

City Council Special Called Budget Work Session Meeting

Transcript – 9/9/2016

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 9/9/2016 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 9/9/2016

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[1:12:33 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Council, we about ready to gavel this in? So today is September -- what day is today? >> 9th. >> Mayor Adler: Today is September 9th, 2016, and we are at the boards and commissions room in city hall. It is 1:12. We're going to be meeting today until 230, and then we're going to stop. And then we'll pick back up next week. Colleagues, I want to point out to you that our meetings next week, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, begin at 9:30, not at 10:00. They were set at 9:30. I want to make sure everybody knows that. 9:30. And recall that we have people that needed to leave at 5:00 or 6:00. We also have a planning commission and another meeting, although we can make that call that night and then we have some people on Tuesday that also have a hard stop at the end of the day. So let's see how far we can get from here to there. Yesterday as you will recall, just as a way for us to organize conversation, I laid out something that was intended to put into relief the kinds of choices that we need to make. I thought they were real good conversations we had yesterday. I've now handed out something different, which is kind of a different way of getting to a number, and I want to just go through this real quickly and then I have a question phialine at the end of it. On the revenue side the

[1:14:35 PM]

first column is what was in what you saw yesterday. The second column is an alternate way of looking at the world. And the third shows the delta between the two and the changes made have been highlighted in yellow. So asset forfeiture, it has \$500 million there, \$500,000 -- I wish it was 500 million. \$500,000 there. So the asset forfeiture question I think there were a lot of people meeting with lawyers and with folks that generally seems to be that the parameters associated with the forfeiture funds that are the laws are pretty strict. That knows are to be spent at the sole discretion of the chief. And he looks at budgets and what are included and not included and can include things that were not included in the budget as opposed to supplanting something that was already in the budget. In conversations -- and in conversations with the chief it's my understanding that his intent to put \$500,000 was asset forfeiture funds towards the rape kit backlog. As a line item in our budget, because we can't line item out the forfeiture monies, just by us being able to keep track of things here, that puts 500 in that column as an asset. The next monies, relocation community, the economic incentives all stay the

[1:16:36 PM]

same. The body camera elements, I think there were still many of us who wanted to do body cameras in support of law enforcement. In the conversations we have had it looks as if we were to cut the body cameras not only would we not get the body cameras, but we would also forfeit the grant monies, about two and a quarter million dollars in grant monies associated with our acquisition over time of the body cameras. So we have put that money back in, on this chart that you have in front of you. The next number that changed was on the E.M.S. 42 work week transition. Two things. The first is on the first column this number does not tie to what we had yesterday because we took the \$3.4 million that was the -- that was the cost this year for the E.M.S. Work -- 42 hour work week, but if you split that between two hours and do half of it this year and half next year, then it's not a million seven savings this year, it's only a million four savings, 1,482,000. The next chart what if we did two-thirds of the phase in this year, leaving only one-third to do next year, which is more money directed toward that than what was on the sheet that got passed out yesterday. Our current estimate of that number is what is shown in the proposed column. That would enable us to basically do a little over two million of the 3.4 currently in the budget. 2.4 roughly would be spent

[1:18:38 PM]

on the E.M.S. Acquisition, so two-thirds of the 3.4. I'm not exactly sure how those numbers work out because it got odd when we cut them in half. We asked staff to tell us that before now. We assumed that the savings we could get there would only be the 988,000 as opposed to the 1.7 million we had yesterday or the 1.480 that we had yesterday. >> Casar: And just to clarify it would be two-thirds of this request, but it would be the implementation over the course of two years because we had 50% last year and what you presented yesterday would get us to 75% of the full implementation so two-thirds of this request is essentially 5-sixths of the way to the 42 hour work week. >> Mayor Adler: I think the math here got us up to two-thirds. It got us up to 4-6ths, not 5-6ths. I think it's two-thirds. >> Casar: The 1.8 that you laid out yesterday is half of the half because we did half of it last year. >> Mayor Adler: I think the only difference is we actually did half of it last year. >> Casar: So that would be the -- the leftover. >> Mayor Adler: If we did half of it last year then it would be 5-sixth. >> Pool: I think the point I'm responding to is it makes it sounds like it's diamin must and I disagree. I think that's an important piece that we need to push on and continue with. >> Mayor Adler: I think it should -- a lot of cuts are also going to be real important. And this is the kind of thing we need to talk through as a council.

[1:20:39 PM]

For the point of this exercise what we have done is basically gone in between funding it all this year and funding half of the remaining work, which was on what I had had yesterday. So rather than saving 1.7 million that we had yesterday this saves \$988,000. The next thing that changes is the building maintenance. It has it increasing 20% as on -- reducing it by 20% as opposed to reducing it by 10%. And then the senior exemption, which did not have any additional senior exemption beyond the senior exemption that we currently have, this has us coming forward with some additional senior exemption as opposed to just maintaining the 80,000 at 80,000. So it would raise the 80,000 exemption to something. >> Kitchen: So let me ask a question. So this still reduces it from what it is in the current city manager's proposed budget. >> Mayor Adler: That's correct. That's why it's showing up as a revenue source. >> Kitchen: Okay. And just -- we can talk about this later, but it's still reducing what the seniors get right now. We can talk about how we want to characterize it, but what was proposed in the city manager's budget is halfway towards keeping them hole. This reduces. So it's still a reduction. >> Mayor Adler: It's

not a reduction of the exemption. It's a reduction in the actual tax impact as seen by seniors. >> Kitchen: Another way to say it is they're going to pay Moore and still going to pay more. >> Mayor Adler: And just like councilmember pool wanted to -- let me run through the cuts first and then everybody can defend them -- >> Kitchen: I'm trying to understand the amount. I'm sorry, you're right.

[1:22:39 PM]

I'll stop arguing on it, but I don't understand -- >> Mayor Adler: Rather than taking an 800,000-dollar reduction benefit here this proposes only taking a 600,000-dollar reduction. >> Kitchen: When we get to the end I'm going to suggest that we headache take this back to where it is in the city manager's budget and we can talk about the change in the gap. >> Mayor Adler: I would imagine before we're done with this everyone will want to put everything back that I'm taking out of here. At some point certainly by the middle of next week we will have to figure out a different strategy for getting here to there. But for the purpose of this exercise I have reduce the the revenue to be gained by changing the senior exemption from \$800,000 down to \$600,000, which was a loss of \$200,000 in additional revenue as compared to what I had passed out yesterday. Those are the revenue numbers. There's a gap number here, but before I talk about that let's turn to the back page. These are some of the expenses that we had yesterday. These are things that we wanted to put money against. I have reduced -- on this page -- some of the things we have put money against. The housing trust fund, based on the formulas that we've adopted by ordinance, that enables us to have \$963.8000. This reduces it by. -- To only putting in an additional \$500,000. >> Tovo: So mayor, I'm sorry, I'm trying to follow, but now it's broken down for me. So yesterday's sheet, which drew from the concept menu, had an additional .96 to get us to the full resolution

[1:24:44 PM]

housing trust fund. And the .5 -- >> Mayor Adler: This has us spending only an additional 500,000, which goes with the \$500,000 that was already in the budget, the proposed budget. So this has us spending an additional 500,000 in the proposed budget as opposed to spending 963,000 in the budget. >> Tovo: So your column of difference is really the difference between yesterday and today. >> Mayor Adler: That's all it is. So workforce training. >> Tovo: I hope we'll find another solution here. [Inaudible]. >> Mayor Adler: That's okay. I'm sure there will be a constituency for every one of these things. Also for workforce development and in support of the regional workforce plan, capital I.D.E.A. Was in the budget yesterday, spending \$600,000 in addition to what was already in the budget. This has it along with everything else taking a reduction, and it goes down to \$300,000. So that's a change of \$300,000 on that line item. The next item was the eastern crescent quality of life money, spirit of east Austin money. It was \$3 million of spending. I've reduced that to \$1.5 million in spending, so that's cut in half from where it was yesterday. From three to one and a half. >> Houston: So when you get through I'd like to find out how you cut that in half. >> Mayor Adler: Why did I cut it in half? >> Houston: How. >> Mayor Adler: We need to talk about when we have a block fund like this how do we spend the block fund and I think that's a really important question for us to have. This has the total amount of money that would be going in that direction. The HHS block grant -- and we talked yesterday about how a lot of the items up above this are health and human services items that stay in the budget, but I

