in the early '80s when it banned new billboards, the city of austin at that time dedicated itself to the city eventually not having billboards. But over time, the first time being in '84 when the -- when the ordinance was expanded to include the , the -- the council had failed to form a -- a signage task force that was required to be on the council at that time and therefore we missed out on what 20 other cities in texas have, which is the ability to amortize signs. So we missed out on that because council had not taken that action. Since then, the city council and every single time I want you to know, I know this in my heart, the city council, to the very best of intentions, the very best of intentions, has seemed to tweak, rearrange in various ways try to -- to -- trying to make the city look better as simply made it more difficult -- has simply made it more difficult to get rid of billboards every single step of the way. First in about 1990 we first allowed replacement of the billboardage, smaller. Nobody knew that on premises sign would affect the billboards. In the late '90s a billboard company figured out that it gave them away to russell, the signs of another billboard company, all of a sudden we had a bunch of new billboards with long leases that would have gone away had we just left it alone. Since then, each step of the way, we've tried very hard to make it better and as we have done that, we now have a situation where you have very complicated arcane ordinance provisions that are very hard to enforce and invite lawsuit [buzzer sounding] and -- and are simply not allowing billboards to -- to disappear through natural attrition. I had some recommendations that I was going to make, but I see I'm out of time.

Mayor Leffingwell: You're right. Thank you very much.

Mayor?

Mayor Leffingwell: Chris? Excuse me, councilmember riley.

Riley: I just want to thank you for your comments as always on billboards. I also want to acknowledge this beautiful facility that we are in today. Didn't you have some role in the design of this facility?

Thank you, councilmember. Yes. Donna carter was the architect for this entire facility. I was the architect for the theater.

Riley: Good work.

Thank you.

[ Applause ] next speaker isabell bell, I've been informed she's not going to be here today to speak. She's not in the chamber. Isabel headrick. Ofelia zapata. Not in the chamber. Sueann campbell? Sueann campbell topic is time wanter, confiscation of bandwidth.

Thank you for hearing me today. I'm sueann campbell. Co-chair of the producers council of public access television. And we've all heard that the american public owns the airwaves and -- but I wonder what that really does mean. Does this mean that we're going to actually share in the benefits of a digital changeover? Or -- and where is the revenue sharing? The public, it was determined a long time ago, that the public does own the airwaves and in exchange for the usage of those airwaves by the broadcasters and the cable companies, the people get a few channels of their own. And it looks like the cable companies have pretty much a lot of control over the public airwaves and they receive all of the revenue. And the digital changeover will provide enough new spectrum to triple the existing channels that they have. This new spectrum is worth over 100 billion-dollars. Who will benefit from this? Is it going to be the people who also benefit as well as the cable companies and the broadcasters? What do the people get in exchange for -- from the cable companies? The public should share in a digital bounty. Each channel that we now have could be increased to three, when the digital changeover is complete. Instead, time warner wants to confiscate those extra channels. This is the legal transference of public wealth into private's hands. These are our channels. We should benefit from this digital changeover. These corporate hands that are already holding the lion's share of the wealth in the form of a vastly expanded channel spectrum worth billions want to take the few extra channels that the people will also inherit from the digital changeover. Yes, the public does own the airwaves, that is why we cannot allow time warner to take channels that rightfully belong to the public. I urge you to join with other texas cities in the class action lawsuit against time warner channel graft. Thank you very much.

Thank you.

[ Applause ]

Mayor Leffingwell: Those are all of the speakers that we have signed up to speak. Today's citizens communication session. So -- are you signed up to speak?

No, no, no, sorry.

Mayor Leffingwell: Without objection, the city council will go into closed session pursuant to section 071 of the government consultation with legal counsel to take up one item, item 36, concerning legal issues represented to nathaniel sanders, senior versus the city of austin, it concerns a breach contract and fraud lawsuit filed against the city. Is there any objection to going into executive session on the item announced? Hearing none, the council will now go into executive session.

Mayor Leffingwell: Good afternoon. We are out of closed session. We took up and discussed legal issues, issues related to item 36. Before we proceed with our agenda, I'll recognize the mayor pro tem on a point of personal privilege.

Martinez:. This is highly unusual but i would like to the a moment to formally acknowledge how much I really, really like councilmember riley's choice in ties today.

[Laughter] he's got --

Mayor Leffingwell: We've got the same haberdasher. Now I'd like to recognize councilmember cole on a point of personal privilege.

Cole: Thank you. We just came out of executive session on the unanimous than yell alexander lawsuit and i believe we have handled the lawsuit in federal court, the lawsuit in state court, the potential settlement and now our anticipated defense in state court different from any other litigation that we or at least I now know of having asked the question twice before in the history of the city. This difference has resulted in an additional lawsuit where our city attorneys, because of legal, ethical conflicts, cannot provides you with a defense and we are forced to hire outside attorneys. These actions raise litigation costs, damage our credibility with the judiciary as indicated by judge sparks' order, and, most importantly, our community trust. I did not want to place additional funding of \$220,000 on what I consider that we could have avoided on july 29th by simply accepting the settlement offer which was for almost the exact sum that we are spending now. However, I also could not vote, could not provide a defense to this city. Thank you, mayor.

Mayor Leffingwell: And now another special announcement. I'd like to welc juleboswell's husband who would like to make a brief statement.

Thank you very much. Mayor, city councilmembers, our city manager, it is a great pleasure for me to welcome you to the george washington carver museum. As you all know, this was a connally and i think she would be sitting here nudging you, needling you and having a wonderful time just watching you sit in on the george washington carver museum. I hope you noticed as you walked through the door today the first historical library of the city of austin that sits in front, which was the museum for a number of years. Soon it will be the geneology center for the carver, and I'm looking forward to seeing all of you over here researching your great, great grandparents and sharing it with us both orally and with the written word. I though a lot of times the only time you hear from us is some complaint, especially i hear a lot of complaints here at the center that the auditorium doesn't have enough seats or that the dance theater is too small, that there's not enough classrooms, but I love that because that's telling me that the city and this community is using this museum to its fullest capacity, and I think that that's why it's here. So those are love words to me saying that one of these days we shall expand and we can house all the meetings here in town here at the carver at the same time. I'd like to tell you what a blessing I think this is that you are here. Not only for the east side of austin, which I call the heart of austin, but for the city of austin. Because when you come over here, they come over here. And this is their museum just like it is the african-american museum. Thank you for the blessing today of coming and I hope you do it again.

Mayor Leffingwell: Thank you. It's a great privilege to be here and especially right here in the boyd vance theater, which is one of the facets of this entire center. And I want to say that one of the ancillary benefits of being here is the opportunity to showcase city facilities around the city such as this. So again, thank you. We will begin I believe where we left off prior to citizens communication, which is council questions on the supportive housing issue, and council, we also have the opportunity to submit questions in writing if that is your preference, but now is floor is open for questions. Councilmember riley.

Riley: Yeah, mayor, i just have a few questions. First I want to thank you for the excellent presentation and for all the work that's gone into both by the corporation for supported I have housing and everybody else within city staff and out in the community that have been doing such great work on this. I know echo has been especially helpful, but a number of other service providers and just community advocates have been very helpful and we couldn't have gotten this far without the help of so many dedicated people. It's an exciting place to be because it seems like we're on the brink of taking an innovative approach to a problem that has been facing us for decades now and we've tried to chub at one way or another but we've never managed to wrap our arms around it and it fools like we're now poised to do that. Thanks for all the work that's been done. Just a few questions. If he could go to your slide 8 where you first describe the overall need that was identified. You mention that-we arrived at the figure of 1,189 units of permanent supportive housing. Can you help me understand where that number comes from. Would all those 1889 be chronically homeless?

The announcement that we did as part of the program and financial model looked both as what we

knew about the chronic homeless population, which for the data we were working on was 919 individuals, and then looking at what we knew about the homeless population and putting those single individuals who were not yet carry-on chronic homeless either because they hadn't been homeless long enough or because they at that time did not have a designated disability. Also remember at this time 's definitions have not changed so families could not be considered chronically homeless so we looked at families. But also a percentage of those who are experiencing episodic homelessness but have not yet reached that chronic homeless designation which says homeless for a year or four times over the course of three years. I think we look across the population, we will see individuals on the streets today who would not qualify as chronically homeless, but who for kind of the markers that we know lead to chronic homelessness are likely to end up there and could benefit from permanent supportive housing.

Riley: If we could turn over to slide 17, I see that as a reflection of what you just described, we have different targets for the different categories. I have two questions about that. First is if -- if -- given that we know that the carry-on being homeless have been an underserved population in the past, only 10% of our funds serving the homeless have been reaching that population in the past, and we also know that this population consumes a disproportionate share of the services we are providing, why wouldn't we devote all of our resources to the carry-on being homeless?

Well, I think some of the same characteristics that have led people into chronic homelessness exist within families and youth in particular. Ideally we are reaching families in particular before that family disintegrates and sort of becomes -- turns into what at the time would have been termed carry-on chronic homeless. I also think that as we move forward, we wanted to acknowledge the concerns of the community about a population that would have been left out of this initiative and make sure that we were building some expertise in serving this population through permanent supportive housing. So ensuring that while the numbers are modest we do get some housing out there for families and for unaccompanied youth as well as some housing targeted to the youth aging out. And I think it really lays, we think, a basis for further work in the future.

Riley: And in respect to that further work, can you help me understand how we would take those targets and put them into effect with respect to the use of these funds? ARE YOU PICTURING R.F.P.s That would specifically set target numbers within the or would there be multiple contracts that would together add up to the targets for each population? How would we get there?

The target, of course, is every four years, and so, you, I think this is something we'll have to hammer out and I'll wait for staff to tap me on the shoulder when I misspeak, but my sense is we would be incentivizing and we're able to annually, for example, begin to adjust, and if what we see just as a possibility is we hit all of our marks but in that final year we've not served any veterans, I think it would be quite likely you would set aside specific funding for that population.

Riley: Finally, if you could turn to slide 28, I wanted to ask a question about the unit mix that we're planning. I see that we're planning to lease 100 units and to build or rehab I think you said at least 250 units. Typically it seems like new housing tends to be more expensive than existing housing. Why -- why would we aim to be building or rehabbing 250 new units as opposed to making use of the existing stock of housing?

Well, the rehab approach, of course, would make use of existing stock of housing. So the benefit of leasing is that it can be fast, right? And we make use of it and there is not the capital investment. The downside from our perspective are multiple. One is when the market becomes tighter, it can become difficult to keep those units. You have landlords in a soft market that may be wig to work with service providers. As the market tightens and Austin is a fairly healthy real estate market from a national perspective, it's harder to keep those units set aside so we don't have the long-term asset. The other pieces that historically without sort of going into the whys of it, what we see is that the units that we invest in from a capital standpoint rather than just going out and leasing units from existing landlords

tend to be better quality. So the -- you know, the maintenance of the physical plant and the management thereof tends to be better. So we're really investing in a long-term asset for this population.

Riley: Okay. And I think I also saw in the echo report that the type of -- that to serve this population in the best way we really want to be looking for things like duplexes, four-plexes, something that would provide more of a community. Is that right?

That is one of the recommendations I would say does not carry through directly into our report. What we would say is that the -- what I do agree with is the sense of community is essential. So typically what we look for is a setting where you can have enough units that you can form a community, that people have access to people who have similar experiences to them as well as other people in the community. For some people smaller projects can be better. In our experience the duplex, fourplexes may be a little too small from the service provision and management standpoint. So I would say that 15 or so is on the small side from our perspective.

Riley: If we're looking for best practices for housing this population,

[indiscernible] 15 units or more would be what you would expect?

Yes.

Riley: Thank you.

Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember morrison.

Morrison: Thank you. I echo councilmember riley's comments about how great all this work is and it's so wonderful to have not only the -- you know, the concept in front of us but some very specific actions that we need to do, and, you know, the advice and how we can really shift our funding to get after the root causes so we're not just always chasing the symptoms. And I think that I'm -- I'm pleased to be part of the council that's really going to push this because I think it's wonderful. One thing I wanted to mention, highlight that you mentioned was in particular although the size of the population of the home for women is relatively small, but that's something we should pay attention to. And I'm not sure if you've seen it, but recently we were all notified that our austin womens commission and the -- our austin human rights commission sent a joint resolution to us highlighting that issue and suggesting, recommending that we try to take some proactive action on that so I'm glad that that's part of this program. You also talked allotted about the partnerships -- a lot about the partnerships that are needed for this to be successful, and I think that we have -- what I wanted to highlight is the issue that we need to include as partners the neighborhoods in this city. You did talk about neighborhood engagements and there was some -- some interaction, I think, in the development of this work with some of the neighborhoods. And I think that I personally have seen a successful partnership with a neighborhood. I've also seen failures, and i think we continue to fail to that to this day. I think we probably even have an example of what could be a failure as of last week. When I was president of the austin neighborhoods council, we passed a resolution that said that the organization supports all kind of housing in all types of housing all over town, and there was another resolution passed recently reiterating that our affordable housing and our very low-income housing really needs to be spread around town. So -- and I'm proud that that organization has taken that stance and I think that what we -- an appropriate step to take now would be to go to the austin neighborhoods council to say help us figure out how to do it right. Because I don't think that we as the city government or whatever can figure that out. We haven't figured that out yet and so I'm really looking forward to working with some of my colleagues and perhaps you to really try to develop a template because for an organization to have said that, we now need to understand what it means to each and every neighborhood and help all those neighborhoods through that and help -- and the neighborhoods need to help us as a city to achieve this. So I look forward to doing that and I hope

you might be able to help us with that. Thank you.

Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember Spelman.

Spelman: Thank you, mayor. At least some of the argument in favor of doing this is going to be related to the costs, avoidance of the costs we won't have to pay because we won't have as many e.r.a. visits and so on. We're talking about roughly 1900 units in total, the big picture over maybe a 20-year period. Only 350 units the next four years. I'm persuaded from looking at figures you gave us earlier that this first 350 units if we chose the people who are most likely to go to the -- any good values should be able to document that without too much trouble. As we increase the size of the population served from 350 to 1,000 and so on, at some point it seems to me we're going to have to start talking about the inherent benefits of providing housing to go people and not the cost to avoid it. At what point do you think we're going to have to start shifting gears.

Excellent question that I'm not sure I have the answer to. I will say across the board the literature tells us that the sort of cost benefits argument holds for pretty much all carry-on you can't have homeless people, right? 900 Of the people we're looking at. The literature is less clear as to what happens as you dip into part of the population that perhaps is not as chronic, if you will, or whose barriers to housing are not as great. You know, the numbers we've seen about the frequent users in our community are pretty astounding. I was using the top -- certainly taking that top cut, but it's not just a few people. So I don't know where we get there, but I agree that at some point we kind of have to talk about -- because what we're talking about when we're talking cost avoidance is this year we're talking an immediate, you know, cost that you can track within a single year. Usually when we talk about social service investment, we're talking about long-term payoff and I don't think that we quite know how to couch that conversation in terms of permanent supportive housing yet.

Spelman: Wouldn't be able to measure it within the two or three-year period.

I think we can get closer.

Spelman: You think so?

Yes.

Spelman: Let me pitch you this and if you don't have immediate reaction to it that's fine, but it seems to me that one of the things that will help us make the case for the next population is that we did such a great job with the first.

Absolutely.

Spelman: And a lot of that is the quality, the housing get built on time, cost effective way and so on, were the services delivered appropriately. But some of it I think is going to hinge on the cost avoidance that we can actually document. , fewer people were incurring costs. If we have a population of 700 that we could easily demonstrate that kind of benefit cost calculation, would it be possible in theory in your mind for us to say, look, we've got 700 people or more who we would love to provide housing to in this kind of way. We only have the cash available to provide housing for 350 of you. We're going to do a lottery. We're going to do a randomization and have a chance to compare the people who got housing to the people who didn't. My argument for that is based on my experience in the criminal justice world where in a formal experiment is cited over and over again and taken to the bank as being correct at least extremely persuasive and everything else is diminished by people saying we had to make assumptions here and there, threats to validity and I don't know whether to beef that. A experiments, I know how that worked and how to compare the controls in the experiment and I believe you when you say we were

able to reduce our cost by \$3 million. Is that something we could do here?

I think it's a very intriguing idea and I think in my mind the balance of that question is about with our limited resources are we going to be able to draw our partners to the table and get the resources we would need for this short-term initiative and not sort of say that we are going to serve those people who we are more certain would demonstrate cost effectiveness.

Spelman: That is in fact the problem. Science you haven't answered the question, I presume --

the question is it could be done, but I'm suggesting that I think it's problematic from the standpoint of getting the resources and doing this.

Spelman: Do you want to take the top 350 from one to 350.

Don't know that we'll be able to invest the kind of money in that science in a rank order, but I think that demonstrating to our partners that we are targeting the same individuals who are impacting their systems will likely be an important argument.

Spelman: I see your point. Thanks.

Cole: Mayor.

Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember.

Cole: Cole thank you for your excellent work. You notice that you talked about a permanent supportive housing leadership council. Can you give me some indication of how you would see that work?

Sure. So very often in communities that put together initiatives of this type, and I think the theme of partnership is common across geography so we need the collaboration and frankly the financing from entities, and I'll name some of them here. We hope to have partnerships from the county, perhaps the health care district. We need resources that the housing authorities have access to. There are a variety of entities we need at the table. Veterans affairs has some resources that are very important. So in the initial phase what we would anticipate is those partners coming to the table and really hashing out what's feasible for them to bring to the initiative, and I think really part of the question about who is being served is probably part of that conversation, how we're targeting the frequent users. As the initiative matures, very often that group or some iteration of that group takes the role of kind of looking at the pipeline of projects coming -- coming through the development process. So, you know, we have a deal that perhaps has received acquisition funds from the city, we know that some of the capital is in place, but we have, a, perhaps a gap on the capital side, or b, we need to ensure that the operating dollars are attached to those units or there are sufficient services. So that really that coordination at the level of staff and leadership becomes critical to making sure that we're not funding capital on one side and operating our services on the other. And in some communities one of the things that we've seen that's very effective is getting to the point we are ABLE TO ISSUE JOINT R.F.P.s So you are putting money for operating out there at the same time you are getting moneys for capital and/or .

Cole: I guess at least a year ago I took a large group of people to san antonio and councilmember riley and councilmember shade and I went to phoenix and then I also went to miami with several of the professional staff so I've had a brief look at some of the other different models, but I am by no means an expert, but I was most impressed with miami, who took their homeless population from 8,000 to approximately 1,000. And what I noticed is that they had a huge board and that it was kind of led by a business leader. But I don't know the process that they used to get there, if they started out small and then gradually built their board, but I would just like to visit with you some separately other than the council meeting about the process of developing that because I only think if we bring all those resources

to the table and even get as far AS JOINT R.F.Q.s OR Ps FOR Services that we'll really accomplish the savings in addition to the aborted savings. And with that being said and your recognition of several partners, I want to say that i have talked to many of them and they receive very positive results she but to recognize that austin-travis county integral care was here, greg gibson, darla gay from the COUNTY WAS HERE, ed McChorus from echo was here, jo katherine quinn from caritas, pete valdez from community court was here, josh allen from sixth street austin was here, and bill bryce from d.a.a. I say that not for your benefit but for my colleagues' benefit who I said I promise if you vote for this resolution, I'll beat people down to help us. So they have been supportive in that way and I wanted to make sure that they knew and i am looking for money everywhere I can find it. I know that makes the c.f.o. And the city manager very happy. The only other thing I want to add is that I want to not only thank the co-sponsors, councilmember riley and councilmember shade, but also mayor leffingwell who from the time I got on council was very much a leader in the social service world. And every time I go to a meeting, they say is lee coming and I say, well, he has a few other things to do. And I know he's been in it a long time because they call him lee and I think that happened before he was ever on council. And second I want to thank councilmember morrison for recognizing that this item was actually coming up on the agenda and saying have you called the neighborhoods and actually sitting down with some neighborhood leaders and talking about a strategy so that even though we have a study, even though we have a plan and it looks like we're going to have some money, we won't have the neighborhoods being, you know, against this and real difficult to make these things happen. And finally I want to thank councilman spelman for helping me write this resolution on the back of a napkin, and also mayor pro tem martinez who is leading the effort with loaves and fishes who I'm sure will also be a part of this effort. Thank you, mayor.

Mayor Leffingwell: Thank you, councilmember. Any further questions? If not, thank you very much.

Thank you.

Mayor Leffingwell: For a very informative presentation.

Thank you.

Mayor Leffingwell: With that, before we take on our second briefing, we have a few items on this morning's agenda. Maybe we can get to right quickly, beginning with item number 11 which was pulled because of speakers. Speaker signed up is gus pena. Gus pena. Sharon blythe. Sharon blythe had donated time. I don't see either one in the chamber so mayor pro tem moves approval of item number 11. Is there second? Seconded by councilmember spelman. Discussion? All in favor say aye.

Aye.

Mayor Leffingwell: Posed say no. Passes on a vote of 7-0. And that will take us to item number 14 and we'll have a brief presentation by staff.

Good afternoon, mayor, mayor pro tem, councilmembers. I'm gordon bowman. I'm an assistant city attorney in the law department. I'm here today to recommend that you approve an agreement to settle a claim filed against the city by austin filter systems in connection with the green water treatment plant decommissioning and deconstruction project. If you will recall, as we discussed in the executive session last week on SEPTEMBER 23rd, THE PROPOSED Settlement agreement generally contains the following terms. The city will pay austin filter systems the amount of \$350,000. The city will also grant austin filter systems an additional 60 days to complete the project. And austin filter systems will indemnify the city from any subcontractor claims including the current lawsuits on the project. The law department recommends the proposed settlement pursuant to these terms.

Mayor Leffingwell: Questions? Motion on item number 14? Mayor pro tem moves approval. Seconded



by councilmember spelman. Discussion? All in favor say aye.

Aye.

Mayor Leffingwell: Opposed say no. That passes on a vote of 7-0.

Thank you.

Mayor Leffingwell: And that brings us to item number 18, which was also pulled because of speakers. Folks signed up to speak on this. First speaker is kim McKNIGHT. kim McKnight. Kim has signed up neutral. And welcome, you have three minutes when you reach the podium.

Good afternoon. Thank you, it's hard to come and talk about something like a park name after hearing about permanent housing for the homeless. I hope this doesn't seem trivial but that was quite an omission presentation. I'm a member of the zilker neighborhood association. I'm also coordinating the park effort for the renaming with friends of zilker neighborhood park. My main goal here is to just tell you about our process and to assure you that we've had an incredible public process and so that eliminates any doubts that our community has been heard. I'd like to thank pard and ricardo soliz and I want to say how much I appreciate them. We want to rename or clarify or whatever sort of term you use our parks because it's called zilker neighborhood park. When we have park workdays through austin parks foundation and have volunteers from outside of you are community come work in our park they sometimes get confused and go to the wrong zilker park. Our community who don't realize it's a city park. Having that ownership issue kind of makes it difficult when you are trying to get people to come to workdays and to do fundraising projects for our park. So our process started a year and a half ago. We assembled a committee, met with different people from the neighborhood. We solicited submissions from school children, notices went to teachers. We had meetings with our zilker neighborhood association. We will about 60 names submitted and then we had a process by which a joint committee of neighborhood and school folks decided on two names and we deliberately picked two to keep the process open, transparent and engaged to submit to the city as part of the public input period. The zilker neighborhood association had which I'm a member voted to submit two names. The executive committee may have done something else in terms of suppoing, but i want to clarify the community understands we have submitted two names. There has been many notices for all of the meets. I was there and spoke about the process. I've not endorsed a particular name. I've also let the community know about the pard meeting. Unfortunately we had little input into those two meetings. At this point we felt it was best to make sure everyone had their names heard and that's why you've been receiving comments directly. I'm not sure the process is great. I'd be happy to give my input when you are kind of want to go rework this process. I want to speak why those names came about. Bluebonnet is because it's on bluebonnet lane. It's pretty much as simple as that and a lot of people think it's really pretty.

[Buzzer sounding] secondly, little zilker park is about the public memory of our original name. It's called zilker park. Little zilker park is not too far away. Any questions before I step away?

Mayor Leffingwell: Thank you. Next speaker is gardner sumner. Richard gravas. Did I say that right? I do speak french.

I'm the president of zilker neighborhood association and as kim said, you know, we've been in this process a long time and we voted -- the executive committee voted at the beginning of september that we like the idea of little zilker park. And I think that the parks and recreation committee chose bluebonnet park about the same time, a little before that, and from what I understand it was because most of us were over in a planning commission meeting across the hall, we couldn't get over to that meeting. But anyway, personally I like the idea of little zilker park because it pays tribute to andrew zilker who donated a lot of land to the city, the neighborhood, whatever, about 90 years ago. And it -- it's simpler than just naming it after the street. But it's up to you now. Any questions?

Mayor Leffingwell: Questions? Thank you, richard. Appreciate it. Discussion, council, or a motion.

Shade: Mayor.

Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember shade.

Shade: I wanted to say thank you to kim for your acknowledgement of the variety of subject matters we deal with in any given day in any one of our council agendas, and they are very important for different reasons but i want to say I appreciate you acknowledging that. sumner had to leave because help a 00 appointment, but I did say I would convey what he told me in our individual conversation which was that he too was very supportive of the name little zilker so I wanted to put that on the record for him since he couldn't stay long enough. And last, I wanted to make a motion that we name this little zilker park. And I'll leave it at that.

