

City Council Work Session Meeting Transcript –12/13/2016

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 12/13/2016 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 12/13/2016

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[9:11:28 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: All right. We have a quorum present. So we can go ahead and begin the Austin city council work session. Today is Tuesday, December 13th, 2016. It is 9:10. We are in the boards and commissions room here at city hall, 301 west second street, Austin, Texas. We have a big agenda on Thursday. Lots of items. Maybe we can -- by going through some of the pulled items here today, we can shorten the time that these items will take on Thursday. So my preference is going to be for us to quickly go through the pulled items before we go the briefings. Yes? Cached later I'd like to talk -- >> Kitchen: Later I'd like to talk about how Thursday may go in terms of time. I don't want to go into the meeting thinking it will go until 2:00 A.M. Or something like that. I'm wondering if there are some things that can be pushed back, but we can talk about that at the end. >> >> Mayor Adler: Let's make sure we do that. Let's go through the afternoon that have been pulled here. I pulled items 12 and 13, skill point alliance and the capital idea items. I don't know if we have staff on those items. I'll tell you what my concern was. >> [Inaudible]. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. This might be a simple question to answer. My understanding is that we anticipate that in the next few weeks we're going to get a regional workforce strategic plan from all of

[9:13:32 AM]

the stakeholders in this area that the county judge and I in our roles as statutory chairs of workforce solutions asked them to come back with. My understanding is that they're going to come back with a single goal or two goals for the entire community that could align all of the workforce monies and projects and efforts in the city in a common direction. And that there are going to be strategies under those goals to achieve that goal. And I think it has something to do potentially with moving people into a -- a certain number of people within a certain period of time into middle income jobs. And further it will speak to specific job segments as well as certain geographic areas of the city. So we're about to enter into a contract on 12 and 13 with the agencies that we think are best -- entities that we think are best positioned to be able to deliver on our workforce goals, but the strategic plan hasn't come out. So my

question is the contracts that we're entering into with skill point and with capital idea, are they aligned with that regional plan already or when the regional plan comes out in the next few weeks do we reserve the ability in the contracts or the monies we're spending to ask them to align with that regional plan? >> Thank you, mayor, Kevin Johns, director of economic development. Mayor, I think you analyzed this very accurately. I am on the board of workforce solutions and we feel that they are aligned and that there is flexibility, but I'm going to ask David Culligan, who is our manager, just to respond a little bit and see

[9:15:33 AM]

if you feel that this is an adequate flexibility that we have. >> David Culligan. Yes, most definitely. We have a great working relationship with both of these service providers within the community. Once it is we receive the recommendations from this regional report I think we'll have the opportunity to review those with these two service providers and then look at the different outcomes and make whatever amendment is needed to our agreement. I believe our service providers will be flexible. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Do we need to -- would it help us to put a line in each of those contracts with them that specifically says that when the regional workforce plan comes out we want them to either confirm that they are in alignment with that or to make whatever adjustments are necessary for them to be in alignment with that? >> I think that would be a good idea. I think just to be on the safe side so everybody knows upfront that there will be this adjustment because they're all engaged in the same level of work. There's the target audiences, the target neighborhoods and so on. But there may be some nuances in the plan that we're not aware of that they should make the adjustments for. I think that's a sound recommendation. >> Mayor Adler: That would be great. I would feel better having that in there. Ms. Kitchen? >> Kitchen: I wanted to ask more about the plan. So is that a plan that will be -- that we'll get a briefing on or how will we as a city council find out about the plan? >> Mayor Adler: I guess we'll all find out about it. I think workforce solutions, the federal and state deal, will present that to the community and I would expect them to come back and present that to the council. >> Kitchen: Yeah, I guess that's really my question. I think it would be helpful to present to the council at the earliest opportunity. >> Mayor Adler: Absolutely. Ms. Garza? >> Garza: I appreciate the