[1:26:44 PM]

took that block grant down by half as well. It goes from a million to \$500,000. Kept in the backlog and the forensic lab, but the next change that you'll see is down in the park master plan. It has it going from

\$300,000 down to \$250,000. Which leaves a 50,000-dollar gap in getting the park master plan done. We'll have to go back to daa and the foundation and say they need to raise more money so that we would be able to get that done. But that makes that expense down to 250. The music arts is a wash from the monies that were in the music fund. The onion creek buyouts is a wash. That's the money that was in the watershed budget. Those are all the changes. All these changes if they were added to the budget, as expenses to what was in the proposed budget /add/(ed)a \$10.3935 million in additional spending. If you turn back to the other page where we talk about revenue, with all the cuts in revenue I made on the first page we are shy \$1.6 million. So even with all the cuts that we didn't want to make on that page we're still \$1.6 million shy of where we need to be. Now we've talked about several different ways potentially to talk about the six million dollars over the -- \$1.6 million over the course of our conversations. One was to look at all of the ftes that the city has that has been vacant for the last four months and to say to staff keep them vacant

[1:28:44 PM]

for another six months. That universal vacancies that have already been open for four months, keep those open for another six-month period of time. That would net, if we did that across the board, \$1.5 million. We have since gone to staff -- and those are non-emergency -- non-public safety -- non-sworn positions. And then we went back to staff and we said are any of those things that we shouldn't do that to because it creates an exigent or an emergency situation? They checked with staff and staff came back with an explanation why every one of those positions should not be delayed. Within we have that list if everyone wants to see the positions as well as the explanation that they shouldn't be cut or delayed, rather. That's one option that we would have. We would just say we're going to do that. I think that Delia laid out another option yesterday of another potential place to be able to get there. Which was to look at the fte positions that we have that are partial year fte positions to take some percentage of those positions and say we're not going to fund those partial positions this year. And then we can take a look at them over the first half year as part of our November to April review and decide what stays in or doesn't stay in. And the range for those numbers -- what were the range for those numbers? Councilmember Garza, do you know about what the range was? >> Garza: Apparently we didn't have all the right information yesterday, but here is the most recent, the answer to the budget question was apparently all

[1:30:46 PM]

new ftes, even ftes that are funded for the entire year. So we kind of did our own numbers here and budget folks I'm sure can verify. I'm sorry, what was the question? >> Mayor Adler: So -- >> Garza: The savings would be about 3.4 million but that would be have to be a one-time cost. And it wasn't not funding in partial year. It was scaling it down. So, for example, the '17-'18 would be the 7.5 million, which would mean the ones for this budget would have to be scaled down from 7.5 million, which is a difference of about 54 fte positions. >> Mayor Adler: So that's a different option in it. Now, when I was talking to -- I'm sorry, Pio? >> Renteria: Where are these positions coming on? >> Mayor Adler: We don't know. There's no specific department associated with those. >> Garza: They're from all. >> Mayor Adler: They would be all over the city. >> Renteria: I would like to see that list of who is going object all over the city. >> Garza: We have a list. >> Mayor Adler: So I took that initial idea, that particular question as well as the question that council asked before, which is to say if our priority were to fund the things that show up on the expense side of this and it meant that we had to find an additional 1.6 million, I went to Elaine and to Ed, I said would you want this council to prescribe is where that money is found? Would you want the council to come in, going back to the question you had yesterday, do we want to say go

execute what Delia has just handed out or go execute something similar to what I had asked on the budget question, or would you rather us just go to you and say this council really wants to spend an additional

[1:32:48 PM]

1.6 million as so shown on the expense page here and please find that? And the answer that I got from Elaine, and you can elaborate, Elaine, was that your preference would be that we just gave you the number so that you have the flexibility and then she would work this weekend with department heads to figure out how that -- how that would best happen. So on this chart and I'll call on you after I complete the chart. What I have is a 1.6 gap on this that's not defined, and we could go to staff and say find this. So now other people's suggestions or thoughts? Delia? >> Garza: The 1.6 is if we funded them by the column a amounts? >> Mayor Adler: No, that's column B. If we make all the changes that I went through when I said add this, take this off, add this, take this off, we need \$1.6 million more. >> Garza: So do you want us to comment on what you just changed? >> Mayor Adler: I think other people have different ideas to be able to attack the problem. It doesn't have to be just a comment on this. It we're all trying to figure out how to get this big boat into port. So -- >> Garza: I guess generally speaking I have questions about stuff that has been vetted through ifcs and other processes. I know it's really hard to fund every program that we're getting requests from, but I don't think it's right to lump -- even though this would increase health and human services funding, that additional 500,000 is simply

[1:34:50 PM]

paying for contracts that are already in place right now. So this reduction to 500,000 is no additional funding, basically means for additional funding to contracts or adding capacity. I feel like I'm at a place now where I'm not going to support anything that either wasn't supported through an ifc or had some kind of history of being a good program like the parent support specialist and the prime time -- because there's stuff in here that is funded that has not in my opinion been vetted and we keep talking about equity issues we have and then we're making more cuts to health and human services and our quality of life initiatives. And I understand we need a better way to budget, but it seems like we're going in the wrong direction. We are cutting equity things, cutting health and human services, cutting quality of life fifth street and we are adding to our -- initiatives and we are adding to our public safety. And that is not the direction that we should be going in. >> Tovo: I had a question for the councilmember. Councilmember Garza, if you feel comfortable naming some of the items that you feel were not vetted, that would be helpful for me to know. Again, I don't want to put you on the the spot. I just want to get a sense of -- if you're ready. >> Garza: I'm specifically -- health and human services was -- is three resolutions that we should be investing 6.8 million. I could not support any cut, and I'll speak to the ones that the housing trust fund had an ifc, healthy food retail was an ifc. Health care continue. I almost feel like every single item I sponsored and was a resolution is not fully -- except for one. There's maybe one or two that are fully funded. A lot of these that were resolutions that we've

[1:36:51 PM]

worked on are not fully funded and in fact are even decreases. >> Tovo: Okay. I guess I'm having a harder time recognizing the ones that were not. But that's okay. I appreciate you offering your general perspective and then I'll take a look at the list. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Kitchen. >> Kitchen: Okay. Whenever we get to the right process I'm comfortable with asking the staff to come back and make some suggestions to us. I'm going to proposal that we make some changes so it's not the 1.6. So we'll get to

that when you're ready. I just wanted to bring to people's attention, you know, you had mentioned some additional dollars that councilmember Garza had identified. I also identified some additional dollars out of the public safety budget. So I fleshed that out a little bit more on what we talked about yesterday and passed it out to everyone. So I want to briefly say, and this is an additional \$914,000. And I think what I'd like to propose is that we do acknowledge the importance of moving forward with additional sworn positions. And that we do that by going ahead and authorizing the additional 12 southern positions, but it's not necessarily to fund them this year for a couple of reasons. One reason that I didn't speak to it yesterday was the fact that the A.P.D. Already has unfilled positions that we've been authorizing for the last number of years, quite a few unfilled. So I think it's important for them to fill those first, and then we can authorize additional 12 but I don't think we need to authorize the funding for it this year. The other thing that I think is really, really important is -- it's important to move forward with the community

[1:38:54 PM]

policing recommendation, but there is some other things that need to happen also before we start filling new positions and I spoke to those briefly yesterday. Those relate to recommendations around the infrastructure that's necessary to support community policing and that has to do with measuring metrics as well as other kinds of administrative kinds of things. So I think that needs to happen too. As well as we've already identified that getting the lab situation in the best possible way to move forward is absolutely critical. The backlog on the rape kits as well as we're really moving forward with an A.P.D. Forensic lab or whether it makes sense to look at the types of notifications that they -- innovations that they use in Houston, for example. I want to make the statement that I do support the community policing recommendations and I do recognize and support increased sworn positions, but we're not even ready to spend that money this year. So I think that we should acknowledge that we can authorize it. At this point we don't put that funding in the the budget right now. You just identified earlier where the A.P.D. Has -- let's see. Over a million in their asset forfeiture funds that they can use for additional things that they need to fund. If they do get so far down the road this year to where they have put into place these community policing recommendations and the filled, unfilled positions and they're ready to fill the 12 and they don't have the dollars, they can come back to us and we can consider it. But that's a lot of things that have to happen before it even time to fill those 12. So given the environment that we're in right now, given the kinds of pressures that we're looking at, given the other public safety needs that we work with, the