Mayor Leffingwell: Motion by councilmember shade to name the park little zilker park. I'll second. Discussion? Councilmember morrison.

Morrison: I do have another thing I would like to offer and that is something that was proposed by the little zilker folks that the little zilker proponents, i should say.

[Laughter] that -- anyway, that recognize -- I think it has been a long process. There's the ins and outs of the process, the planning commission meeting that was going on, so to recognize and acknowledge the process i think that adding bluebonnet on to little zilker, which as I understand it sounds sort of like an okay compromise to some people, that I -- and i do agree that it's very important to save the name of little zilker as little zilker park in some way because it is historically the name and it's sort of a shame to give it a new hair cut and just call it something else. So that would be -- if not a friendly amendment to your motion, then a substitute motion. So you choose, councilmember shade.

Spelman: What is the.

Morrison: Little zilker bluebonnet park.

Mayor Leffingwell: Is that acceptable to the maker?

Shade: Before I do that --

Mayor Leffingwell: Wait a minute. You can't speak from the gallery. When a councilmember has a question for you, week do that.

Shade: I would like to -- because I've been back and forth and even talking with my colleagues about this, I don't have a really strong opinion other than that a get name so we can address the -- really it's a branding issue, you know, to -- more than anything else so that neighborhood has a place to identify. As I mentioned last week when we looked at this, in my own neighborhood we actually have a park that has some multiple names. Some people call it the clarksville park, some people call it the mary bailer park, some people call it the plays with the splash pad now thankfully. I would like to get kim's take on this because I think simplicity appeals to me a little bit, but if it really is important to include bluebonnet in the name, okay, I mean what do you all think? What do you think, kim?

I would say say on one hand we're zilker and south austin and it wouldn't be completing out of character; on the other hand, I think that it kind of goes against what our original spent was which is to gt the park a distinct identity and i think that now we have a couple of different names and I'm not sure we've really solved our problem. I would say the neighborhood hasn't come forward to say let's do two

names. I don't know, I haven't really --

Shade: And that said, what I'm going to do is stick with the original little zilker and let councilmember morrison --

Mayor Leffingwell: I would not have accepted it either because it's too long. So the substitute motion --

Morrison: If I may, MS. McKNIGHT --

Mayor Leffingwell: Can we get a second on that? Go ahead and ask your question.

Morrison: Yes --

I think we prefer you pick one name. That's the feeling from the neighborhood. We haven't had anyone say let's do on two and I think we have a distinctive day we can celebrate. We have a workday in october and we want to get our signs and get the dedication.

Morrison: I'll withdraw my comments.

Shade: I like Izb. No, I'm kidding. [Laughter]

Mayor Leffingwell: Well, I don't know. Councilmember spelman I think wants to weigh in on this one.

Spelman: Are you withdrawing your motion?

Mayor Leffingwell: Yes, she did. me this is a good idea. If we name it bluebonnet it going to be called little zilker so we might as well name it what it's going to be called.

I don't think you are going to get an objection from the community, but my observation I've been very neutral on this, many people seem to feel more strongly about little zilker.

Mayor Leffingwell: I think we get it, kim. Thank you very much.

Okay.

Mayor Leffingwell: Any more discussion in the main motion to name the park little zilker park. All in favor? Opposed? Passes on a vote of 7-0.

Thank you all very much.

Mayor Leffingwell: So that brings us to our other 30 morning briefing, briefing on taxi cab issues.

Good afternoon, I'm gordon derr with the transportation department. And earlier this year you passed a couple of resolutions and asked that staff work with urban transportation commission members to bring forth a recommendation on issues related to taxi cabs. And this is our report back to you. The first resolution that was passed asked the staff and task force to look at flat rates, boundaries, cleanup fees, other issues as arise. Next, please. Then the subsequent resolution, how we might shape in the future and owner operators or other operators and how might we look at ways to better renew franchises in the future. Next slide, please. There were a number of people involved and I want to recognize dustin lanier and boone blocker who were on the urban transportation commission. They participated with us in seven meetings with the taxi cab franchise holders and the taxi cab driver, the petit cabs and so staff was involved in this task force. Went through all of the list of issues and I apologize gut it was a lengthy

list of issues. Next slide. We tried to come up with some basic ideas that we need to provide safe, convenient and valuable taxi service while respecting the need for the drivers, riders and franchise holders. Create incentives for effective operations and appropriate city oversight and identify high value short-term pilots and long-term adjustments. Just to give an overview, our vehicle for hire section within the transportation department controls limousine charters, petit cabs, horse drawn carriages, touring and airport shuttle. To give you a look, a snapshot fare that we had is about in the middle between some of our peer groups and cities around the state. Austin is about in the middle as far as number of taxi cabs on the street as compared to the population of our community. We're kind of in the middle of where things are at as far as taxi operations around the country and the state. So if you would like the recommendations, we broke them into three sets. Ones we feel no action should be taken on at this time, some other categories were immediate action items, and then some long-term study/future action items. So from the no action recommended, there was a recommendation in the original resolution to look at a flat rate from the airport to downtown and the university of Texas. When we talked with the community, the franchise owners and the taxi drivers, there was no real proponents for that so we do not feel at this time that's appropriate to move forward with. Also during the discussions it was brought up some other cities around the country, they just alternating days for access, so even cabs one day, odd cabs -- not odd cabs, but odd numbered cabs the next day. The airport staff, vehicle for hire staff looked at that and didn't feel it was anything we needed to initiate at this time. There was a request to look at the city be involved when drivers are terminated. We felt like that was something that should be discussed and handled as part of the negotiating the contract between the franchise holder and the drivers. And that the city really shouldn't be in the middle of that. Again, insurance coverage being provided by the franchise holders to the drivers, we felt there was a number of issues, but that's really something that would be between the franchise holders and the drivers and I think the franchise holders have discussed some ways they could provide additional insurance coverage for drivers. And then the last is a request for drivers to process credit and debit payments through the franchise holders. We feel that's more appropriately handled between the franchise holders and the drivers and the city doesn't really need to be in that process. Immediate action, as part of the discussion about airport, there of the at one time a process where if a driver had a short run from the airport, like out to the parking lot, they got to go back to the head of the line. Over time there were problems with that process so that process was eliminated. But there was still -- when a driver sits for an hour, hour and a half for a fare and it barely is outside the gates of the airport, that is an issue with the drivers and we felt like one way to look at that would be to specify that any trip out of the airport is a minimum of four miles, plus there's the dollar surcharge from the airport. That takes you past the hotels and motels at riverside and 71. It's kind of in that nether land between that and del valle that any of the trips would be a minimal amount. 65 plus the time charges for the time it takes to make that trip. Cleanup fee. There was -- in the original resolution you asked us to look at cleanup fees. We came up with several options including one, the one that's recommended here is to add 10 cents to the drop so the drivers would have additional income. It would be up to them to then clean up their cabs and the city wouldn't be involved. The other two options were to add a quarter to that but have that come back through the franchise and the city would have a fund, the driver could apply for materials to clean the cab. The third option requested by some of the drivers was the ability for the drivers to charge up to \$250 to a passenger if they messed up the cab, let's say. And again, we felt it was better to provide the money. There's still some additional discussion that could occur on this particular issue, but at this point our recommendation is to look at additional income at the drop, but then over time it would add up and take care of that. There was request for additional taxi stands over a series of meetings, we looked at the downtown area. We're proposing and will move forward with doing two additional stands for sixth street, one on fifth street, one on seventh street. A stand for warehouse district on fourth street, and then we're still looking for a good stand on west sixth street. But the idea would be to have evening stands with additional way finding, which is the next topic, to direct people to where those taxi stands are. We tried to get them out of the areas where the police would typically barricade when there is a large crowd on sixth street, but we hope with signage and active usage of those large taxi stands that the taxies will know they can come to the location, get a trip and won't have to drive around downtown looking for trips. There was also a request to look at how we deal with all these speed vehicles within the city code. Right now the pedi cabs are addressed in the same section of the code as horse drawn carriages. Our recommendation do we go back and look at all the sections of the code currently apply to vehicles for hire, make sure we

have appropriate regulations. Right now our pedi cabs are controlled under operating authorities assigned between the owner and the city. And a lot of those have a lot of elements in common. Those should probably be in the ordinance so that everybody understands the insurance requirements, the license requirements and everything else. We think this is also an opportunity to look at other low speed vehicles and other rental vehicles that are using rights-of-way to get the propose codification we'll be working with the city attorney's office to draft that for you all if that's your choice -- how you would like to proceed on this. Then lastly, immediate action would be to look at and develop some additional processes to look at future franchise and permit approval processes. We feel like within the time frame we had we could not go into the detail that we needed to really make a big recommendation here, but we have a window of three to five years before the next franchise comes up so we should take that to look at how we might take this forward in the future. I think we need to go one more. So we're recommending there's some issues that we need to continue to refine and look at how we authorize franchise agreements, how we provide incentive for hybrids, the permit allocationss between franchises, mobile or portable permits. Next, please. Performance indicators, growth and fees, city franchise agreements and integrating performance measures for continue franchise authorizations. Next slide, please. So what we evolved from this process was that staff working with the urban transportation commission and the industry, the franchise holders and the drivers, work toward building, let's say, ideal franchise operator agreement which would cover a number of different issues which look at company performance, driver satisfaction and the service provided. Then we come up with a number of measures of effectiveness, we then collect data over a period of time. We develop what we feel is an ideal and then we work toward that. And that would be the basis for awarding franchises or permits in the future. Next, please. Please. Some of the measures was total number of trips per cab per hour. There's a whole list. There's actually two pages of lists. I don't know if we want to go into detail, but these are potential things we could measure. We need to work with the cab drivers and franchise holders to see what's effective in really measuring what they are doing and measuring how that could progress over time. We would -- we will talk about yellow cab this year versus last year as opposed to really between the different cab companies because they are different organisms, different methods of working. But what we want to move toward is an ideal. Next slide, please. For example, the second within here about average fleet fuel mileage, that's something we could wrap the percent of hybrids in the fleet in the future, the percent of electrics, it would be in the city's interest to provide better fuel mileage in the fleet so that would be something we could track over time and award points as to how the fleets are getting better over time. So our next steps moving forward is staff and the utc will move forward working with the stakeholders to develop a profile for best franchise holders practices. We'll work with the city attorney's office to prepare changes to the fee ordinance, the abia minimum, and the cleanup fee. We will move forward with implementing the additional taxi stands downtown and the signage, and we'll draft changes to the city code section on vehicles for hire. If you have any questions.

Mayor Leffingwell: Questions for staff? Councilmember spelman.

Spelman: As a -- first let me thank you for all the work you and the other stakeholders have put in and you've laid out a really nice road map moving forward into the future with. I particularly like the idea, it's interesting that you are posing this today or at least presenting this to us today. We had earlier today chanded our [indiscernible] contracting process. We're paying increasing attention to what it is we were getting for them but not exerting control over who we contracting with and that changed today. And you can exert the same level of control for the benefit of the public that we're doing in social services contracts. I'm happy to hear we're moving forward even though it may be four to five years. One specific issue you did mention was that the immediate issue we could be getting -- we want to discuss changes to the franchise and permit approval process and that would be something you begin talking about right now. What form would that discussion take?

What we are discussing is that we bring on board a national expert who can look at our overall system at the moment and maybe identify for us some paths that we may look at for the future. But then we work with staff, the urban transportation commission, the franchise holders to develop how we might work. But we would be looking in the next three to four months to find an outside national expert on taxi cab -- you know, just about ever city I've heard of has a different way to do this. It's a skinless cat. That's

probably not an appropriate thing to say, but --

[laughter] a different way to do this.

Spelman: A joe biden moment.

So we want to have somebody from external look at how we do it now and whether there are avenues for improvement.

Spelman: Are there cities that are generally regarded as having systems that work well for the public?

That's certainly something we can look into. I think there's many cities that have different aspects which are really good. I think that's -- we understand san diego has some very good pedi cab -- process in place. We want to look at that. We want to look at

[indiscernible] taxi cab franchises and so I think we need to look at a number of cities and see what's working for them and what's not working to really inform us about what works best within our community.

Spelman: Okay, so in addition to a national expert we will be looking to other cities for best practices involving our stakeholders ad the whole conversation. Would that start soon? Six months, a year?

Yes. Unless we're told otherwise, the city manager has told us to proceed forward with these initiatives.

Spelman: Well, you certainly will not hear otherwise from me. Thank you very much.

Mayor Leffingwell: I believe councilmember riley, then councilmember morrison.

Riley: I want to thank you for the presentation too and for all the work that's gone into this. Just a few questions. Really starting with the process. On the last two bullet points under your next steps, first is implement downtown stands and sign acknowledge, and the second is draft changes to city code section on vehicles for hire. With respect to both those bullets, I need more guidance how we're going to get there. What those next steps are going to look like. When we go to implement the downtown signage, are we at the point where we know specifically where those stands would go?