[9:17:33 AM]

goal, but I guess I'm concerned about I don't know what those recommendations are and what if we don't agree with those recommendations and we've tied -- we've tied this contract into having to follow those recommendations? And especially the one that stuck out to me was certain time -- I guess it's wanting to create certain numbers and certain time. And some of these programs like capital idea, for example, are very case worker intense where there's students who probably wouldn't have finished rn school, but they have somebody there who is constantly helping them with childcare. And I've heard stories about how they drop off the program, but then come back. So I wouldn't want a situation where you drop out of the program, you're done, sorry. That's the whole point of programs like this to have the intense case work. So I don't know if I'm comfortable with not knowing what the recommendations are and the timing of them? >> Mayor Adler: I agree. I would prefer language that says when the

recommendation comes out if the council wants to align further with that, the council has the ability to do that mid contract. >> We'd be happy to do that. And these are partnerships, they're multi-year contracts, so we will make sure that they are in alignment. Of course, if this is-- if the map is approved -- plant is approved by the council. >> Mayor Adler: My understanding is both skill point and capital idea have been part of the groups that have been working on that. I think their goal was to have a pretty wide group of everybody who was involved in workforce development, but to really focus people in ways where they could support each other and get the greatest bang for their dollars. There are lots of workforce monies being spent in lots of different places on lots of different things, and I think it was my -- my understanding is -- I don't know, because I haven't seen the recommendation because the recommendation hasn't come out, that they thought that if they could align people in some more limited number of goals, they would actually be able to move more people into middle

[9:19:33 AM]

income jobs. So I agree, we should only be reserving the right if the council wants to redirect mid contract to have the ability to be able to do that. >> We'll do that. >> Mayor Adler: Anything else on these two items? Thank you. The next two items are 16 and 17. Those were the bond monies with transportation. I pulled this one because this is the first time that the bond money is coming up. And I wanted to pause on it and kind of touch base with where we were relative to what's happening here and the election that we just went through. First I'm real excited that the staff is moving so quickly on implementing the bond. I think there's a lot of energy behind it. I think it was great yesterday that campo recommended to the state leveraging four to one the dollars that we had put up on one of the projects, 360, because that was always the hop that if we found money we would be able to leverage it, so I think that's great. With respect to the monies and how they're being spent here -- and I have the memo that talks about how the staff is being organized to be able to drive that under you to do that. I think that all sounds good. Coming back in April with the additional capacity that you'll need sounds right to me. The community should be prepared for that because we're asking something to be

[9:21:33 AM]

done here at a level that we haven't done before and we'll have to increase capacity somehow or another to be able to do that. But with respect to the dollars that we're spending here, I think it's -- we had told people during the election was that we wouldn't spend any money on a project until it had come back to council and the council had a chance to see it so that the public would have a chance to vet that. We had also said that -- or implied that we would try to have the greater context laid out when we're spending money so that someone can see what the overrule plan is. And I know that that context is not planned to come out until April. So we're now making some expenditures before we have the overall context of all the funding. And the push-pull there is to have some money that we know is going to be part of it in order to get started versus having the larger context which we need. For example, Brodie lane. The Brodie lane money can't come out of the corridor money because there's no corridor money designated for Brodie lane. The only money that's designated for Brodie lane was in the \$11,000 of -- it wasn't listed -- manchaca was listed I think as the future corridor. What was listed with respect to

Brodie lane was the \$11,000 to allow the city to fund and implement substandard streets, capital renewal projects, that project. And in that envelope it had William cannon railroad overpass, it had fallwell lane, it had circle C and cooper, Johnny Morris lane, Brodie lane was in that group, which means to the degree that we're spending the \$11,000 on Brodie lane

[9:23:34 AM]

here -- >> 11 million. 11,000 we'd be done. >> Mayor Adler: 11 million, I'm sorry. We didn't get to that level of detail. >> I feel much better about implementation. 11,000, we can handle that, mayor. >> Mayor Adler: Quickly, let's revote. Then it's going to be coming out of something else too. But as we spend money we want to make sure that if we're going to spend part of the \$11 million that we know how we're going to spend the \$11 million and the public seeing that within that universal project this is what we're prioritizing so they have a chance to discuss that. And having money that's earmarked just for Brodie lane at this point doesn't seem to allow us to have that conversation. There was some items where there were three million dollars for some safe routes to schools and \$10 million for sidewalks. And a discussion about why wasn't it reversed. And I'm not recommending that it be reversed, but just to understand what the thinking was with respect to spending that money. And then stray thoughts like rather than doing the sidewalks over a five or six-year period of time, from where I sit I would love to see us spend a lot more money on sidewalks, while we're doing the engineering and the planning on the corridors, which will take some time to do. So that people in the community can see the bond working and all over the city. So at a general level the concept of bringing in more than just the one contractor that we've had or bringing in more so that we can -- maybe we could get 50 million dollars' worth of sidewalks done in a year or two while we're doing the planning. So I have those kinds of questions. So I'll let you talk about what you've done here and why. >> Sure. Robert Goode, assistant city manager. We're currently the team that's been assembled as