[1:40:56 PM]

health and human services, when I'm having to weigh putting dollars in for positions that we aren't even going to fill versus cutting 500,000 how far existing health and human services budget I don't think we need to do that. I think we can support our police department and support moving forward with these recommendations without putting that money aside at the moment. So I just wanted to say that I hope people will consider that because I think it helps us with this 1.6. >> Tovo: I want to talk about two different issues today if we have time. One is a proposal I'd like to bring forward regarding lighting in our parks, and I wanted to talk a a concept that was on the concept menu that was not on this short list that has no physical impact and that's to move the sobriety center into the public safety budget. I want to be sure we talk about both those things. But I wanted to suggest that we do still have I think some options ahead of us, in front of us for making additional cuts. Some of them are on the concept menu. I have proposed and asked a series of questions about some of the development services position. I think it is an area where clearly we're seeing a lot of expansion. Some of those positions are covered by

anticipated fees. Some are not. And I think if we're looking at belt tightening and really what represent, I agree with councilmember Garza and kitchen, what represents health and human services I think we should look carefully at things like that. I'm willing to look at things like the 70, -- 70,000, \$75,000 that we currently give to the Austin technology council. As we've had a discussion in here I think they do good work, however they are branching out in their focus. I've seen an increasing number of communications

[1:42:58 PM]

about their advocacy efforts in an attempt to kind of communicate with us on policy matters in the wake of the ride hailing and other conversations that we've had over the last year. I think that is a good direction for them to go if that's where their membership directs, but it makes me uncomfortable to continue to provide funding, especially given the funding needs we have. We do have concepts still on the concept menu that related to cuts that we haven't really had an opportunity to address item by item. And I have a couple others I would point to in the Q and a that I submitted 255 asks. We have \$6.5 million in the city manager's budget for funding and software to improve business processes and I've asked what soft savings in the current budget could be approved through deferring or phasing the implementation of these projects. We do have -- I really appreciate the kind of summary things we have in front of us, but it doesn't capture every option we have in front of us. Within dough have to options on the concept list as well as answers that may arise through the Q and a process. We definitely have hard choices ahead and I'm prepared to make some of those and it may mean that some good programs aren't maybe going to get some funding this year, some good departments aren't necessarily going to get the staff they've asked for, but it will just come down to what we prioritize and my priorities are going to be in the area of health and human services and some of the other critical needs related to those on our sheet. >> The cuts in development services, was that the budget question 255? >> Tovo: I'm sorry, mayor. I was trying to fly through about nine subjects in three minutes. 255 is technology. >> Mayor Adler: Was there a budget question that went to the development services? >> Tovo: Yes, there are

[1:44:59 PM]

several. And actually, I probably need to ask some follow-up questions that we haven't had an opportunity to do. And those questions are 207 through 210. And they relate to -- some of them I think we've resolved, 207, for example, the cost of adding 18 positions for expedited permit review. We've had some back and forth and gotten enough information that it does appear that those are going to be fully funded and by the anticipated fees. And that they'll be phased in. Let me say I still have a question about that. If most of the people through the door start going to expedited permit review, for example, what happens to the staffers who are handling regular permit review. Then we're paying for expedited permit reviewers and possibly we have regular plan reviewers who now have less work. So '18 seems like a big jump. I know they will do it in two teams. I guess what I'm saying is some of their responses may take some follow-up, but I do think particularly with 209 there may be some cost savings. We've heard some suggestions from outside groups that the third-party plan review may be an area to look carefully at. That's a 450,000-dollar expense. The answer to 211 about the community forest division I think points wait to some potential savings there. And there may be others. One of my goals is to go through all the budget questions again this weekend and to see the responses to any of y'all's questions, point the way to some savings as well. >> Mayor Adler: It would appear as we start teeing up for Monday and I don't know if we want to get into those kinds of things now, but we probably need a more

in-depth conversation with development services folks, probably the -- if we were going to make kind of a side list of where we needed to actually get more information, that business cost issue, the public

[1:47:00 PM]

safety police issue. >> Tovo: And I mentioned technology. I think that was the first 255. If we delay or defer a small portion of those upgrades, that would certainly represent a pretty good savings. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Greg? >> Pool: Mayor, can I add a piece to what you're writing there? On the permit review I would also like a breakdown of how many staff are on commercial versus residential along with how many staff would be doing expedited versus regular. We have a number of different types of permits. And I know the expedited is primarily for commercial, but I'm afraid that may be drawing from the staff that we have for residential permits and that's making it difficult for the smaller projects that homeowners may be needing to do to get permitted. >> Garza: So I wanted to sort of take a broader view or zoom out on what it is that you've proposed here and want to make it clear that essentially my view of what it is that we've got before us is that yesterday we were talking about decent size increases to a lot of programs that I think the council approves of and holding on to essential programs, but with the new information that I've gotten about, forfeiture funds that I recommend anybody and everybody to learn more about those and there's still more to learn. With that new information along with the information that we could put in jeopardy about 1.5 million in state and federal grants on body cameras if we don't put the right amount of money in. With that new information we didn't have, plus the concerns from the council about having some increase in the senior exemption percentage or dollar figure that we currently have, and trying to have as much of a commitment to the 42 hour work week. All those things combined

[1:49:00 PM]

makes it really difficult to increase things, but you know, I appreciate the expenses that are listed out here because there are largely keeping things going that the council has approved of, keeping the host team going, keeping the programs at aid going, keeping the food programs going. And then with sort of what's left over trying to expand our workforce training and our health and human services and investment in the eastern crescent with the dollars that we sort of have left over. And that's kind of in sum where it seems like we're at, but if we want to get back to some of the things we were at yesterday we have to figure out where some of the additional money may be. And I appreciate both councilmember kitchen and the mayor pro tem bringing those ideas up, but I wish we could have passed basically in the budget what we had yesterday, but with more and new information it looks like it's currently not feasible. So we just have to keep on working through Monday. But I do want to make it clear that what we're -- what it seems like this was trying to go is that we're keeping above water programs that are currently existing that are doing a lot of good with aid and with our food access programs or with the host team and then trying to put some of the remaining dollars to council approved ifcs around housing and health and human services. I appreciate the direction. And if what we need to do is improve scale then we need to find dollars somewhere else because it seems like some of the places we were looking yesterday are not the right places based on the information that I have now. And one thing that was a bit of a mistake, I was discussing with the mayor some of the affordability audit money going to our linkage fee study and then when -- so when he so selflessly gave up the affordability audit as a 500,000-dollar cut that money evaporated with it as well. I think that's one on the list that's a long-term

[1:51:01 PM]

investment in affordability and revenue generation that I have confidence that we'll be able to find the money for it. I thought we had already found the pot of money and we just gave it up, but we can find it again. I just wanted to flag that for the group. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston? >> Houston: Thank you, mayor. The other day we were trying to figure out how much money, other than prime time parent support specialists and victory tutorial program, how much additional money do we give to the school district from all parts of the city? Do they have that information back yet? >> The question is do we have a feel for [indiscernible] And how much money we give to the school districts? >> Houston: Let me ask it again. I think that helps in a broader context. The other thing I need to know is it seems like there are seven food access items from council on the concept menu. Can you tell me what the total of all seven of those are? Then while they're doing that, the third thing, mayor, is am I to understand from your proposal that of the three quality of life commissions that we're only putting \$150 million for all three for them to do a block grant on because some of those have been vetted so I'm not sure -- most of them tried to pare down to a little over a million. So in your proposal is it that only 150 or are you talking about 150 extra for block grants. And we continue to look at the ones that the advisory commission have said that these are the things that we need. >> Mayor Adler: I think --