We have developed a plan, we have provided those to the franchise holders and the drivers and asked for comments. We've gotten some comments back. We are looking for -- for example, the stand on seventh street as it comes into red river between neches and one on fifth street, a little east of there where there would be parking meters during the day and in the evening a taxi stand. We've talked to capital metro about using the bus stop that's on brazos between fifth and sixth after the end bus stations, that would also be a taxi stand. On fourth street the frontage of the hobby building being, again, a block long taxi stand. Those are the ones we've identified so far. We have the regulatory authority to make those happen now and, again, unless we hear otherwise, we're going to proceed forward with implementing those.

Riley: Well, is there any further opportunity for additional input on those decisions?

Yes.

Riley: And I think there are some things that have come up, I mean you mentioned capital metro. I know some of us at cap metro have been talking about how it might be helpful to have a -- have bus service connecting to some of the taxi stands. In particular we've been talking about the airport flyer which

currently doesn't get much use, but if we ramped up some -- some -- made that a little more convenient at the airport and then had a taxi stand within downtown where the airport flyer could drop you off at that taxi stand. So instead of paying \$25 to get from the airport to downtown, you could pay one dollar and then take a taxi to get to your final destination. Right in and out we're not set up to do that and neither seventh or fifth would work because they are one way.

we'll give a call tomorrow and could start a discussion.

Riley: I think that would be helpful. With respect to the last part about the -- the -- the vehicles for hire, the low speed vehicles for hire, i know there's a lot of interest in -- in doing some further work on that and I just wanted to ask you about the process. I've gotten input from some pedi cab operators that they would like to see regulations addressing things like lighting capacity, provisions for children, waiting areas, provisions for when pedi cabs can or can't be on sidewalks, when pedi cabs could operate on one way streets that have been closed, and then having designated -- specifically designated pedi cab waiting areas. All very important issues to the pedi cab industry and seems like there's a lot of stuff there that could use some further discussion. What sort of process would you envision for having conversations with things like that?

We had two of the task force meetings where we invited pedi cabs. We probably need to set up a few more with just the pedi cabs and let all the other vehicles be involved. One of the interesting things that came out of the meetings was a couple of pedi cab folks talking about what they really did was pick people up and carry them to taxis.

Riley: Yeah.

And there would be seemingly a great synergy particularly if we have these big taxi stands downtown where the taxis could go and the pedi cabs knew they could get someone there, but if someone is going to georgetown, but pedi cabs, you know, kind of roam downtown and they would -- there's an opportunity there that I think we can build on. I think we need to have some meetings to discuss with them, we need to look at what the code sections should discuss and what should still be under operating authorities, but i think there's certainly room to meet with them and discuss their ideas.

Riley: Yeah, I'm glad you mention that because that is another conversation that we need to have about the way that we can have a symbiotic relationship between pedi cabs and the taxi cabs. There has been some tension in the past but they can be mutually supportive so we need to foster those kinds of conversation. We've done a lot of important work, to whatever extent council can be of help moving that forward, I think I'd certainly be interested in hearing about that. So I'll be in touch with you after this meeting and we can get moving on all this stuff. Thanks.

Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember morrison.

Morrison: Thank you. Thank you for all the work and dozens of stakeholders that were part of it. I want to make sure i understand when you say these are recommendation, are these staff recommendations from the shake holder process? I guess what I'm curious how much consensus there was coming to these recommendations.

I failed to mention these recommendations were brought to the urban transportation commission. They endorsed them unanimously. They added additional resolution about future franchise renewals and processes and that should have been provided to you and i apologize if it's not and we'll get that to you. But once we drafted these, we invited the franchise holders in and talked to each individual listen and heard their concerns and we will continue to talk with them as we build each piece of this block. But certainly, you know, the last change related to the code related to vehicles for hire was 1998. There's a

lot of things that happened in the last 12 years and we need to bring everything up to date.

Morrison: And I guess the taxi drivers as another stakeholder, did you have an opportunity to go through with them and do you know where they stand on these recommendations?

We invited the taxi driver -- the taxi driver union, one might call it -- association, and went over the discussion with them and told them about it before we went to the urban transportation commission. There's some issues that we're not 100% in, but I think for the most part we're in alignment on.

Morrison: I don't know if it's possible, I mean I could do this or I don't know if my colleagues would be interested in it also would just be to have sort of a summary of people's positions if there isn't complete consensus so we can understand more of the conversation that went into it. Do you have any record of that or --

we have the report that's been provided to you and today the association has provided a document which I'm sure will be provided to you on their view. And then we can certainly sit down with the franchise holders and get something written from them about their view of the process.

Morrison: That might be an efficient way to start because I know that several of us I'm sure will be invited to meet with the franchises and all. So if there's a way to do that without too much work, I would really appreciate it.

Okay.

Morrison: Thanks.

Mayor Leffingwell: Anything further? Mayor pro tem.

Martinez: Quickly I just wanted to ask, following up on the questions councilmember riley asked about the downtown taxi cab stands, can you expand a little bit on what you plan on doing, if anything, with regard to the parking spaces that are eliminated when you start putting cab stands that take up entire blocks. Have we contemplated things like consolidating valet services where it seemingly has taken over every block in the western downtown area because all meters are bagged and there's simply no parking in the evening and weekend hours.

Well, that's come up as part of the discussions on taxi stands. We -- we feel that that's another group that we need to start to work with to come to reasonable accommodation with. As I said on west sixth street is an important area. We weren't able to find a good place to put a taxi stand because of all the valet operations. So we need to come to you with recommendations about how we balance out those different groups and their needs, and that's something I think we need to -- will do over the next few months.

Martinez: I guess then what I would suggest is that we really do need to figure out this piece of the puzzle, I think, before we start implementing taxi stands. You know, additional taxi stands in the downtown corridor. I think you are only going to exacerbate the problem. Thank you. Thanks, mayor.

Mayor Leffingwell: Anything further? Thank you very much, mr. derr.

Thank you.

Mayor Leffingwell: EN I Think that brings us to our 2:00 zoning cases. >



Good afternoon, mayor and council. Greg guernsey. Item 37, case c14-2010-, the west austin neighborhood group rezoning. That will be a discussion item and we'll take through a motion sheet. Item 38, c14-2010-0006. Ready for second and third reading to rezoning various properties in the area generally bound by west sixth street and west 12th street along blanco and baylor. This is an historic area. And this is ready for consent approval again on second and third readings. Item number 239, c14-2010-0085, for the property located on u.s. Highway 183 north to rezone the property to commercial liquor sales, conditio overlay. Ready for consent approval. Item 40, c14-2010-0096, zone the property to community commercial, conditional overlay or gr-co combined district zoning. This is ready for consent on secretary and third reading. 41, Property located on north fm 620, to zone planned unit development to change the condition zoning. This is ready for consent approval on second and third reading. Item 42, c14-2010-0087 for various properties on north mopac expressway, domain drive and this is for the domain rezoning piece. Staff is requesting postponement of this item to your october 14th agenda. That concludes this portion of what I can offer for consent.

Mayor Leffingwell: The consent agenda is to approve items before us -- councilmember morrison, are you recusing on 38?

Morrison: Yes, thank you.

Mayor Leffingwell: Okay. So councilmember morrison is recused on item 38. The agenda is to approve on second and third readings items 38 and 39, 40 and 41. And to postpone item number 42 UNTIL OCTOBER 14th. Councilmember spelman moves approval and mayor pro tem seconds. Discussion? All in favor say aye.

Aye.

Mayor Leffingwell: Opposed say no. Passes on a vote of 7-0. Z let me move on to to public hearings are open, possible action is possible this afternoon. Item number 43, c 14-06-0121 rca, various properties on burnet road, domain drive and esperanza crossing. Staff is requesting a postponement to this item to your october 14th agenda. Item 44, for supportive housing various properties on burnet road, domain drive and esperanza crossing, this is rezoning the endeavor portion, staff is requesting postponement of this item to your october 14th agenda. Item 45, case c14-2010-0099, located at 4929 fm 2222, the applicant has requested postponement of this item to your december 16 agenda. That's item 45. The final item, number 46, that will be a discussion item.

Mayor Leffingwell: So the consent agenda for those items where we've yet to hold public hearing is to postpone null october 14th items 43 and 44 and to postpone item 45 until december 16. Councilmember spelman moves approval. Seconded by councilmember morrison. Discussion? All in favor say aye.

Aye.

Mayor Leffingwell: Opposed say no. Passes on a vote of 7-0.

That brings us back to item 37, the west austin neighborhood group planning area rezoning and I would like to introduce paul who will present this item. Thank you.

Good afternoon, mayor, mayor pro tem, city councilmembers. I'm a planner with the planning and development review department. We are speaking on item number -- agenda item number 37, which is case number c14-2010-0052, which is the west austin neighborhood group neighborhood plan combining district. And I'm presenting this item for third reading. The -- there were three motions. Before I get started, does council have any questions?

Mayor Leffingwell: Questions for staff? Go ahead. Q.thank you. Motion number 1, your action is approve

the zoning and rezonings in the west austin neighborhood combined district. The proposed action is recommend approval of rezoning as recommended by city council on second reading except for the following that will be taken by separate vote shown below. Those are tracts 104 and 105. Prior council action was on first and second reading. You closed the public hearing and approved the rezonings. Does council have any questions.

Mayor Leffingwell: Is there a motion on -- motion number 1? Councilmember spelman moves approval. Seconded by councilmember morrison. Discussion? All in favor say aye.

Aye.

Mayor Leffingwell: Opposed say no. That passes on a vote of 7-0. Motion number 2 and 3 are presented because there are currently valid petitions. So your action is to approve the motion to rezone in the west austin neighborhood group, neighborhood plan combining district. Motion 2 represents to tract 104 at 700 hearn street. Prior council action was on first and second reading, you closed the public hearing and approved mf-3, c -- np with a 35-foot height limit. There is a valid petition so six votes are needed to approve zoning category with 35-foot height limit or more restrictive.

Mayor Leffingwell: Questions for staff? Motion on tract 104? Councilmember morrison.

Morrison: Move approval on third reading.

Second.

Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember morrison moves approval on motion number 2 on third reading. Seconded by councilmember spelman. Discussion? All in favor say aye.

Aye.

Mayor Leffingwell: Opposed say no. That passes on a vote of 7-0.

Motion 3 located at 2309 pruit street. Prior council action was on first and second reading to close the public hearing and approve sf-6-np. There is valid petition. Six votes are needed to approve any zoning category other than sf-6-np.

Mayor Leffingwell: Questions for staff? Is there a motion on tract 105? Councilmember morrison. Councilmember morrison moves approval seconded by councilmember spelman. Discussion in all in favor.

Aye.

Mayor Leffingwell: Opposed say no. Passes on a vote of 7-0.

Thank you.

Mayor Leffingwell: Thank you.

Item 46, the last time we were at council, you recommended this for additional review. The planning commission reviewed the case and came back with a vote of 5-4 recommending against historic zoning for the property. Can we go to the next slide, please. This is the callan-bosswell house and just to give a brief reiteration, the landmark commission recommended for historic zoning. Planning commission did not. Came to council with neighborhood association bringing forth some new information. The council

remanded it and here it is back again. The only thing we know about this house for sure is that it was located on this particular site in 1945. So obviously an older house than that, but we don't know where it came from. In addition to the neighborhood research, staff also conducted additional research. If we can go to the next slide. There was a house located in the approximate location of this house in 1921, as we can see on the 1921 map. This house has a different footprint, full width front porch. In 1935 the house has a -- in 1962, this is the current house in its current location. It's number 408 east 33rd street. Going through the city directories, what we found was that this house appears for the first time in 1935. Now, according to the 1921 map, there was obviously a house on this site. But there's no listing for any house on 33rd street in this block. Is there is no listing for any house in the rear of 3300 duvall street, which is the french cougar house. In 1935 we have a listing for leroy johnson who lived there, worked as a chauffeur. Then we have directory listings up until 1940. 1941 And 42 there's no city listings for this house either. So it is unclear whether the house that is there right now was always there and simply moved forward, came from another site, we just don't know. And for that reason staff still cannot recommend the house for historic zoning. We need to have a full history of this house to recommend it for historic zoning and as there is a valid petition in this case, that point becomes even more crucial in your decision. Thank you. Questions for staff. We have a number of folks signed up to speak on this item so we'll go to those in favor beginning with scott morris. If you prefer a different order, please say so. All right, mary ingall and rick iverson. Is rick in the chamber? Mary, you will have six minutes.