[9:25:36 AM]

just doing a fabulous job of preparing the implementation plan for the entire \$720 million. This early out action that is on your agenda for Thursday is really to send a message to the community and to council and staff that this is a different approach than we've taken before. Typically we come back six, eight, nine months after an election and ask for this budget amendment. We are doing this in 35 days. So the intent is not to spend money at this point before you see the program. You are correct, mayor. The plan is to come back in February as per your resolution to talk about council's oversight, the education program for the community, and lay out those programs, every one of those from the regional mobility to the corridor plans -- to a degree of the corridor plans, sidewalks and all the other local mobility to show how that fund -- how those funds will be allocated the next eight years, with the idea, as you mentioned, mayor, we're in sync on that on I've challenged all the program leads when they've come back for a preliminary assessment on how to spend those monies in eight years to see what are those constraints that you can allow and see that we remove those funds in three, five years. So we're absolutely in sync with the conversation that you just laid out, mayor, and so the intent of this early out action is to give those funds available so after February then as soon as you all see the entire program

we're launched and we don't have to get back with you until April for that next tranch of funding. So February will answer all your questions. Here is the program laid out. It's fuzzier in the eighth year. It's clearer in the fourth year. It's really clear on what we're doing this year. >> So in the -- in this agenda item there's \$28 million and it's divided by section. Are you saying in February

[9:27:36 AM]

we would actually -- we're not actually doing that now. In February we would be looking at the individual projects and either agreeing to them or saying no, we want to reverse these things or move these things around? >> Yes. The 28 million that's identified now, we've sort of done a preallocation and asked the programs what do you think you can really need to encumber in the next few months. This is months, not years. That we came up with a 27, \$28 million of this is what the program leads said they would probably need in the next few months. After you see the full plan in February the day after that we may have to encumber some plans for a consultant or idiq or delivery and content delivery for sidewalks and we would have the authority to launch those early out projects after you see them in February, and that's what this would give us the authority to do. You will see that in February. And you're correct, mayor, if that if there's some reallocation that in February we're going to show you we need more than 20 million on the transportation side, we might have to come back in March to update that. But I think between February and April that we'll have enough funding to move the early out projects and have to get the big tranch in April. >> Mayor Adler: And I understand the February and April stuff. I'm still a little uncertain as to what's happening today. We have two million dollars for safety and vision zero but we don't know what that is, and what it means. >> You will in February. All we tried to do is give us some seed money to keep the programs going in this early out, really push for getting projects ready for your look in February. That allocation is really -- it's fairly flexible or fairly broad at this point. We just tried to put some money together for the programs that we said we think this is what we'll need in the next few months. If council says in February, go, we'll have some money and all those programs will launch. >> Mayor Adler: When we say the next few months, do we mean the next few months,

[9:29:37 AM]

February and the next few months or December and the next few months? In other words, by February will we have spent \$28 million on these things? >> No. >> Mayor Adler: So we'll not have spent this money yet? >> No. Because we won't encumber things until you see it in February. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Other than -- let me -- early February we'll come back with a corridor consultant, that's going to be on your agenda. We'll probably spend that or encumber that very quickly because that's one of the critical path items is to get that consultant on to help us. >> Mayor Adler: And that consultant is going to help us lay out the program. >> Yes. >> Mayor Adler: Manager? >> Just from a process standpoint, we need the appropriation, which is the authority to spend, so we can let our purchase documents out in the vendor community. Understanding that when Robert says encumber the money, this is that is when council takes action on a contract with a vendor. That is the actual purchase transaction and that's when the monies are encumbered. And once that's encumbered then you can

spend against the contract. But we need the appropriation to be able to engage with the consultant community in order to do the rfp work, rfq work, so that we are ready after the February briefing to quickly get those vendor contracts on your council agenda. So that's really why we need appropriation now. Otherwise we really are going out in the community asking for a vendor to propose on a transaction that they don't have any budget to back it. >> For example, the future preliminary engineering reports for the future corridors, we know we're doing those. You've identified those corridors to put a rotation list on the street. Our process says council needs to give us the authority to spend that money. We'll come back with the consultant selection that you all would approve, but we're going to get that rfq out on the street even before February because we know we're doing all those