[1:53:04 PM]

what this shows, what we we've got laid out here today with respect to the quality of life lists, I think every one of the quality of life folks put in as one of their items, I think every one of them put in the social service delivery through the parent support specialists and the social service delivery through the programs. >> Houston: But we took those out. >> Mayor Adler: But it was on their list. So what would that mean is that with those two programs, about \$2.2 million of the quality of life, things that were originally given. Now beyond that I don't remember if any of the ones that were listed here were specifically put in the quality of life initiatives or not. I don't remember if these two food access issues were there or if the childcare continuity services showed up on anyone's list, but assuming they did not, what this shows is \$1.5 million, not 150,000, but \$1.5 million in additional monies for the quality of life eastern crescent initiatives. >> Houston: So that 1,000,005 is additional money for the block grant and then we will consider those as they come up by each quality of life commission. Most of them tried to get theirs down to one million without the duplications. >> Mayor Adler: And they did. And what I presented yesterday I had three million dollars total there -- >> Houston: Which would be one million for each quality of life. >> Mayor Adler: If we wanted to do it that way. >> Houston: I'm saying that's an easy way to do it. >> Mayor Adler: And one way I came to funding to \$300 million is I cut out the body cameras and I took

[1:55:06 PM]

out the -- I cut in half the 42 hour conversion for E.M.S. So there were a lot of cuts that a lot of people on the dais were saying hey, I'm not really comfortable cutting out body cameras. It also assumed that we would have access to 1.4 forfeiture money and then it turns out we only have access to 500,000 forfeiture money. So if we were not to make those cuts and if we are not to get the forfeiture money, then we have to cut back some of the things that we were spending money on or we have to find additional money somewhere else. So as part of that exercise I was basically cutting everything back or lots of things back. Certainly the big ticket items back. And that's why this exercise took it from three million dollars to one and a half million dollars. >> Houston: So I have to say that I think the million and a half -- and I understand the stretch that we're trying to reach here, but million and a half for three communities that have worked very hard, not discounting the items from council that were also

implemented or recommended or passed, but we have to make an investment in some of these communities. And 1.5 million for some of the real historical and long-lasting kinds of issues is -- doesn't really compute for me. And I guess I will have to go back and try to see -- I've tried to really get ours down to scale so that I can say what are the most important things that we need to do. Some of these programs are programs that meet a different demographic than any of the other programs that we currently fund and have been funding for years. And it comes again from the people, of the community who live there to say this is a niche that has not been addressed by any of the

[1:57:08 PM]

other workforce agencies. And so it's disheartening to I'm sure both the asian-american and the African-American and I'm sure some of the things on the hispanic quality of life to say now we're going to cut that down to 1.5. Yes, we are doing a lot in some zip codes in some of those areas, but in many of the others that won't be enough to make any difference at all, if we talk about the investment that we want to make and if we talk about the equality issues in this community and the lack thereafter. -- And the lack thereof. >> Mayor Adler: I understand. Ms. Garza? >> Garza: I really appreciate councilmember Garza's comments and you're absolutely right -- councilmember Casar's comments, and you're right in a lot of ways. We're holding the line on many of these increases we've made. I will say that we're not on the food retail. That is cutting current contracts in place. So most of your statement was right. >> Casar: I got the text instantly that I was right about everything except one line. [Laughter]. >> Garza: That being said, I know we have tough decisions to make. I'm really concerned that we're once again adding to public safety's budget. And believe me that is very hard for me to say because I'm a former firefighter and so it's hard for me to say -- to be the person out here saying why he we are increasing public safety's budget? But the reason I see where it's okay and I've come to terms with that is that the return on investment and investing in our health and human services is huge. If we invest in them the way that we should be investing in them, that's less calls. That's less police calls, that's less fire calls. And until we start that -- until we start doing that and we keep doing -- budgeting how we've always budgeted, we're going to be in the same position. So that was the whole point

[1:59:08 PM]

of trying to invest more in these programs. And here again -- so -- again, I absolutely believe that we need to find a way to get this backlog and find these ftes. Yes, it needs to be done and police -- in my opinion we need to ask the police to go find that money, go find that money. Don't leave it to us to balance this budget on the backs of our most vulnerable populations and the programs that benefit them. And so I don't know how else to how else to reiterate that we need to find that money. It needs to get done, it needs to get done now, but we also need to start moving in the direction where we're investing in these programs because that will in turn mean less police calls, less people in jail, less fire calls, less medical calls and that's how -- it helps everyone, basically. And so we can't keep budgeting the way we're budgeting. That was the whole point of trying to change the way that we do things. I hope we can start maybe -- I don't know if Monday we can start doing these cuts, maybe making some decisions on these cuts and then seeing what's left after that and more forcefully ask our police, who I know are in a tough position, to find some money, to prioritize fixing that backlog. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston >> Houston: You all have the amounts for those -- if you'll just let me know so I can write it down, for the seven items of food access that -- items from council and then the total amount that the city gives to the school district from all other departments. >> I've got the food access information. >> Houston: Okay. >> Elaine hart, chief financial officer. On the original concept menu

[2:01:11 PM]

there are three items. One is broken out into five subparts. It's hs1.04a through he have and those sum to a total of \$1,917,000. There is item hs1.13 for food access program coordinator, the amount on that is 95,500. And the last one is hs1.16 for \$750,000. And that's for healthy food retail initiatives. But that looks like it duplicates some of the funding in hs1.04, which it had 941,000 in funding versus the 750 funding so I don't know if they're overlaps or they're in addition to. So that would total about \$2.7 million. If you assume that was not an overlap, if you just added the three numbers up. >> Houston: The one-time funds are about 75,000? >> I think so. Yes, that's included -- the one-time is included in that total. >> Houston: Oh, okay. Thanks. It looked like they were separate. So thanks. >> We'll have to get back with you on the aid funding amounts. >> Councilmember, we are tracking that information down so we'll get it to you as soon as possible. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar. >> Casar: I'd like to lend my voice to support the idea of thinking of public safety comprehensively. When I talked to patrol officers in many of my neighborhoods they say one of the best things you can do for me and public safety in this area is get more permanent supportive housing on the ground or get more addiction services on the ground. I agree with that a hundred percent and do think

[2:03:12 PM]

that we need to continue to think about how we can target our social service funding in a way that pump can see the public safety results of it, but I also don't want us to be too hard on ourselves. It's a tough budget year and there are some other great things that we are funding in this budget that aren't on this list because they're already in the manager's budget from the extra hundreds of thousands of dollars for housing first. And the sobriety center, some with a more comprehensive way of looking at public safety and the increase to the downtown Austin community court. So I definitely stand with the -- I think the majority of council that wants to keep on directing more funds that way and thinking of public safety comprehensively. I just want to make sure that we know we have a long way to go, but we are already in the base budget doing some good things and we can do more to do better. I just don't want to send the message that there aren't some really important things that we are already planning to do even though we want to do more. >> Mayor Adler: I think in terms of also say that thoughts, I think it's important too. I think that the major in the budget that he prepared this time reflected a lot of our values of this council in a way that went beyond last year's budget, perhaps because we had another year kind of working with each other. It included lots of things, in addition to the ones that Mr. Casar just mentioned, the fact that we have a minimum wage in essence that's gone up to 13.50 in this budget is pretty exciting thing to do. So I think we have those elements as well. So today's exercise just kind of is juxtaposed to yesterday's. Yesterday was a way to say if we wanted to fund full programs it's a bigger chunk so it needs a bigger chunk cut. Today's exercise, laying it out was to say we wouldn't have to necessarily do it that way. We could also lay smaller --

[2:05:13 PM]

make smaller cuts and do more things but then the things that we were funding didn't go all the way. I think it's a good exercise to go through, to discuss the other funding options that people are bringing to the table. You know, I have some reservation about further cutting public safety. I know that the number of officers that they were looking for was a much higher number and there was already a significant cutback in what the manager proposed to us. And I think one of the reasons why this city is successful is because it is a safe city. I think we do need to give real serious consideration to getting to the community policing concept, which involves not only people but the kind of infrastructure changes

that councilmember kitchen put in her changes to the rider. And I think that's important, and I'll go back to where I was, what I mentioned earlier last week. I think we really need to put together something that will take a look at what the five-year plan is with respect to public safety so that we're not doing 1-off projects so that we actually see how you get from here to there over a long period of time because I think that it's frustrating to me as a councilmember to go through the process the way we go through it, in terms of how we do public safety. It's frustrating to me and hopefully the November -- April thing will help us, that, you know, we have a \$3.5 billion budget. The general fund component of this is over \$900 million. And we're spending two months talking about \$15 million. There's got to be better use of council's time and staff's time and everybody's time than to be going through this kind of exercise over this period of time for something that represents a small portion of the budget. I think it's important to look