Thank you. I'm mary ingall and I live in the groom subdivision of the north university neighborhood. Some of us are passionate about historic preservation and I'm one of those folks. As a ex-classicist they read footnotes for a living. I'm passionate about facts and proper documentation. This was done concerning did case on 408 east 33rd street. Our historic preservation program in the city is? Shambles and with the expectation of equity for all parts of our city, I hope that the revisions to the landmark process will occur soon and be thoughtful. It is the hope that the local historic district program will become easier and it will be a tool to prevent unwanted demolitions to our older neighborhoods. The house at 408 east 33rd street would have been a contributing structure to the grooms local historic district. Many questions about these numerous -- many questions have been asked from these numerous hearings annual some remain unanswered and some have been answered. This house met three categories of the historic landmark commission's criteria for landmark designation, architecture, historical associations and community value. The cottage retains its architectural integrity and it was more than 50 years old when it was moved before and after it was moved to the -- from its original location behind the grand mansion at 3300 duvall. We have a permit with specific language to prove this relocation. The zoning change review sheet prepared by staff reports that the house is in good condition. This condition is also verified in a statement made by the chair of the planning commission, dave sullivan. Architecturally this is an example of a double pin house, a kind of folk architecture and referred to as a dumb we cumberland. It's the only example of this tile left in the north university neighborhood which makes it a rare style. Under the category historical association, this house represents a significant portrayal of the environment of a group of people in an historic time. The people who lived in the structure were from the working class, a class of underrepresented people in this community. And the structure has community values to the north university neighborhood. In addition to the meeting -- in addition to meeting the hlc criteria, we verified our methodology and logical conclusions with two experts, one from gregory smith from the texas historical commission and one from laura david, a local architect, the head of the historic sites for texas parks and wildlife. Despite the facts and the support of two experts about the history of the house and that our conclusions from this research were based on substantiated research, not hearsay, our research will not go to waste. Fortunately the university of texas department of architecture has partnered with the city grant thanks to councilmember morrison to collect historic data on the historical wiki database. Even though this database is in its infancy, the potential applications are numerous and may have been useful -- and may have been useful and have unfor season applications to other city departments. Our research for 408 east 33rd street will be included in that database entry. That makes me happy. We have learned so much throughout this journey to save this house from demolition. Regardless of the out come from today's hearing and we hope that this house will be relocated. Our team of volunteers have made a great contribution to the history of our neighborhood and to the history of the city in a lasting way by having the opportunity to have our data recorded on the wiki database and publicly available and that's

a grated achievement. No one can remove, relocate, demolish that history from its rightful place in history. The best part is that no permit is required either. And I have a little prop, uncle.

Mayor Leffingwell: Next speaker is scott morris.

Thank you, mayor. Bee remanding this case to the planning commission, you've directed a gap from the process to forward specific findings of the hlc to the commission. This time provided staff with an opportunity to uncover a bit more history of the site. That research is included in newer packet. The backup beginning on page 4. New information to the says CASE IS DURING THE 1930s, wicks were chauffeur force the finches. They lived in the portion of the block face where the subject property is now. It was research that we missed. According to census data, leroy johnson and henry wicks were in fact heads of the household for large african-american families. This backs up earlier jurneu who accounted two adalias played in the creeks. We now know adelia was list understand the census as althea. Despite including other values and social equity to correct the bias toward the affluent, we keep going back to did they make a name for themselves and what did they do. The history and culture of the african-american presence in the north university neighborhood has been erased and has been a complete and lasting erasure. Today the neighborhood -- in one of austin's most progressive neighborhoods, less than 1% of our residents are african-american. The city of austin's 1928 master plan with deed restrictions and laws making it illegal for nonwhites to have water, electric or sewer service made it impossible for people of color to live in our community. North university and surrounding communities still carry the effects of that racial cleansing. By what measure is their inadequate in 2010? We know it's far broader than a listing in a city directory. We have been offered a standard of proof more suited to a criminal trial than a balanced assessment of the profitability of this evidence. The evident is strong. We have a 100-year-old house that is in good condition by all accounts. Once a working component of an edwardian era manor house. Good architectural style, it it's on a site that speaks to racial past and economic diversity of the community. The families who occupied the cottage while not famous were an integral part of the history and the estate would not function without this house and the work of those people.

[Buzzer sounding] please honor this history by designate 408 east 33rd street, the wicks, johnson, finch house.

Mayor Leffingwell: Thank you, scott.

Thank you.

Mayor Leffingwell: Next barbara epstein signed up against rezoning. Barbara, you have three minutes.

There should be a map -- there we go. Good afternoon, mayor and councilmembers. My name is barbara epstein and I have been asked by susan pryor and richard boneer to state their position on this case and they could not be here today. They reside at 3300 duvall street, which is the historical landmark property ADJACENT TO 408 EAST 33rd. They obtained a valid petition opposing the zoning change and asked me to present the following map showing the area. Top please note 408 east 33rd street is identified in yellow. Susan and richard's property is to the east and north of this property and most directly affected by this action. All the owner-occupied properties close to this property were contacted and signed the petition. These are indicated in green. Note also to the west of this property is the illegal super duplex on the corn irrelevant corn he shall corner of 33rd and tom green. The areas in orange are either multi-family or condos. There are many homes, grand and modest which deserve to be preserved and many austinites both rich and poor whose lives deserve commemoration. This property does not qualify. The true history of this house cannot be ascertained and its owners were like thousands of other austin residents who served their country and worked for the university. At a time when the spotlight is on the designation of historic properties, they need to be far more contributing in people and/or structure than this property.

[One moment, please, for change in captioners] it. Representatives of the grooms historic committee made it clear that the structure at east 3rd street was more important than having christine and charles built retirement home they had planned at this location. Those of us who live in the direct vicinity of this property want you to know that this does not reflect the feeling of those of us who will be directly impacted by this decision. Having a well-built owner occupied single-family home that reflects the character of the neighborhood and occupied by neighbors who will contribute to the viability of the neighborhood is more important than this structure. Zoning this property historic over the owner's objections such that they cannot build the home they planned on building when they bought the property does not serve in the best interest of this area of the neighborhood. The structure is next door to a super duplex. It will be the only single owner opened property on 33rd street from duval to grooms. Two full blocks. It is [inaudible] to the historic committee representatives and I think the planning commission to suggest that christine and charles should have to sell the property ordeal with the house if they want to live in our neighborhoods. Neighborhoods are made up of people and we would like very much for charles and christine to know that we welcome them to our neighborhood. Those of us in agreement have signed the petition, and again, there are 16 signatures. On a personal note, I too am passionate about historic preservation. I own two other properties designated historical. They're not in tarrytown, not in hyde park. They're here in east austin, both on cesar chavez. So I'm very familiar with historic properties, and the subject structure appears to have been moved on the property in 1945. It has no historical significance to the property itself and the structure itself appears to have little or no significance. Our neighborhood has a significant amount of apartments, condo, rent houses and duplexes. It caters to ut students. When school is in session i have to call the police on a regular basis complaining of noise violations and underage drinking. I would very much like to have a single-family owner occupant as a neighbor and the current structure is amenable as a rent house. Probably no one would want to live in it as a single-family owner. It is a rent house and i think it would be in the best interest of the neighborhood to have that house removed and to allow the boes to build a single-family residence for the benefit of the neighborhood. Thank you. thank you. Next sp christine boes. Charles boes, you have six minutes.

Thank you, mayor, mayor pro tem, city council members I won't take my full six minutes. We want to build a great house and a great neighborhood. We want to stabilize this part of the neighborhood. It will be the only single-family owner occupied single-family residence on the 4400 block of east 3rd. We want to be committed to this neighborhood, active participant in the neighborhood. We have expressed - I'm told by my wife that this is the 8th or 9th commission or board or council meeting that we've had on this matter, and during this seven-month process we have expressed ma times that we're in favor of repurposing this structure, and at this point we have three or four individuals that have expressed an interest in our -- and our constant response to these individuals once we get through the city process, then we can have some discussions. We're very conservatio oriented. We want this house, or the structure, to be used appropriately and repurposed, and once the city council makes a final decision we'll have some discussions with these individuals. And we thank you for your support. those are all the speakers that we have signed up. So, council, the floor is open for discussion or a motion. Council member -- excuse me, mayor pro tem martinez moves to close the public hearing and approve -- disapprove staff recommendation of the application.

The approval of the staff recommendation and disapproval for historic zoning.

All right. I'll accept that.

[Laughter] I thought it was the same thing, but --

just trying to spell it out. second by council member spelman.

[Inaudible] council member cole? [inaudible] for historic zoning and recognize that we've been going through the dilemma of how much of that zoning to grant when I do not think that this property rises to that recognition, and i agree with -- with the staff and planning commission recommendation. council

member morrison?

Morrison: thank you. I want to thank the neighbors for all the work that you-all did and wish you good luck and hopefully and quick effort in your local historic district, because as has been discussed many times, that's a great tool, and now we have two as of a few minutes ago, in the city. Maybe yours will be the third. I wish you luck on that, and I appreciate the boes' offer, and, in fact, as i understand it, in addition to actually, you know, being willing to discuss the relocation, according to some interaction that we had via email via my planning commissioner, that you actually have a plan pending in council action to get the house. So I appreciate that, and hopefully it will find a good home. Anythi anythi ng else? Council member riley. I also want to thank all the neighbors for all their work on researching this house. So much of the value of this neighborhood is in its history and so much of that history remains to be discovered and it's only through the efforts, like we've seen here in this case, that we're going to bring that to light, and I'm pleased that we now have better tools than ever for memorializing that history, with the work that mike holleran and others are doing, so that will be I think he will pointed out, that -- engel, that history wants it's preserved will never be demolished, and I'm very grateful for all the energy and time you have invested in that. And I also encourage you to make all those materials available to the austin history center, and I hope the existing structure can be documented before demolition and we can have some files at the history center to record the work that's been done to uncover the house's history. And I also want to join council member morrison in thanking the boes for being willing to consider the moving of the house, and I've also met with the boes and understand they are committed to moving forward with some plan for the relocation of the house, and I know that's never an easy undertaking, but it is significant and will make the loss of the house much more painful to those who are sorry to see it go. -- Make it much easier to deal with the loss of that house, and so I really do appreciate your efforts in that regard.

Council member shade. I'm going to be supporting this motion, but engel, could you come forward? I have a couple questions for you. Thanks. Mayor, you and I have exchanged a number of emails about some productive things that could occur to improve the historic zoning process, and I think this case has been instructive in that, but I've also gotten reports from people, including your neighbors, including that you have stated that I'm in dismantling the historic zoning program, and I've had it from a couple of sources. So I wanted to clarify for the record that you and i have exchanged several emails about the importance of addressing the holes and the gaps and improving the process, and I wanted that on the record.

Absolutely.

Shade: great.

In fact, I found that you were the only council member who really responded in a positive way to my suggestions.

Shade: great. I wanted that on the record because I've had too many people -- and this is a great example of the case of neighbors going against neighbors creates problems and tension. You know, it's our home, it's our community, and there have been a few people who I can talk to you about off-line but who have said there's this idea that I'm trying to dismantle or leading an effort to dismantle the landmark program. I'm absolutely not trying to do that and I wanted to make that clear and I appreciate you doing that today, thank you. And I do appreciate all the work you're doing on this.

I appreciate your efforts.

Shade: thank you. Thank you very much. And I do want to echo the thanks to the boes family. Welcome to austin, and i really look forward to you having a very happy, healthy retirement in this community and in what is an excellent neighborhood as evidenced by the activism and involvement, really, of the people around here. That is a big part of what makes austin austin, and i also really appreciate the fact

that once we get through this case that you are open to gifting the house or allowing for an opportunity for the home to be saved for somebody who might be interested in that. So thank you, and again, welcome to austin.

Thank you. I just want to say I'm going to support the motion also, but I -- at the same time I want to say I really appreciate the efforts on the part of mary engel and scott morris and so many others for historic preservation, and i consider myself a strong advocate for historic preservation, but in this particular case where we have not met the standard of proof required to validate the historic status of this building, I feel like I have to honor and respect the rights of the property owners in this case who have been through a very extensive process and who have also strongly suggested that they support historic preservation as well and are willing to make efforts to preserve the structure if not on the site. So I will just echo council member shade and say welcome to austin.

Thank you. Anythi anythi ng further? All in favor of the motion to deny historic zoning say aye.

Aye.

Mayor leffingwell: aye. Any opposed say no. Passes on a vote of 7-0. And by my calculations, council, we have no other items to consider until our time-certain public hearings 00, so without objection we stand in recess until that time. Blank slg we are out of recess and we'll begin with our public 47 and continue right on through 55.