[9:31:38 AM]

corridors. Those were specifically identified in the resolution and in the bond document and in the ballot that the voters approved. So we know those. >> Mayor Adler: That one I'm more clear on, recognizing that Brodie lane is different than William cannon and slaughter and those documents, so it comes from a different funding bucket, William cannon and slaughter versus Brodie. That one I'm clear on. That one was really laid out. I think in community, when we start spending money on bikeways, for example, or start spending money on safety vision zero or on sidewalks or urban trails or even capital renewal projects, before we start spending any of that money I think the community and the council needs to know what bikeways and how are you deciding bikeways. >> February. >> Mayor Adler: Safety vision zero and at a time when the council can weigh in and say or the community can say that is not what we want to do. We'd rather do something else. My understanding is that on Thursday our launching this does not commit us are and the community will still have time to talk about each of these things and to say the capital renewal projects, you have six million dollars, but we don't want you to spend it on that one. We want it spent on this one. But all those decisions are made February, save and except, perhaps, starting on the preliminary engineering on the corridors because they were very specific and the corridor coordinator that we know we have to get engaged. Everything else is setting us up for that February discussion. >> And even the capital renewal projects were specifically identified. There were only a few. The William cannon bridge overpass, fallwell lane. Those were specifically identified. We may launch design rfqs to get on the street again, but I get where your concerns are and it will be unveiled in February. We're working real hard to work that entire program together so you can see what that looks like. Again, the first year will

[9:33:39 AM]

be more in forecast than year six. >> Mayor Adler: Perfect. And while the universe for the projects is very limited, there's not enough money to do them all. So what we had told the voters was the staff would come back to priorities that the community could see that we would still pass on. Ms. Kitchen? >> Kitchen: Okay. Just a couple of follow-up questions. I guess I understand what you're saying. So for example, the four million for the corridor mobility program, that will be spent -- help me understand if I'm correct. That is for -- for consultants to start the process. What exactly does that pay for, I'm sorry? >> You all have asked or directed in the resolution and the contract with the voters that we would come

back with a corridor construction program that prioritizes that corridor work with the criteria you've given us to prioritize, reduce congestion, all that whole list. That corridor consultant that there's an rfq on the street, the solution is due back to us December 15th. And that consultant will help us look at all the preliminary reports that have been done, the new information we have, the criteria that you've put together and come back then. This is how we recommend based on that criteria biggest bang for the buck that you spend the 482 until dollars on those corridors. And council would approve that and then we would launch design for those corridors and construction in the future years. >> Kitchen: What I'm thinking about is that one of the things we said on the corridors is that we would do the planning -- planning is probably not the right term, but we would do that initial step for the corridors that that had not occurred on yet, which I believe was William cannon and slaughter, and that we may have to do some updates on that phase for some of the others that already have corridor plans. So does this four million

[9:35:39 AM]