[2:07:13 PM]

at everything that people have mentioned. And including development services and economic development. But I also have some reservations with respect to those, want to learn more, because I'm afraid -- I don't want us to get to the place where we're in essence eating our seed corn and by that I mean that, you know, we have the money to be able to spend on health and human services and on social services and on the wages that we have because of the tax revenue that the city generates. It's because we have the development that we have in the city, the groaning we have in the city, the economy that we have in this city that we're able to have the money to be able to spend on the people that live here. And I think we have to do a much better job of directing those resources to folks that live here, but if we -- but there is that balance. If we took everything that we had and spent it all on health and human services, my fear would be that that would be short-sighted and would not be in the best interests of folks because we wouldn't be able to -- no, no, no. I'm just saying -- I said there's a balance. I said there's a balance there with respect to that, and I think we need to make sure that the economy of the city continues to be real strong too, and I think that's to be part of the balance when we're discussing those things. Yes. Let me go to Leslie and then back to mayor pro tem. >> Pool: When we're looking further on Monday, discuss possibly Wednesday to -- Monday, Tuesday, possibly Wednesday to find the place where we need to be on the budget I want to be really mindful in one specific area. You remember last year when we were looking at some issues with our emergency management services, our ems folks, and we had some really tragic

[2:09:14 PM]

situations with the staff there? And a lot of that was because they were overworked. They were working too many hours. And we entered into kind of a promise, a contract, with our ems employees, saying that we're going to reduce your hours from 48 down to 42 and we're gonna do it by phasing it in. We'll bring on some more supervisors in the first year but then in the second year we will be able to lower your hours by six hours a week and allow you to have some rest time between your shifts. And a lot of that was based on the fact that we were losing some of our ems -- our techs and our medics because of the stress of the job. Some of them were leaving, taking other jobs. Some of them sadly took their lives. And so I know I pledged to myself and I think many of us around this dais did as well last year that we would do what was necessary to recognize and protect our hard-working medics with ems. So when we are looking at the cuts, I would ask that we look more at the programs and protect the people that are doing the work, in particular the medics are taking, I think, 11,000 calls a week in excess of what they had been before, and nobody else has that size of a workload. So I just wanted to raise that one issue and put it out there, because I would very much like to make good on the promise to hold firm and fast on

reducing from 48 to 42 hours for our medics. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mayor pro tem. >> Pool: Thanks. >> Tovo: This is on another subject.

[2:11:16 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Kitchen: I was just gonna reiterate that I -- thank you, councilmember pool. I support that statement also, and if -- mayor, if we're gonna move forward by asking the staff to look for 1.6, I think we need to ask the staff to look for a range, perhaps, and I think we need to add back in a number of these items at the level that we -- some of us would prefer to see them at. So that what we're doing for help from the staff is a range of 1.6 to whatever the number is. And I think that the 42 hour workweek is one of the high priorities for including back. It's probably not the only one, but it's one of them. >> Mayor Adler: Well, let's talk about that because, you know, as we come into the last 15 minutes, one thing I think mayor pro tem may actually have answer to some of the questions you asked yesterday so I want those to be able to daylight here as well but we want to be able to tee up departments or people that we want to come back to us and talk to us on Monday as we start. And we probably need to give a number to Ed and to Elaine to see if they can reach. Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: Thanks. I guess I would ask, I remember one budget year where the staff went through and identified potential areas, and I don't think you stuck to a particular amount. So I would just be interested. That was the year where I think you brought forward fee waiver cuts and other potential things we could consider even if they are not items that councilmembers had mentioned. So I would just -- I'm very interested in having, you know, a broad range of things to considerate amounts beginning at one six but also that go beyond. If we have a couple minutes, I'd like to just lay out a proposal I'd like us to consider during the budget adoption next week. In looking over the concept

[2:13:18 PM]

menu, there's an important one on there -- sorry, assistant city manager, that relates to lighting in public parks. And, you know, this -- especially if we're talking about public safety this is very definitely a public safety issue, if we have public parks that neighbors and others are -- feel unsafe, feel are unsafe because they're not properly lit, and, you know, after -- in looking at some of our rationale and motivation for service area lighting and the way that we handle that throughout the city, that is a cost that is distributed among commercial and residential customers alike because it is a community benefit that we all have streets that are lit and, you know, certainly that has public safety benefits. So one proposal that I'm gonna ask y'all to consider is to take the cost of lighting in our parks and handle that, handle that through our service area lighting charge. And we have consulted with our outside counsel about that, and it is appropriate and consistent -- let me say based on my information from those conversations, it would appear to me to be completely appropriate and reasonable to include our public parks, the lighting within public parks through that community benefit charge. So that's what I'm gonna do. And that would be -- that would relate to the service area lighting tariff that's part of the community benefit charge as I mentioned. >> Mayor Adler: Do you know how much it would be to do that? Do you know the details on that? >> Tovo: I have a figure but it's not clear whether that figure is for installation or installation and ongoing lighting. The way that it's happened now, our street lices are both the installation costs as well as the ongoing costs of

[2:15:18 PM]

running that utility. And so I think within a -- maybe a minute or two I may have the clarification on whether the number I've got in front of me relates to that, but it is, in terms of our totaled lighting cost,

the various other things we're talking about, it's a -- it would not represent a significant change. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. If you don't get that number in the next minute or two and get it later can you post that or something so we have it to be able to play with as well? >> Tovo: Sure. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. >> Casar: Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Let me get to Mr. Renteria. >> Renteria: I just wanted to ask, the one -- the community service charge that's on the utility bill? >> Tovo: That's right. Currently the community benefit charge, one of the areas that that funding goes to is street lighting. So we all help pay for street lighting throughout the city, and this would just make it clear that the street lighting also includes lighting in our public parks for the same rationale because it's a safety issue. >> Renteria: It won't be an increase? >> Tovo: It would be an increase in terms of the costs that are put within the community benefit charge. It is not -- I don't know that we have an estimate back from Austin energy about whether that would represent an increase to ratepayers. And it's my understanding it would not impact the settlement in any way. >> Renteria: Okay. >> Tovo: Because that wasn't one of the points in the settlement. >> That's correct. The community benefit charge is outside of the settlement. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. What departments are we gonna want to have be with us on Monday? Police, development services, tech. Ems? >> [Off mic] >> Mayor Adler: What? I have development services. This doesn't mean we're just limited obviously to these people but the ones we can put

[2:17:19 PM]

on notice that we know we want to have would be development services, ems, police, tech. >> Renteria: And that homestead -- senior exemption, we need to find out what amount we are gonna look at. I personally don't support -- support the senior exemption to move that to 91,000. I think 80 is what is the amount that all the other taxing entities, including Travis. So if we're really gonna be increasing community service fees then we should just use that senior exemption and use that money to finance the lighting and stuff instead of increasing their fees. >> Mayor Adler: Yes? >> Houston: Mayor? You told me after -- >> Mayor Adler: Yes, Ms. Houston, you're absolutely right. >> Houston: This is gonna be a hard weekend for everybody, and this appeal is to the better angels not only on the dais but also those who have requested additional funding that as we go through this process of trying to look at what we've added to the concept menu, regardless of how it got on there, to see if we could scrub that down to what is just absolutely necessary for us to function. Because we've heard that the projection for next year is a little bit more optimistic. We immediate some bandwidth to get through this year but we heard had a the projections for next year and the year out we're in a much better position. So I'm asking all the entities who have asked us for additional funding to go back and participate with us in this process and scrub their budgets to see if they can manage with less than what they actually have standard us for. Is it what you need? Or is it something that you