Good afternoon, mayor and council. My name is virginia collier from the planning and development review department. This is the second of two public hearings for the following nine full-purpose annexation areas, items 47 through 55. Council will not be taking action today at this hearing. Ordinance readings are tentatively scheduled for october 28 with an effective day of december 31. I brought copies of service plans for each of these annexation areas and left those up from with janette at the city clerk's table up front. In general upon annexation the city provides full municipal services to each other. 47 Is the boulder lane area, which includes approximately 18 acres located in travis county north of boulder lane at the intersection of body lane and foundation road. This area is currently in and is adjacent to the full purpose jurisdiction on the west, on the south, on the east and directly across boulder lane. We've talked with neighbors since the first public hearing last week and we'll be glad to meet with neighbors between now and the ordinance reading october 28 to answer any additional questions they may have and address any concerns they may have in that time period. Again, the city will provide full municipal services to the area described in the service plan and this concludes the staff presentation to item no. 47. Questi questi ons of staff? We have one person signed up to speak on this item. , Alice stool. And is again, and you have three minutes.

Thank you. I've come to represent the nine houses that are in this area, and it is an area that's been previously used for things that aren't quite in the city, like horses and -- so some of those homeowners are a little bit concerned about the use that they have of that land right now. It's between one and nine acres, each property owner has, so they would request that either staff or council members come out and visit the area, or come out and visit with some of those people to see how the land is being used. Thank you. thank you. Anyone else wishing to speak on item no. 47? With that, those are all of the speakers that we have. I'll entertain a motion to close the public hearing.

Mayor? council member shade? I'll make the motion to close the public hearing, but I did want to give some direction, if possible on this item. Is is this the appropriate time to do that? there's no action on this item. This is only -- before this comes back, I would like to instruct staff because -- this is a very odd case and I thought that the discussion we heard at the last meeting in the wee hours of the night was pretty compelling and since then my office had a chance to follow up with some of the residents and I've gotten a chance to see some of the questions that have been raised, and I'm not opposed to the annexation, but it does seem clear that the city could have done a better job in providing the residents of the subdivision with a better understanding of what's in front of them and the zoning process, the

implications for keeping the livestock and horses that were mentioned by Alice. And so prior to October 28 I would like for staff to sit down and review each and every one of these items that have been raised and just do a better job, because this is a very peculiar case.

Let me say, this is the -- the place to ask these questions, the purpose of the public hearing is to come down here and ask these questions. We have staff assembled, ready to answer these questions from all city departments, ranging from the fire department to watershed protection, solid waste, et cetera. So I would encourage you if you do have questions, those of you who are facing this possibility in the future, to take advantage. That's what these hearings are for. Council member Morrison. I appreciate the comments and the direction from council member Shade, and I wanted to add one other thing, and that is, I want to make sure that the neighbors have the opportunity to address questions to council or comments if not everything is resolved by the time it comes back. So if you-all could please make sure to let us know if there are still some issues to address. Motion and a second to close the public hearing. All in favor say aye.

Aye.

Mayor Leffingwell: aye. Opposed say no. Passes on a vote of 7-0. 48 is the Kruger area. This includes approximately 7 acres located in Travis County at the northeast corner of the intersection of Dessau Road and Parmer Lane. This area is in the city and full purpose northwest and south side. Development in this area is for commercial establishments and a vacant commercial lot with a site plan for -- the city provides full municipal services upon annexations. Copies of this are available and this concludes the presentation for item 48. Item 48 has no one signed up to speak. Is there anyone who wishes to speak and hasn't signed up on item 48? Seeing none I'll entertain a motion to close the public hearing.

So moved. Mayor pro tem moves to close the public hearing, seconded by council member Riley. All in favor say aye.

Aye.

Mayor Leffingwell: aye. Opposed say no? Passes on a vote of 7-0. 49 is the Oak Valley Road area. This includes approximately 18 acres located in Travis County east of Old Manchaca Road at the intersection of Old Manchaca Road and O'Fallon Road. It's currently in the city and adjacent to the full purpose jurisdiction on both the north and west side. Development of this area includes 7 single-family detached homes and the city will provide full municipal services to the area described in the service plan upon annexation. I'd be happy to answer any questions you have on item no. 49. Questions? No citizens signed up to speak on item 49. Is there anyone wishing to speak? Entertain a motion to close the public hearing. Council member Spelman moves to close the public hearing. I'll second. All in favor say aye.

Aye.

Mayor Leffingwell: aye. Opposed say no? Passes on a vote of 7-0. Item 50.

Item 50 is the Pearson at Avery Ranch area. Includes approximately 196 acres located in southern Williamson County south of Avery Ranch Boulevard at the intersection of Avery Ranch and the Pass. This area is in the city and adjacent to the full purpose jurisdiction on both the north and west side. The area is currently undeveloped and [inaudible] Pearson Place subdivision, includes multi-family lots in addition to single-family lots. Upon full-purpose annexation the city will provide full services to the area and I'll be happy to answer any questions I have. One person is signed up to speak on item 50. Jeff Howard. You have three minutes.

Thank you, Mayor, good evening. My name is Jeff Howard. I represent the owner of the property



proposed to be annexed in item 50. The property is pearson place as avery ranch and as I mentioned last week, the property is currently undeveloped, and the owner certainly recognizes the city's right to annex this property and has no problem with the city annexing the property as it develops. It's currently undeveloped. However, we do have one of our sections, a 43-acre section, our first section, has been platted and we are in the process of getting ready to start construction of that platted section, subdivision construction plans have been approved. We fully support you annexing that first section, and that would be consistent with your intercounty local agreement which calls for annexation as plats are approved. What we have asked, if you recall from last week, is that the remainder of the property not be annexed at this time. There's no planning or taxation or legal need to do so, and it would give us some flexibility to get the project funded and finished. And then we would support being annexed as plats are approved and go forward with that. And we would also ask, and we're willing to -- we would ask council to allow us to work through any process issues that the staff may have through an annexation agreement. And I know you're not taking any action today, but if possible, we'd like to be working on that this next month so that when it comes back on october 28 we can be ready to present that to council. I'll be happy to answer any questions you may have. council member cole? mayor, I have a brief question for staff. Greg, I guess that's - or -- can you describe or give us some indication of what the staff process would be for future annexations of the 43 acres? well, if we were to annex today, or later this year, that would be brought in. I think what jeff is suggesting is with a palestinian plan it covers larger tracts of land than just the 43 that they proposed, and normally what we've been doing is as we have a preliminary plan, we annex the entirety of that preliminary plan because now -- we identify the land use. As jeff said there's not a negative tax or actually land -- tax or land use issue because client rights are preserved by state law based on the preliminary plan, so regardless how we apply land use and zoning to that they would be protected by that. We would go forward with the annexation on the entirety just like we have done in many other cases, which jeff is asking that we take the 43 away and do nothing more than with that and as we see more pieces, staff would be compelled to do another notice, go through a process similar to this, and then bring that piece in, and i would presume, do something on the same with the last piece as well. Staff's recommendation is we do all the preliminary plan now, and especially in light that there's not a land use issue or tax issue with this property. and I understand this is not directly before us now, but I understood you to say there's no negative tax impact if we -- no, I think what jeff had indicated is that when it does come into the city, if the property owner wanted to change the preliminary plan between now and the time of platting, they would get to go through our zoning process, and there are adjacent property owners that are adjoining this property to the west that might have more to say in that process than if it was simply in the county, and that's what staff is suggesting, is that we bring that in. As I said, there's not a tax burden or a land use issue, but there might be a more engaged process with austin citizens if the permitting plan were to change before annexation. let me ask you one other question. Can you tell us about the joint agreement that we have with williamson county that would have any impact -- that joint agreement doesn't necessarily say we have to wait till final plat, but within a year of final platting that we would agree to bring that in. Jeff mentions that, that it's something that compels the city to act at some point in the future, but nothing stops us at this point to ask that it be brought in with the preliminary plan.

Cole: thank you. howard, when did you say this was coming back to us? Was it october 14?

Yes, council member, i believe it's coming back october 28. Is that correct, virginia?

Mayor? council member spelman. I have a question for either greg or virginia or staff, anyone who can answer it. We're talking -- the current proposal is 195 acres including part of which is platted and part of which is not platted. What is the benefit to the city for annexing the entire 195 acres and not only the 43 acres which have already been platted? well, as i mentioned, it's actually twofold, one from an administrative standpoint is that we do our advertising once, we conduct these public hearings once. For whatever reason if there's a land transaction might be dealing with different property owners in that respect, but we'd be bringing all those properties in at one time. So there's administrative ease both for you, for us and essentially that the owner doesn't have to come back, necessarily. The other is that there is a more engaged process when we start talking about zoning, although if a property comes in with an interim zoning designation, there's not a petition right, but certainly there is a right of coming

forward and engaging in a meeting before planning commission and city council with regards to the change -- or actually establishing the initial zoning, and that would be not only for the 43 acres that is being brought in of our new citizens, but those that also exist within the city boundaries along the western property line. I was under the impression that our approach to zoning newly annexed property is to fit it to the use of the recently annexed areas. Is that right?

We do to the extent that we're talking about single-family. If there are larger tracts of land they come in with an interim or r designation. Usually lots of one acre or larger. If they're already platted they come in with a 2 designation and that prefers the right of the property maintaining the use of the land. But there's a provision under state law under local 002, that prefers the right of the property owner, if they have a project that's under way prior to annexation, in this case they have a preliminary plan, that regardless of what category we place on the property as far as interim zoning designation, they have the right to go forward with the land use designated in the preliminary plan. In this case there's single-family and multi-family. So when I mentioned earlier they have the right to proceed, and that's not hurting them in a sense they can't go forward with multi-family. There is not a penalty for doing that under our codes by virtue of state law. However, if they went on to change, let's say, a portion from single-family to multi-family, yes, there is another step because there would be zoning that would be -- have to be agreed to before a new preliminary plan changed to a new intensive category, like multi-family or commercial would have to take place.

Spelman: okay. So as I understand it, for the 152 acres that have not yet been platted but for which there is a preliminary plan.

Guernsey: yes. that if there were no changes to that preliminary plan, then nothing -- there's no benefit to the city particularly, you just go ahead and do [inaudible] and the city would not be involved particularly. Zone it as it's platted. We would zone it to the use that it is planned to have.

Guernsey: that's correct. the benefit is if there were a change in the owner's designated usage for some of those lots, then the city would be involved -- it would have some say as to whether

[inaudible] zoning, regardless, would come before council if it comes into our -- if it comes into our city limits, but they don't necessarily have to follow the zoning as the interim designation when they come in -- zoning case, we would say yes or no.

Guernsey: that's right. I have a howard, if I could. Yes. it's my understanding that you're okay with platting these 42 acres but the rest you'd like to leave unannexed. Why is that?

Well, largely because of the time expense and potential uncertainty that goes with a potential having to do with zoning, and i have todd janson, who's with the owner who can tell you more about this if you're interested. But the long and short of it is that this property, which is adjacent to avery ranch, was supposed to be under way and being developed a year ago. However, the economy intervened, and it has been extremely difficult to put back sort of the financial picture to get this project up and running, and we're talking about then margins, we're talking about tight costs, we're talking about tight timelines, and anything that brings both uncertainty, in terms of time, cost, delay, jeopardizes it. The problem is in the future -- we're ready to go on section 1, but in the future we've got some pieces that we may want to adjust, and we're not talking about commercial zoning or industrial zoning or doing anything other than what's in the preliminary plan and maybe moving that around or -- wan way or the other. If, for example, we move our multi-family out of one section into another section, and vice versa, move some single-family in, that's entirely consistent with our preliminary plan in terms of general land use, but it would trigger a zoning change, and that zoning change would take time, it would take money, it would create uncertainty and that jeopardizes the project. The project is going to be, I think, a wonderful tax generator for the city and i certainly understand why the city would want to and should annex the property when it's developed, but the property needs to get under way first. It needs to get off the ground, so that's why we're asking for that. And we're willing to address guernsey's issues, both the administrative issues

because we can deal with process concerns. We can deal with, you know, the land use concern through an annexation, and we just want that opportunity.

Administrative concerns about providing notification?

Absolutely, we'd be happy to pay the notification. That was a concern that it was expensive and the city wouldn't be able to pay for it. We'd be looking to look at that. If the concern is the city doesn't want to do a bunch of annexations we understand and we'd limit the number of annexations. If the city is concerned about going through our property to other properties, we understand that as well.

Thanks, I have a question for greg, if I could. If we wanted to do -- if this council decided that jeff had a point and it made sense for us to annex the 43 acres that are platted but the 52 that are unplatted just yet, but we're willing to honor his offer to help us out with the administrative concerns, what would be the process be going forward?

Probably work with the law department in creating that agreement and bring that back to you all at the time that we would bring back this for consideration of annexation. on october 28 you would have the instruments available? we may ask for a delay depending on what the language is that's created because we want to make sure that it would be equitable to the city and to the property owner. The only concern that i have, if we did go forward, that we may be annexing properties where the person that we're annexing might not be in a similar situation, and so although this courtesy can certainly be offered by this property owner and may allow a development agreement to annex some pieces, we may annex at some point another preliminary plan, where i have someone who is in a fiscal position or be willing to do a similar arrangement, and so it raises complications of consistency and equity, i think, if we start treating one different than another. I understand the concerns about consistency. I'd also prefer to

[inaudible] to when we come to it.