pay for that actual work? >> Won't pay for all of that work, but that's where we'll come back in April and add additional funds required. So the memo it explains that you're exactly right. William cannon and slaughter, we're going to use an existing rotation list to pull the engineers off of that so we don't have to resolicit for that. But we need approval to spend that money, engage that contractor, that consultant right now. >> Kitchen: And this four million will let you do that. >> That gets us going on all these preliminaries. >> Kitchen: Part of our concern there was to make sure in order for you to really bring back a schedule you had to bring all of them up. In other words, the two that didn't have studies on them at all needed to be started right away so they didn't lag behind in the potential implementation process. >> William cannon and slaughter are critical in the corridor process. We need to get that information on the consultant and staff to be able to annualize all that stuff in the bucket, spin it around and come back with a recommendation on priorities. >> Kitchen: Go ahead. I have other questions, but you should go. >> Mayor Adler: We'll go to Ms. Houston and then Ms. Garza. >> Thank you, mayor. I appreciate you laying this out. My question is regarding the vision zero. Why are we waiting to delay that? I thought they had a plan that could -- with the number of traffic fatalities we're having, why can't we go ahead and implement their plan because we've already given them some money? I don't have the exact amount. >> We're not waiting. This initial tranche of funding will help us begin the design work. We'll come back in February and tell you those projects. We had given a list of the most dangerous intersections. We're going off that list. So that will come back quickly. So this will jumpstart it. So we're not waiting for anything to get going on these programs. By February you'll see it all laid out and then we'll start spending that money at that point. >> So the information that vision zero has given us for

[9:37:40 AM]

the past couple of years, that's not enough. >> It is. That's the framework. Just like, for example, on the sidewalks, we're using the sidewalk master plan. We're using for bikeways, the bicycle master plan. For the dangerous intersections, the vision zero information. Those are all fundamentals that we're using as we move forward. >> Houston: Okay. I just think that's important as having more and more traffic

fatalities. >> Absolutely. >> Houston: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: Yes. Ms. Garza is next. >> Garza: Back to William cannon and slaughter, can you remind me is it the entire William cannon and slaughter or is it a block to a block? >> The -- it's not defined in the report. We're doing the entire corridor in this look to figure out begin the biggest bang for the buck, what the best segment of that corridor might work as we move forward. >> Pool: I just had a question about staffing. Where does that piece fit into the long range plan. >> The interim city manager Elaine hart said in her memo, we're trying to use as many existing staff resources as we can. We know we'll need more staff as we move forward in this aggressive fan, but this early out action that we're asking for in this point doesn't add staff. It adds consultants to come in and support staff. We expect in April we'll be coming back with a better analysis about the staff required as we move forward. But the manager has told us clearly we're trying to use existing resources and prioritize them in this new way as much as possible so we're minimizing the staff request at this point, but we will have to come back in April and ask for more staff to help us. >> Pool: I think that was the understanding when we were discussing the bonds earlier this year. So great. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: >> Kitchen:? >> A follow-up question then.

[9:39:42 AM]

On the 20 million bucket. So for example, the three million on the safe routes to school, if I'm understanding correctly that money will be used at this point, will not be spent on constructing or even identifying which -- which sidewalks, right? In other words, is the preliminary work to hire the consultants, but you're not yet starting any of this work in terms of construction? >> Staff is already beginning to work with the school districts, but she doesn't have this relationship and with council offices. We'll try to identify some early out projects in that program as well for safe routes to school. These funds -- I'm sorry this is confusing, but these funds give us the authority if we -- after February when you all see that if we need a consultant contract quickly or we need a contractor on board to do a sidewalk within a school that we've already identified with the council offices and early out program, we're ready to go. We have funds then to launch that. But you won't -- we won't spend those funds until you see those projects. >> Kitchen: That's what I wanted to make sure I was understanding. >> This gives us the authority to do it. As soon as you all see it in February and say go do it, then we're launched. We could have come back and perhaps we could have come back in February and done this altogether, but as I mentioned earlier, this was a sign to staff especially and to the community and council that we're doing things differently. So instead of six months it was 35 days to have this back in front of you. >> Kitchen: No, I think that's great. The vision zero or the list of the most dangerous intersections provided as part of the bond package is a little more objective and straightforward. We can point to okay, this is the order. But some of these others we don't know that yet. And in some cases the