[2:19:21 PM]

want? And so that's -- help us do this. If you have any ways that you can find some extra funding that we have not seen, then feel free to bring that forward to us. You all know how to get in touch with us, but all of us are gonna have to do some really hard soul searching and I'm just asking all these partners that we fund all the time to go through that soul searching with us. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. I would also add health and human services to the group of folks to be with us on Monday. >> I think that's an important point. I wanted to clarify that staff prongses actually is that next year doesn't look terribly great, based on the proposed budget staff brought forward and all of our cost and revenue projections we're projecting a small deficit at the roll-back rate next year before any of these discussions we're having. Now, when you get past that, things inevitably start looking better because when you get fiscal year '18 we don't build into our budget a whole bunch of cost drivers. We try to stick to the budget that's in play

and if we just move it forward for things like wage increases, but, you know, we don't build into those projections new initiatives, new fire stakeses, a lot of the ifcs that have been asked. If we were to include all of those things, none of the years would look good. They just wouldn't. >> Houston: Thank you for correcting that. I guess I was looking forward to the year after '18. >> Fy '19 is sergeant to look better but it's highly contingent upon what we -- if we fund five new fire stations fy '19 will look like a budget beyond the roll-back rate. It's all about what assumptions you make in those forecasts. >> Houston: Thank you for correcting that for everyone. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool. >> Pool: I just wanted to make sure on the ems piece are we able just to leave that -- to take that off the list for discussion and leave it as it was in the base budget? The city manager had made a recommendation, and I'd like to see if around the dais we

[2:21:21 PM]

could just revert and return that item back to the base budget. >> Garza: I have a follow-up question. >> Mayor Adler: While at a work session we can't take action. We can take action on Monday. >> Pool: I wanted to get a sense around the dais without actually voting. >> Mayor Adler: That's good, yeah. Ms. Garza. >> Garza: I had the same question about -- I really appreciate all the work you've done, mayor. Sorry this is criticizing it. >> Pool: Absolutely. >> Garza: You've done a lot and appreciate it. The sense I'm getting is that you've also had conversations with our budget folks and the direction is gonna be this is where we are now with this, go -- can you go find the 1.6 or 1.3 million and to councilmember pool's point, for some of us that number is bigger and goes to what councilmember kitchen suggested. It's -- I'm also supportive of the keeping ems and so, unfortunately, that number is gonna be bigger. Maybe in the next five minutes that number is gonna be please go find 4 million but I think it needs to be a realistic go-find number because yeah. >> Mayor Adler: Before we left here today there were a couple things we needed to accomplish. One to identify the departments and the second was to give instruction to staff in terms of what that number should be that we're challenging them to go do. But I think we do need to give them that direction, yeah. >> I just wanted to note that when the manager's budget was proposed initially, we took a final look at it and he asked us to go back and cut an additional \$3 million. And before it was rolled out to you, council, and the public. And so the departments have already cut 3 million out of their budgets. Between this 10% reduction in memberships, that's \$400,000,

[2:23:24 PM]

and the 1.6 we're asking them already to look for another \$2 million. What we had thought we would do is rather than look for specific line-item cuts, we would allocate that savings amount across the departments and let them manage next year to a lower budget number. Let them decide where they want to make those cuts operationally, either hold positions vacant longer, delay contracts, do whatever they want to do with their operations to do that but let them do that off line, not have to do that this weekend. I think that's in a doable range. If that number gets up to \$4 million we are going to have to ask them to look at programs to did you think. I don't think the 4 million on top of the 3 million is a manageable number. It would impact services in a big way. And we would generally have to hold positions longer than six months, longer than maybe 12 months. We might have to hold them vacant the entire year to achieve those kinds of numbers. >> Kitchen: Could I have a question. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, Ms. Kitchen. >> Kitchen: One of the things that we have is new positions. You know? One of the things that councilmember Garza was talking about was a whole range of new positions. So in my mind, and I might not be thinking about them crediting. I don't have them in front of me to look at. But in my mind that's not so much cutting programs but not increasing programs. And so to my mind it's very legitimate to look at that, particularly since the extent to which we increase them this year means that

we've got to do a file year of them next year. So so my suggestion would be that's a good first place to look. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: I want to add something I would like to talk about more on Monday. Is the central library question. I had noted that yesterday, but we haven't had an opportunity to have that discussion.

[2:25:26 PM]

And I think I understand from Ms. Hart's comment that the 10% reduction in select membership subscription and travel, the suggestion might be to ask the departments to figure out where those economies could be found. >> Yes. >> Tovo: Okay. >> We've already done that. >> Tovo: I would like to just quickly say the number that I have received from our parks department is \$1.9 million. That's the cost of lighting our parks for safety and other reasons. And it's my understanding -- I believe that that number does not include the amount that is paid to the parks department by organizations of that agreements, for example, we have some youth leagues that play within our fields is and they are responsibility -- they are responsibility -- they are responsible for the utility costs and so those are backed out, I believe, of that \$1.9 million. And so were this change to go into effect, I understand that would be \$1.9 million I assume that would be available within the general fund budget. I think it would be appropriate for some of that to be used to provide the kind of lighting that was in the concept budget that is a ongoing cost of lighting. It's not the installation costs. What was on the concept menu was an installation cost. They're both important in terms of public safety. So that's an update on that. We have asked Austin energy to run the numbers on how that would change the community benefit charge. It's -- again, it's my understanding it will be a very minimal impact on ratepayers. >> Mayor Adler: So that I understand you're suggesting that -- what you're trying to find out is what is the impact on the community benefit charge of getting an additional \$1.9 million in revenue so as to be able to fund lighting in parks? >> Tovo: Yes. >> Mayor Adler: And if that happens is there any impact -- >> Tovo: There should be a \$1.9 million impact on the general fund. >> Mayor Adler: Because it's expenses we're otherwise -- it's otherwise already in the

[2:27:28 PM]

budget. >> Tovo: Again, I didn't go into my rationale here but I would say it follows the same rationale for lighting our streets, that those are done, that we all share in the costs of those throughout the community for public reasons and I think certainly our public parks are no exception. I do want to -- I don't know if we have any time to talk about the sobriety center but I wanted to signal again I think it's really critical we consider my measure on the concept menu to move that into the public safety budget. We will see savings I believe in the public safety budget over times. It's a saving in terms of officer time. It's a matter of public safety and our A.P.D. Has been involved. We've had good participation from officers within the police department, the assistant city manager who has been supervising that process is ray Arellano, it just is consistent for all kinds of reasons. Now, does it have health benefits? Absolutely. If we're successful with the sobriety center it will certainly I hope connect individuals who need resources to longer-term resources with relationship to substance use, but it does definitely have a public safety component as well. It's no fiscal impact. It's just a matter of where we have that residing in the department. >> Mayor Adler: Where does it reside now? >> Tovo: It's proposed to be within health and human services. >> Mayor Adler: So you're just saying -- >> Tovo: Moving it to public safety. >> Mayor Adler: The money goes with the prong, the question is where is it more appropriate. >> Tovo: That's exactly right. Whereas consistent with our vision of where we might see those savings over time. And I think, you know, hopefully we'll see savings in a variety of places, including within our hospital community, but in terms of the city budget I think it belongs in public safety. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ms.

Pool? >> Pool: I like the items that mayor pro tem is offering, and along those lines the esd4 item was 62,000 this year and I would like to ask chief Ker

[2:29:28 PM]

to try to find a way to pay for that in the fire department budget, see if it's possible. >> Mayor Adler: Does that 62 obligate us for the million dollars later on? >> Pool: It probably does. I will say that I don't know what the time line is on that, but Travis county has already appropriated and obligated their share, which is also 62,000 this year. So they have -- I guess they decided on Tuesday or maybe it was last Tuesday to go ahead and move forward with that. So in line with trying to stay in step with our county partner, I would offer up that 62,000 from the city side. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Pool: Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: So as we go around the table, there's potential additional money. Ed, does that make sense to you with respect to -- if we were to move the lighting over to make it part of the community benefit charge? Would that turn up that kind of dollars on the budget? >> I'd want to look into the numbers with pard. I'm not sure if it was just the parks you're talking about or the parks and rec centers, trails, parks, rec centers. They have a lot of different things they run lights at but the utility costs are in the parks department budget so any that could be deferred to the community benefit charge would be a general fund savings. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. So you're gonna look at that. >> We'll get an answer from Austin energy and the parks department and be ready on Monday. >> Kitchen: I have a question. >> Mayor Adler: Go ahead. >> Kitchen: Are you talking about the ongoing operational cost? >> Tovo: That figure is the ongoing operational cost, yes. >> Kitchen: Okay. You're not talking about a one time -- the reason I ask that -- we can finish this conversation. I'm not sure we're thoroughly examining what might could be spent addressed in the C.I.P. Budget. So -- but you're talking about ongoing operational. >> Tovo: I am. I do think the item on the concept menu is for installation, which is different. And critical, I believe. But the figure I gave was for