[Inaudible] obviously the council will take a vote on the subject. I would be very pleased if you would have an opportunity to talk to the law department and develop whatever instruments are necessary, if I was to sever off those 43 acres. It makes sense to annex

[inaudible]

we understand that and all we can do is work with the law department to create something so you'll have choices when you come back. I've got a few questions. First of all, an important point that it's such a precedent, that we would be obligated to provide this same courtesy to other folks who wanted just part of their property annexed but not the other part. The second part was you raised the issue that without annexation the city has very little control over how this property is developed; is that correct?

Guernsey: that's correct. If a property owner wishes to change the use from the preliminary plan, council then would have the consideration of what the final land uses would be allowed under zoning. If they went along with the plan regardless of what action council would take, by state law they would have that right to continue. So if the property were to be sold or the property owner changes their mind, we do not control the land use of. so in the interim something could happen that we didn't particularly like, we couldn't control had we gone ahead with the annexation. that's correct, yes. and i don't know if this is the case on this property. I haven't looked at it, but when you annex, of course you're -- you extend your e.t.j. We may be hemmed in on this one. I don't know without checking, but certainly that is a consideration, that we lose the opportunity, perhaps, especially in this fast-growing northwest corridor -- we'd lose the opportunity to annex in the future, five years, ten years or whatever. So -- and my last question is, there's a timetable for annexation that's pretty strict, and I believe i understand that on most of the annexation cases if we had a delay, then we would lose the opportunity to meet the deadline for this year. and I'm going to let virginia actually answer that because she's -- the dates and times, I know

it's crucial to have the two public hearings and then come back, and I'll let her answer that.

Mayor leffingwell: okay.

I can tell you about the scheduling of annexations. This year we looked at the come council meeting schedule and found six windows where the timing requirements line up with when you-all are meeting. This is our last window for this year and that's why we try and bundle a bunch of these together. But initially starts with a notification to property owners. We send out notice 30 days in advance of the first public hearing. You're required to two public hearings and we schedule those at council meetings back-to-back, and between [inaudible] you have to conduct the ordinance approval and finalize the annexation within 90 days of the ordinance reading. So we scheduled these towards the end of the year so we can approve the ordinance in october and then the effective date will be in december. so bottom line is if we encounter a delay we'd lose the opportunity to annex any part of this for how long?

Well, we would probably recommend bringing it back next december -- that would be a year.

Right. even for the 43 acres that's already platted?

Mayor leffingwell: right.

Right. Right.

Mayor leffingwell: mr. Ho ho ward, did you want to comment on this?

If I may respond to those -- those I think are excellent points, mayor. On the precedent issue, i understand that, and -- but I think on the other -- on the flip side I would suggest maybe that anytime you have a chance to get with a landowner and come up with a consensual annexation that works out issues and that provides no harm to the city, I think that's a good precedent. Second issue on land use issues, as I stated earlier, we're willing to address those land use concerns, so there won't be a land use concern. We can do that in the annexation. , your won't be bumped out by this. We're completing surrounded so it won't have any effect on the e.t.j. On the fourth point which i believe was timing, we understand. If we can't work out an agreement so that you can get us annexed this year we don't expect you to delay till next year, so we expect you to annex us this year and we're prepared to work with your staff and with you to make sure that we can get that done this year. thank you. I'll just say from my perspective, I want to be fair and say in advance before we go to all this trouble, this is going to be very difficult for me to be receptive to dividing this property and annexing only part of it. Is there any further discussion? Let's see, do we have a motion? Council member spelman moves to close the public hearing, seconded by council member cole. Discussion? All in favor say aye.

Aye.

Mayor leffingwell: aye. Any opposed say no? That passes on a vote of 6-0 with the mayor pro tem off the dais. 51 is the ranch apartments area which includes approximately 10 acres located in williamson county east of parmer land approximately 1600 feet north of the intersection of state highway 45 and parmer lane. This area is currently in and includes the balance of a multi-family property that was annexed in 1985 prior to the construction of the apartments. This area is adjacent to the city's full purpose jurisdiction on the northwest and south side and annexation will help ensure emergency dispatch and increase efficiency in the delivery of public safety services to this apartment community. The city will provide full municipal services described in the service plan upon annexation and this concludes the staff presentation for item 51. there are no citizens signed up to speak on 51. Is there anyone who wishes to speak who's not signed up? Entertain a motion to close the public hearing.

So moved. council member cole moves to close the public hearing, seconded by council member

spelman. All in favor say aye.

Aye.

Mayor leffingwell: aye. Opposed say no? Passes on a vote of 7-0.

Item 52 is state highway 45 at parmer lane area which includes approximately 18 acres located in williamson county at the intersection of highway 45 and parmer lane. This includes the eastbound lanes of state highway 45 on either side of the intersection with parmer lane. Westbound lanes to the north of the area are in the city's full purpose jurisdiction and due to construction of additional lanes, portions of the right-of-way extend beyond the city limits to the e.t.j. So this would bring the balance of the lands into the city limits and increase efficiency in public safety services to the area. Once again, the city will provide full municipal services as described in the service plan and this concludes my comments on item no. 52. no citizens signed up to speak on 52. Anyone not signed up to speak, if you would like to address [inaudible]. Entertain a motion to close the public hearing on item 52. Council member morrison moves to close the public hearing, seconded by council member riley. All in favor say aye.

Aye.

Mayor leffingwell: aye. Opposed say no? Passes on a vote of 7-0. 53 is the springwoods outparcels area, includes two acres in williamson county, north of pond springs road and east of the intersection of pond springs road and spark lirchg creek drive. This in the city's e.t.j. And will become outparcels when the springwoods mud area is annexed later this year and full purpose jurisdiction surrounds the tract. Upon the annexation the city will provide services to the area as described in the service plan. Copies are available today and I'd be happy to answer any questions you have on item 53. item 53 has no citizens signed up to speak. Anyone else that would like to speak on 53? Entertain a motion to close the public hearing on item 53. Council member morrison moves to close the public hearing, mayor pro tem seconds. All in favor say aye.

Aye.

Mayor leffingwell: aye. Opposed say no. Passes on a vote of 6-0, council member spelman off the dais.

Item 54 is the waterford house area. This includes approximately nine acres located in travis county east of ih-35 approximately one quarter mile east of the intersection of i-35 and brandt road. and adjacent to the full purpose jurisdiction on the west, south and east sides. Development in this area includes a special events center and begun upon full-purpose annexation the city will provide full municipal services as described in the service plan. Copies are available today and this concludes the staff presentation for item 54. no citizens signed up to speak. Anyone else wishing to speak on item 54? Entertain a motion to close the public hearing.

[Laughter] motion by council member morrison, seconded by council member shade. All in favor say aye.

Aye.

Mayor leffingwell: aye. Opposed say no. Passes on sa vote of 6-0 with spell council member spelman off the dais.

Item 55, the bridges of bear creek phase 2 section 2, 28 acres located in southern travis county, west of intersection of fm 1626 and brodie lane. This area is currently in and adjacent to the full purpose jurisdiction on the north side. This area is currently undeveloped and includes a proposed 57 unit single-family residential subdivision and the adjacent section of brodie lane. In accordance with city code this

area will initially receive an fm 2 zoning on annexation and upon full-purpose annexation the city will provide municipal services as described in the service plan, copies of which are available today and I'd be happy to answer any questions you have on item 55. no citizens signed up to speak on item 55. Anyone else wishing to pe? Entertain a motion to close the public hearing. Mayor pro tem moves to close the public hearing, seconded by council member morrison. All in favor say aye.

Aye.

Mayor leffingwell: aye. Opposed say no? Passes on a vote of 6-0 with council member spelman off the dais.

And that brings us to item no. 56.

Good afternoon, mayor, mayor pro tem and council members. I'm paul lewis, the assistant manager with the office of telecommunications and regulatory affairs. Item 56 is to conduct a public hearing and consider the propriety and reasonableness of a proposal from the atmos energy corporation mid tex division to increase customer gas rates pursuant to a new agreement between the as moss energy and the as moss texas municipalities, of which austin is a member. This hearing is reqred by state law prior to council taking action on the proposed increase in rates for natural gas charged by atmos. Atmos serves approximately 6,000 customers within the city. In april 2010 atmos filed for a rate increase that would have generated an additional \$70 million in annual revenue. Atmos also requested a two-year extension of its rate review mechanism that was approved by council as a part of t settlement agreement. The rate review mechanism was intended to govern the process for reviewing changes in rates requested by atmos during the course of the agreement. The negotiations between the participating cities in atmos produced settlement terms that we recommend to council for approval today. Four months were spent analyzing the rate request for 2010. The proposed agreement reduces the original request from \$70 million to 27 million and extends the rate review mechanism by two years but with much more favorable modifications to the review process. A significant change in the products is the elimination of the rate of return true-up, which would have allowed atmos to make up any shortfall in achieving the stipulated rate of return of 6% for the most recent calendar year. For a typical residential bill the proposed increase 25 per month, a 3% increase over current rates. For commercial customers, the increase would be an -- 82 a month, or about 1.5%. The proposed rate increase will help pay for the replacement of 100,000 steel service lines that are in most need of repair, spread over a two-year period. The settlement also calls for atmos to file a general rate case before each of the cities and the railroad commission on or bef june 1, 2013. Their lacerate case was filed in 2007. This concludes staff presentation. Staff recommendation approval of the proposed settlement. Our outside council that the city retained to assist during the negotiations is here and available to address any questions you have. Questi questi ons of staff? We do have one citizen signed up to speak, and that is joe jackson, signed up against. Is joe jackson in the chamber? Joe jackson has three minutes.

Thank you, mr. mayor. I presented you and council a copy of what I have here and I thank you for the opportunity to speak to you. mayor, who better than you, the council member, new city manager, would have a better handle on tough economic times to reconcile for the city to include, in addition [inaudible] greater capital city area have to make the sacrifices to their budget also. Atmos headquarters in dallas is america's largest natural gas only distributor, 3 million gas customers and their bone of contention is they're not taking enough money or receiving enough money for [inaudible] with the rates currently in effect. This company makes billions in profits but the want the people who gave them billions to pay too. Atmos when they first moved to texas they were given a 6% rate increase by the railroad commission. Yes, I feel the council and the city manager staff has negotiated with atmos to get the best deal they can for us. However, I also believe this utility company is throwing out used stickers that are inflated so they can be sure to get what they want, if not more out of your pocket, my pocket and from the very least those who cannot afford it. Those of you elected to lead the city I believe are not prone to raise utility rates for the sake of raising rates. We paid our financial bills. We look for ways to get the most out of what we have and focus on family priorities. I also believe that families already struggling shouldn't have

to bear a greater utility burden. It is essential that we keep our utility rates competitive to continue to attract new businesses and jobs to the capital city area. Page 2, I invite your attention to a preliminary investigation I conducted on atmos in a multi-state area from colorado to kansas, from missouri to kentucky and kentucky back to texas, with the same old tired song, \$70 million rate increase. For what? They want us to pay for increased wages and salaries, medical benefits for their employees and to include covering the cost of \$18 million in bad debt. mayor, the cost of natural gas is decreasing, yet I got to wonder why atmos keeps requesting rate hikes. Why? I am recommending to this council and to the mayor to issue an austin ordinance of denial of rate increases for atmos energy, which is most appropriate at this time, and why atmos is seeking to significantly increase rates for residents and commercial customers by raising customer charges, which is excessive. I believe that each of you will agree with me when i say the wisest course of action both now and in the future is to [inaudible] utility rate increases on residential and commercial customers. Thank you for your attention. My name is george jackson and may I have your questions? Questi questi ons for mr. jackson?

Yes, sir. thank you. Those are all the folks we have signed up to spe. So, council, we're -- the floor is open for discussion or motion on item 56. Council member cole moves to close the public hearing and approve on all three readings item no. 56. Second by the mayor pro tem. Discussion? All in favor say aye.

Aye.