[2:31:29 PM]

ongoing operations. >> Kitchen: So the installation amount, is that out of the C.I.P.? >> Tovo: Well, I've -- it is -- right now it is an unmet need of the parks department and I assume if it were funded it could be funded through the C.I.P. Budget, yeah. And it may also be able to be funded through community -- through -- you know, what I believe -- one of the questions that we need to track down is whether installation -- I assume that installation for lighting, for street lighting and otherwise, is also handled through the -- I want to get the title right, the service area lighting costs as well. So it's possible that the installation is also -- also becomes an appropriate parker creek ranch part of that service area lighting cost, which. The installation may also be able to be rolled in that as well. It typically is with the street lighting but we just need clarity on that. >> Mayor Adler: Those are the questions that Ed is answering. We have that as a possible revenue source. We have the police issue which races possible revenue source. We have the -- that's a possible revenue expense. The other possible revenue source was the money we'd asked Elaine to look at, the 1.6 and .4 right now. Do we ask Elaine to -- let's get to that question. What is the number we're asking Elaine to get to? If we don't go past the 2 million is what she said she thought that was a reasonable thing for her to do. >> Kitchen: Does that account for what you raced on the 42 hour workweek? >> That was -- >> Pool: 1.5 and then the mayor had reduced it. Which way had you done it? >> Mayor Adler: So it does not. The gap was 1.6 as was shown here. If we were to make the one change to bring up an

[2:33:30 PM]

additional \$500,000 to do the ems all this year, that would take the gap up to \$2.1 million. Plus the 400,000, which was the 10% reduction across departments in those budget I'm. That takes it from a gap of 2 million in essence that Elaine would be look at to 2.5. >> Kitchen: Well, I remain committed to the senior exemption, but I'm look for other dollars and I'm happy to -- in addition to what I brought forward with regard to the public safety, I'll be looking for other dollars too because I do think the senior exemption is critical. >> Mayor Adler: For the record, I am committed to every expense that's shown on this to the full extent of what they cost. >> Kitchen: What does that mean. >> Mayor Adler: These are all really important to me and I want to fund them all. So I'm ready to engage in the conversations about where moneys come from. But there will obviously be limitations associated with that. I just don't want the newspaper tomorrow to say these people were committed to this and I wasn't committed to anything. >> Kitchen: I understand. >> Mayor Adler: I'm committed to all these things too. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. So with respect to the number, Elaine, if the number went to 2.5, in other words, if you were asked not to find a gap for 1.6 but to find a gap for 2.1 plus the 400, is that something that you think is manageable? >> I think between just the savings and maybe looking at the new ftes that are proposed we can come up with the two and a half. I'll have to talk to the departments. >> Mayor Adler: That's 2.1 plus the 400, just to be clear for the record. That's a gap shown on this as 2.1 plus the 400, which is the 10% for a total of 2.5. So if we did that, that would cover then that change on the 42 hour deal.

[2:35:34 PM]

>> Kitchen: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: Of course we'll make other changes too. But if I understood the question right that's what those would be. >> Kitchen: Those were changes in addition to what we have identified around the table if I'm understanding correctly, right? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. Separate from the police. That's separate from the -- >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: -- Question about lighting. >> Kitchen: One of the questions they'd was maybe as part of this, that you all could identify for us, if there's any of these items eligible for the C.I.P.? You know, there's a lot of very, very important things that are included in the C.I.P. Right now but we haven't looked at it at all. So if there are any of these items that that could be eligible for C.I.P., I'd like to have that identified for us also. >> Mayor Adler: I think it would be good, Ed, to have the conversation because I'm not sure as we sit at the dais we're real sure of what it means to put something into or out of the C.I.P. Budget. And where that money goes or comes from. So a quick, short discussion to help orient us on C.I.P. I think would be helpful in the budget. >> Kitchen: I feel like Ed has provided that to us. If you'd like that, that's fine. I just mean that to -- like I raised the question yesterday about the -- you know, the downtown loo. I don't understand why that couldn't a C.I.P. Item, for example. So -- >> Mayor Adler: What does it mean for it to be a C.I.P. Item. >> Kitchen: It's got to be one-time, that's one thing, obviously. Traditionally what we've done as I understand, traditionally it's infrastructure kinds of needs, although I understand from our discussion yesterday that from time to time there might be items out of the C.I.P. That are one-time -- that are not bricks and mortar kind of infrastructure and I think you gave an example yesterday that related to codenext. I don't remember exactly what that example was, but typically speaking, you're talking about it's got to be one-time and typically speaking you're talking about bricks and mortar. Did I get that right, Ed? >> Mayor Adler: My -- go ahead. Then I'll ask the question. Go ahead and answer that question. >> You did. So the C.I.P. Is really a

[2:37:34 PM]

construct for us to largely account for longer-term projects that are gonna last more than a year and in one sense that's what it is. Typically that's big buildings like the library that take many years to build so

you put the funds into the C.I.P. The money, though, has to come from somewhere so it's either coming from debt issuances, voter approved bond programs, cash transfers from your operating budget to the C.I.P., cash transfers from your one-time funds to the C.I.P. So when you say add it to the C.I.P., we could certainly add it to the C.I.P. But the crux is really where's the money going to come from? Is it going to come from our reserves, operating budget, a bond program? If it's gonna come from a bond program it's got to be appropriate for that bond funding it's gonna displace some other project. >> Kitchen: Right. I mean, we're putting Jane lane and meadow lake in there, for example, and we made a decision that we wanted to do that. So I assume that's coming from bond -- I don't know where that money is coming from. >> Mayor Adler: We had a discussion on that that we are issuing cos in order to do those two so that's where the funding from those two would come if we move the downtown loo into there, that was the question I was asking, do we want to see more of what the overall C.I.P. Budgeted items are to see if we want to take something out that was otherwise being funded under the C.I.P. Budget and fund this instead? >> Kitchen: My question wasn't that big. If others want to ask that question, that's fine. I was just trying to brainstorm if there anything on here that would be worth looking at. That's all. >> Mayor Adler: I'm just trying to make sure that I'm following where you're going. >> Kitchen: Yeah. >> Mayor Adler: Why that would make a difference. We're still having to find the money somewhere. >> Kitchen: That would free up -- basically what you'd be doing is the same exercise we're doing right now, where mayor pro tem tovo, for example, is identifying things in the operational budget that she thinks perhaps could be cut or deferred. You would do the same thing on

[2:39:35 PM]

the C.I.P. List. >> Mayor Adler: But if you were to move the downtown loo into the C.I.P. Project, there's not can be the C.I.P. Project zeros out. Is that right? Or is there extra cash money sitting in the C.I.P. Budget? >> Kitchen: I don't know if there's extra. >> There's not extra cash sitting there. >> Mayor Adler: If you put it in C.I.P. It's going to have to displace something or when you put it in there it has to come with money with it. >> Kitchen: I know. I'm talking about the potential to displace something but, again, that depends on whether something is even appropriate to consider in that bucket. >> Mayor Adler: Right. >> Kitchen: So that was my first-level question, is it even appropriate to consider before going to look for tradeouts, you know. >> Tovo: If we're talking about the loo, let me mention one piece of bad news, is that the estimate that we have on the concept menu turns out to be too little in funding and some of it is a capital expenditure and some of it will need to be an operational expenditure. So some of it could be funded that way, but in that particular case I believe that we're look to fund that through the pid and so it's -- that's one option. So it -- I think it is -- I think the -- assuming about it right now is that it will not come out of general fund dollars. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Tovo: Two, if that is not an option, I still am going to argue strenuously if it's across the street from a convention center it's an appropriate use of dollars that we would just -- just in the same way we pay for infrastructure at the consequence center. I don't want to be a broken record on this but I want to say when we talk to development services I am gonna have significant questions related to 210 and this is the third-party plan review for \$450,000. You know, as we look at potential great ideas that could potentially wait, that's one that I want to talk about. I think we all -- or probably all of us or most of us share a commitment to making sure our development services run very smoothly. We've got a lot of new business, but we are making some really significant investments in development