Mayor leffingwell: aye. Opposed say no. Passes on a vote of 6-0 with council member spelman off the dais. Item 57, and I believe we have an agreement. yes, mayor and 57 was an outdoor music venue appeal by the zilker neighborhood association and eleanor McKINNEY, AND AFTER AN Over three-hour mediation earlier in this week that was hosted by larry schooler, we were successful. There were nine conditions as part of this, and so they would partly modify the appeal that -- or the permit that we have. There is agreement we limit the decibels, that they would turn off any outdoor music, piped music or canned music during closing time. Sunday through thursday, as agreement, they would basically end their stage live music outdoor 00, and on friday and saturday. They would purchase and install sound mitigation equipment. The purchase and statement of a decibel meter at the property line so that they can make sure they're not exceeding the 70-decibel limit. The city of austin staff would actually test this equipment, but the owner would provide -- opa's would provide zilker neighborhood association a list of four names of individuals they could contact, that the contact of the neighbors and opa's, both sides would maintain a log and finally if opa's fails to respond in a timely manner by the neighborhood, that the neighborhood would not call the owner any longer, would call apd with a complaint. Pdr staff, egrso staff would really like to thank those who participated in the mediation. Opa is the neighborhood's eleanor, but we would like to give special commendation to larry schooler who kind of took this on and brought everybody together at the last moment and make it a win-win-win for everybody. Thank you very much. so I'm assuming you're saying the appeal is withdrawn?

Guernsey: that's correct. all right. The appeal on item 57 is withdrawn, so --

mayor? council member morrison.

No.

[Laughter] well, the item is withdrawn so --

right --

no, I just wanted to -- this is two in a row. We had one last week that didn't even get to council because of our music department and other staff members. This one did end up in appe but they met -- many of our aides met and staff with the neighborhoods two and a half hours in the morning to iron out the issues and I want to thank everybody who was involved for what turned out to be a much better

situation than what we were headed for. Thank you. council member morrison?

Morrison: thank you. Just to echo what mayor pro tem said, I want to especially highlight that there are situations where there is conflict to start and we're not seeing them on appeal that's getting resolved, and that's exactly what was intended, so it's really great to see things sort of working the way -- along the way so that folks can work things out together. city clerk, those are all the items I believe we have on our agenda, and so in that case, without objection, we are adjourned at 4:45:00 p.m.

### **Proclamations:**

I wanted to thank the mayor and council for this proclamation of this week. The goal of national save for retirement week are to make employees more aware of how critical it is to save for their financial future. To promote the benefits of getting started saving for their retirement today as well as to encourage employees to take full advantage of their employer sponsored plans by increasing their contributions. Now, while our pension plans, I'm talking about the police, fire and the municipal employee pension plans, are among the best city -- plans in city government across our nation, deferred comp is a benefit that allows employees to enhance the quality of life for their retirement years on a deferred tax basis. You can save in a disciplined matter, you can save as little as \$10 per pay period. And I wanted to share a few stats about our plan. We have 6500 contributing employees that participate in the plan across the -- all kinds of employees from police, fire, as well as municipal employees, and we have 10,500 participants, those that may or may not be actively putting money in the plan. There's over \$225 million in the plan and it's all been put in by city employees and the growth of their investments. Average contribution for participants, about \$250 a month, and we've got over 24 investment options. Before I conclude my remarks I wanted to thank great west for its exemplary service over the past several years. They are the principal reason why our deferred comp plan has been so successful. In a few days ing will take over as our plan administrator. We look forward to outstanding service and continued plan growth with that organization and I want to urge employees to take advantage of the communications efforts with ing over the next few weeks and information tables during this next few weeks. In doing so you're making sure that you're saving for your retirement. I wanted to emphasize that it's not only good for you, it's good for our country to have a savings base, and I'm looking forward to over the next few months new plan that the president signed this week offering a ross option to our deferred benefit plan. Thank you, council.

Morrison: Next, mike trimble, you're going to join us and others. I'm going to introduce mike trimble and let you introduce the other folks because I don't know your name. Edie and max, that's what i just learned. We're here to celebrate and kickoff the city of austin combined charities campaign which I think was kicked off earlier today. Is that right, by the mayor and the city manager? Which is an opportunity for all the folks that work for stint to contribute to charities and I think if you watched any of the city council meeting this morning, you saw that we were looking at the need for housing the homeless and the social service contracts, how we have a huge demand for services in our community, so I think this year more than ever this is such an important campaign, so I appreciate all your work on it. And so I'm here to read a proclamation. It says be it known that whereas charities provide a vehicle through which contributors, volunteers and community agencies can work together to support a comprehensive array of health, education, environmental, social justice and service programs for the central texas community as well as our broader statewide and international communities, and whereas the city of austin combined charities campaign has raised more than \$9,760,000 for charities since 1993 and whereas the success of the annual combined charities campaign is evidence that the city of austin employees care about our community and the world in which they live. Now therefore i, lee leffingwell, mayor of the city of austin, texas do here by proclaim october 2010 as the city of austin combined charities campaign in austin.

[ Applause ]

thank you, councilmember. I'm honored to serve as chair of this year's combined charities campaign for



the city of austin and I'm joined with our campaign managers, max and edie with earth share. And on behalf of them and our whole campaign leadership team, karen sharp, sarah hensley, deanna brown, our citywide coordinator, we're very proud to receive this proclamation and very excited about this year's campaign. We have a lot of great things going on this year. We're very excited about having an online donation tool which will make it easier for our employees to pledge through their payroll deductions and also support our values of sustainability, environmental responsibility. And as councilmember morrison mentioned, the need has never been greater. And this is a great way for our city employees to connect with those causes that they care about so much. And so we're looking forward to a great event. It's going to be -- the kickoff eventually is tomorrow morning, starts at 10:30. And yes, we will be joined by the mayor and the city manager tomorrow. And we'll have live music and food and we'll have a lot of fun tomorrow. Then exaint itself will run from october 1st through OCTOBER 31st. And again, we're looking forward to a lot of good participation from our city of austin employees and thank you so much, councilmembers, to all the council and the mayor for your great support of city of austin employees throughout. Thank you very much.

[ Applause ]

Morrison: And we have max woodson and edie mullburger. Thank you, guys. And I do want to mention that nancy williams will not let anyone on the council floor get away with not participating. Participating in the combined charities.

[Inaudible - no mic].

It's against the rules. Sorry, she won't be doing that. But I know everybody will be participating. Okay. Great. I'm joined here by annie crawford to celebrate binational health week. It is to improve health and well-being of the underserved latino population living in the united states and canada. It encompasses an annual week long series of health promotion and health education activities that include workshops, insurance referrals, vaccinations and medical screenings. So it's really terrific to have you here with us. And with that I wanted to read a proclamation to celebrate this effort. It says be it known that whereas binational health week reflects coordinated , mexico, el salvado guatemala, ek ca dor and peru to improve the quality of life of underserved latino populations by expanding their access to health care and whereas our country is home to more than 5 million people of latino origin, many of whom are mobile populations requiring multiple approaches in service design, delivery, funding priorities and a strong binational commitment. And whereas outreach efforts during binational health week and rear yownd focus on uninsured and underinsured latino populations to raise awareness about preventive health and available health services, now therefore i, lee leffingwell, mayor of the city of austin, texas do here by proclaim october fourth through 15th 2010 as the 10th annual binational health week in austin. Thank you so much.

[ Applause ]

thank you so much. I am annie crawford, director of the [speaking spanish] and onehalnd e mexican consulate here in austin, I would like to thank the city of austin for your support of binational health week. As the councilmember said, the binational health week is one of the nation's largest mobilization movements to promote the health and well-being of underserved latino community, many of whom don't have health insurance or lack even basic preventive health care. So our goal with this austin's fifth year of participating in the bihealth week, is to educate people about what services are available to them and connect them to health. So this year span has coordinated more than 25 community health agencies to create a week long series of free health events targeting the latino community. So there will be educational health sessions, exercise classes, workshops and everything is free. Our kickoff event is tomorrow at the mexican consulate, so you are all invited to come. 00 to noon and mike martinez will be joining us as well. And there will be all variety of free health screenings such as hiv, vision testing, things that are basic needs that a lot peesm don't have access to. So we thank you and we thank the

city for the support of our community health efforts. [ Applause ]

The consulate has a new location at 410 burial street, one -- baylor street, one block west of the corner of lamar. Come by tomorrow to the health fair. It will be a blast.

Morrison: Thank you. Now jean, we're ready. Welcome to jean warnecke. We're here to celebrate german-texas heritage month. And I've been learning a little bit about german-tans recently. -- German texans recently. I think we all know about fredricksburg and that great settlement there, but in fact german settler were in texas before texas was part of the united states of may america and one of the largest immigrations ever, germans moved to texas from 1835 to 1910. Skilled germans contributed to many early austin buildings. The old general land office, sholz's garden, many of the buildings around the capital and many of the businesses along sixth and congress that are still standing. Germans built the first public school in austin predating any organized school district. It's now the german-texan heritage society state headquarters, which is a texas registered historic landmark. German was a very common second language in austin until the 1940's, much more so than spanish at that time. And german-texan heritage society was recently named, and this is really fabulous, preserve america's stewards, a national recognition for volunteer groups who care for historic buildings or sites. It is the first preserve america stewards award in texas. Congratulations on that. But the most important information is that you need to mark your calendars for october -- the octoberfest celebration on october 16th. And jean will give us more information about that. So before that, I do want to read a proclamation. It says be it known that whereas drawn to central texas by reports of its fertile soil, mild climate and abundant fish and game, german settlers began arriving in our area in the 1830's. And whereas german settlers in austin helped build many noteworthy sites in town, including the capital complex, downtown buildings, sholz's garden and the sandegrunde hall. Whereas the german texan heritage society provides texan cultural heritage through many celebrations through the month of october, now therefore i, lee leffingwell, mayor of the city of austin, texas do here by encourage citizens to enjoy octoberfest and do here by proclaim october 2010 as german-texan heritage month in austin. Congratulations.

[ Applause ]

thank you, councilmember morrison. Or I should say danke schoen. I want to thank you the city for honoring us and reminding everyone from some of the things that we heard today obviously the german school here in austin predated huston-tillotson college. We also as you mentioned german was a much more common language here than spanish was, not that many years ago. And I do invite you all to come visit us at the german preschool at 507 east 10th street. It's the best kept secret in austin and we're making sure to make sure that that's no longer true. The reason you can't find it is when the settlers decided to build the school they built it on a bluff because they wanted to protect the school children from indians in the street. So we still sit up on that beautiful bluff covered by live oak trees and we overlook the corner of 10th and red river, including bars like the mohawk and club deville. Not quite as quiet as it was back then. On october 16th we will be celebrating octoberfest as well as we'll be celebrating our receiving the award, the preserve america stewardship award. At our meetings and our celebrations we're germans, so we eat a lot of sausages, we eat a lot of beer and striewdle. We will have music by the walbur boys. We will have dancers from both local high school and university, german language students. And there is a tradition in munich where octoberfest started and I think it's time to start the same tradition here. October 5th does not begin until merit says it begins. So I would like to invite mayor leffingwell and if he's not available I would love for you to come out and do it and what do you is you tap the first keg and then the beer can flow. It's an extremely important job and I think it's time to start that here. And you only have to say one thing, I'll pronounce it for you, it's in german. It's in a very bavarian dialect of german, which is -- (speaking german) which means it is tapped.

[ Laughter ]

Morrison: Great. I'm going to have to practice that a little more.

[ Applause ]

now we have one more and we're going to welcome christie casey. Is mary moore here? Okay. That's fine. I've been looking forward to this all day long because this is the proclamation i dressed for today.

We started early and now we're ending our day together.

Morrison: We started our day at the police department headquarters, which was very exciting. And we're here to celebrate breast cancer awareness month kicking off and the komen race for the cure and all that. And that's -- it's a special month for me. I have -- it's a month where I can especially honor my sister who died from breast cancer in 1996 when she was 46. That seems like a long time ago now. I'm a co-survivor also with my mother having had breast cancer in her 30's, my best friend of 30 years is a recent survivor of breast cancer and she and I will be doing the komen race for the cure together. But most of all what I've been thinking about this year is that with the great work of komen and all the other folks that are so dedicated to find agriculture cure. I am hoping that my 10-old-month granddaughter will only know about breast cancer by reading about it in the history books. So with that I want to thank you for being here and read a proclamation. It says be it known that whereas in austin's five county region more than 900 women will be diagnosed this year with breast cancer, although the disease does not discriminate, it affects men and women of all ethnicities. And whereas 75% of funds raised at the komen austin race for the cure goes to 12 local breast health organizations providing screening, diagnosis and treatment services for uninsured and underinsured men and women. The other 25% support the komen grants funding research for the cure. And whereas we encourage austinites to register for the race for the cure to support someone else who is participating or to text the word impact to 500555 to donate \$10 to komen austin. Now therefore i, lee leffingwell, mayor of the city of austin, texas do here by proclaim november 7, 2010 as the 11th susan g. Komen race for the cure in austin.

[ Applause ]

just a quick thank you to the mayor and to the council for recognizing the race for the cure. Our race is every sunday -- every first sunday of november. We couldn't do it every sunday. No way. The first sunday of every november. This year it will be back at the domain. So we welcome everybody to come and to register and to represent raise funds to serve the five counties that we do serve. So thank you again. And what a great day to start my day and now end it with you. Thank you.

Morrison: Exactly.

[ Applause ]