[2:41:36 PM]

services through this year's budget. We did through last year's budget and through previous budgets and I think we just need to look at holistically at all of the improvements. If we have 18 new plan

reviewers do we also need this almost half million dollar contract for third-party plan review. I would say in my mind right now that's something we probably could delay. >> Kitchen: I withdraw my question about the C.I.P. I think you answered what I was asking. >> Tovo: Just on that one. I think generally the question is a good one. There may be things on this list that are C.I.P. Eligible that we want to see the city move forward with and, you know -- >> Mayor Adler: So the corresponding question -- >> Tovo: As priorities in advance of what's already in the C.I.P. Budget. >> Mayor Adler: So the corresponding question to me, if we're gonna do that, which I think is something worth looking at, would be if we were going to cut something out of the C.I.P. Budget, what would be the first thing or two that we would move back? To take a look at the C.I.P. Budget to see what it was that we would displace. Most reasonably displace so to take a look at that I think would be helpful. >> That would be very dependent upon what it is you're look to go displace because of the funding sources in the C.I.P., a lot of them are restricted. So if we're looking to fund additional roadways or sidewalk, we'd be displacing other sidewalks or road projects from bond funding. We wouldn't be displacing funding from a parks proposition. That wouldn't be allowable. It just depends what it is you're looking to fund and then we could do that work of what projects will we put on the back burner in order to move up some other projects. >> Mayor Adler: That's because the C.I.P. Is tied to a bond that described the source -- >> A lot of the dollars are. Not all of them. >> Garza: I have a question on that. >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Garza: Not all of it is bond dollars, right. >> No. >> Garza: Along those lines, another question we asked, I believe it's 226, was about the ktm data center relocation. And it's a one-time cost of

[2:43:40 PM]

2.7 million. And so I would -- my question would be, if we could find something to replace in C.I.P. To move that ctm relocation. That seems to be something that could be moved to C.I.P. If there was room found. >> I don't believe it is because on that data center relocation I don't believe what we're entering into is an actual physical building that the city would own. It's a contract, leasing space for the servers servers and all that, studies and planning to do the move. I know we have staff from kilometer here and they'll be here Monday as well to maybe describe more what that is but my recollection of that is that it's not an actual physical asset, something we'd be building. So it wouldn't be C.I.P. Eligible. >> Garza: Would an actual asset be, like, software? Or is that not -- >> The only way moving something like that to the C.I.P. Would help you really in terms of funding something else would be to issue debt for it. >> Garza: Okay. >> Debt finance it. We're not gonna be allowed to debt finance leasing space. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Garza: I just had another comment. >> Mayor Adler: Go ahead. >> Garza: Border to the direction that -- reward to the direction we're giving to staff, I guess I'm still a little confused about -- I'm a little concerned about saying go find us 4 million because I'm afraid that we'll get back -- something will be cut that we don't -- are we gonna be told what's being cut? To make room for whatever that is? Because -- this is not to say anything bad about staff but my fear would be that something -- that we would not be happy cutting is going to get cut when we don't know about the ten other things that maybe could be cut and we would be okay with the ten other things but what's gonna be offered up is something that we're gonna hear from our

[2:45:40 PM]

constituents about. For example, when we ask for cuts in police, sometimes they used to always offer up the district reps, knowing that we would get 5 million emails telling us don't cut the district reps. And so I'm just -- that's why I've been -- I've been trying to go down the road of new positions, new ftes, not forcing our staff to cut existing -- and I know that can affect, you know, priorities that we've made in improving different departments, but I really hope that we can look really at the new ftes and the

possible savings in there so we're not leaving it up to -- because that's what I tried to do with the 1%. I tried to say go find 1% and was basically told there's no -- there's nothing in there. And so I'm just trying to figure out a way to do this where we're not cutting very necessary things. And I thought a good way to do that was to do the new ftes. >> I would just remind you some of the new ftes, some of the most significant ftes in this budget are related to the 42 hour workweek which I know council very much wants. If we can't touch that or any existing programs if you were to look at it from ems' lenses where they've already scrubbed down, you know, to very small line items trying to find any thousands of dollars here, ten thousands of dollars there they can cut from things like small tools but equipment they basically need to do their job, it's hard to think where they're gonna look to find significant savings to fund things in the multi millions of dollars. And so any kind of parameters this council can put on us as we only have two days before budget adoption we're happy to do the work but trying to make significant cuts Ta to come up with millions of dollars without it impacting anything existing, I'm just telling you in all honesty and candor it's

[2:47:41 PM]

going to be extremely tough to do. These departments do not have lots of cushions and just suitcases full of money that they don't need to deliver the service that's the community expects and that I know the council wants. I'll remind council that our fire department is projecting to overbudget, overbudget by two and a half million dollars this year, to say I want you to find 1% next year when you're already going over budget and don't touch any existing programs, I don't know how they do it. So we will do the work, give it our absolute Ernest attempt but I want council to be disappointed if we come back Monday and say if you want three, four, \$5 million, I don't think there's a magic pill that's gonna not impact any services, it's not gonna impact rec's ability to maintain rec centers or maintain their parks. I know we don't want to touch health and human services because so much of the discussion has been about trying to get more assets to health and human services, you know, programs like development services largely pay for themselves. Ems, a lot of their programs pay for themselves. You start look for cuts there, and you start chasing your tail. Weekend cut staff but that means there's fewer permits we can process which means there's less revenue. So it's a bit of chasing your tail on some of those programs. So it is a challenge, and the challenge you're having trying to find little pockets of money to find your priorities is the same challenge staff had in putting together the proposed budget. I do appreciate it very much and we can do our best but I don't want to set false expectations either. >> Garza: I appreciate that and I didn't mean to imply that staff has suitcases full of money. I didn't mean -- if anybody took that that way. And I agree, you -- this is a really hard budget, and a lot -- I'll just say that this is a lot of the reason that I did not support the homestead exemption, is because of the hole that we're in now and having to look for money. And what we did did not make Austin more affordable. And so I hope we really take a

[2:49:42 PM]

serious look next year, if I have the privilege to be here, at looking at adding additional percentages to that exemption. >> Mayor Adler: To be clear, the number I think we've asked Elaine to take a look at is the two and a half million dollar number, the 1.6 plus the five plus the four. Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: Mayor, one other idea that I'd like our police department in particular to consider over the weekend, our homesteadness outreach street team is identified here for funding so that that pilot can continue. And I would like the A.P.D. To evaluate whether that is an appropriate funding, whether that would be an appropriate expense to fund through the asset forfeiture fund. It's not currently being funded through our general fund because those costs have been absorbed by the existing departments and so it strikes me that maybe an item that were the chief, as I understand our discussion earlier, could be

funded potential through the asset forfeiture fund -- >> I'm not the absolute expert but using asset forfeiture funds for ongoing expenses is generally not an allowable expense. >> Tovo: I got that piece of it. There may be a portion of that cost that is related to the vehicle, and so it may be that a portion of that is eligible and a portion is not. >> Casar: Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Would that be something supplanted on the bucket? If we didn't fund it, if we didn't fund it, because as we looked at it we decided that was a cut that needed to make and it wasn't in the budget, are you saying that the police chief would not be able to spend, to choose to spend his money there? >> That's something that I'd need to look at with the -- with the person in their department that specializes in these particular funds. The rules are really particular and specific, and

[2:51:43 PM]

so I don't want to make any recommendations or comment on that without consulting with them. >> Mayor Adler: If you would check that, with the assumption that it may be something that we just can't afford to do next year. So if it's not in the budget, then it's not supplanted, would you check that? >> Yes. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Mr. Casar. >> Casar: I want to be clear. So we're asking for two and a half million but I heard also some desire for ranges. Are we gonna have the 1.5 million option and two and a half million or are we just asking for the two and a half? Sorry to get particular. >> Mayor Adler: I think we were asking for a two and a half. >> Casar: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: Unless anybody heard that differently. Ed? Anything else? Everybody enjoy your weekend. Thank you for the time. We know that we just downloaded to staff. This meeting stands adjourned. [Adjourned]