[9:41:42 AM]

criteria, we've had some discussion about in some cases perhaps updating criteria. So that's why I'm just trying to understand. I think I understand now. So in February you'll bring us the list of projects, in what order, and what the criteria was for determining that, and that will all happen before those projects are picked. And I'm talking about for the bigger buckets of things, like the sidewalks and the safe route to

school and the capital renewal projects, is that correct? >> That's correct. And let me clarify something on the safe routes to school. As you mentioned the sidewalks and dangerous intersections and the bikeways, we have master plans and lists for those. Safe route to school, this is more funding than the program has ever had and we don't have a master plan or priorities of how we fund a pedestrian hybrid beacon versus a sidewalk, so we will likely come back at some point to ask for a consultant to help us develop what should be the priorities and criteria we use after some of these early out projects to develop the safe route to school program the next few years. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> So that's a foundation we don't really have. The other ones we have master plans to fall back on. We've seen that and we've seen those as fundamentals to begin that list in February so you can see what we want you to move forward with. >> Kitchen: That's helpful. The sidewalk master plan, the bicycle master plan, those are great, but they were done a number of years ago. So we had some discussion during the bond process that they may need some updating in terms of how priorities are set on these projects. So I just want to not lose that discussion that we had, which was that there were some -- that's why I'm asking that the criteria also be presented. So that we can understand that and we understand that we still have the

[9:43:44 AM]

flexibility that some adjustments need to be made or the plans updated. >> Absolutely. And we shared this with the mobility community. Fortunately or unfortunately we have so many needs in the community we don't have enough funds to complete all of those so we have some choices then. We'll have a sidewalk in your district, three or four that are about equal priorities, but we don't have enough funds to complete all three or four of them so let's choose which one we want to move forward. So we certainly need council input in that February time frame on especially those early out projects. So we're looking forward to that discussion. >> Okay. The last question about the February time frame. We -- the resolution contemplates -- I think that's what you might be working off of when you mention February, the 90-daytime frame. >> Right. >> Kitchen: It mentions a report to the mobility committee and a report to the full council. So is that what your thinking is that we'll go to mobility committee and then go to full council? >> Certainly we'll have that on our schedule to try to do that in February. >> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Pool: One last question on the sidewalks. I think I remember during our conversation about the safe routes to schools that aid would be involved in those conversations too because they have-- we would like to have input on where the sidewalks would be located. >> Absolutely. The safe route to school we work with the schools involved and it's a great pip as we work forward what the school thinks is important. They know their kids and their community and their neighborhood. So we work directly with them. The resolution also says to work with the council offices. So we'll be with each office and school district. The school itself to figure out what's the best route -- the best construction improvements for those safe routes. >> Pool: Great, thank you. >> Houston: Mayor? I want to just say that I appreciate councilmember kitchen's advice that some of the plans that you reference have been outdated and also were very inclusive

[9:45:47 AM]

and not very -- exclusive and not very inclusive. So I think it would be very-ful to have those

conversations with the offices to there can be tweaks because some people didn't go off as far as I did on Lamar. So we need to make sure that we're not locked into those plans as they were historically done and have some ability to modify them as the need now exists. >> Absolutely. This is one caveat as we're moving so fast that I want to caution council that we want to take the time to make sure that we're making the right decisions. So many things need to be refreshed. The corridor studies that we've talked about many times were done quite a few years ago so the first tasks were doing was trying to fresh what we know now and take that information into account as we make decisions moving forward on projects to complete. >> Mayor Adler: Anything else on the bonds? Again, I am real excited that you guys are coming out of the box so fast on this. Thank you. Next thing that's pulled on here is the grove. I pulled all the grove items here on 29, 30, also down to 75 just to give the council the opportunity at this table to talk about this before it comes up on Thursday, provide opportunity for people to talk about they wanted to have that opportunity. Does anybody want to say anything at this point? Leslie? >> Pool: I think we're looking at requesting, a couple of us have wanted a 4:00 time certain to take that up. >> Mayor Adler: No earlier

[9:47:48 AM]

than 4:00 P.M.? >> Pool: Right, no earlier than 4:00. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: My sense is if we wait until 4:00 to bring this up, we leave -- we stop for music at a certain time. My guess is we probably won't get to Austin oaks at 6:30. Just because I think it will push into the evening. But the other alternative would be to reserve for us the ability to start an hour earlier in hopes of being able to -- I would imagine Austin there would be amendments and obviously a lot of discussion. While the public hearing has been closed, I would imagine there's going to be a lot of conversation on the dais. >> Pool: I think we can work with that. I also wanted to mention that on Thursday -- was it last Tuesday we talked about an archaeological monitor for the site. And my staff and some of the stakeholders in the community who do this kind of work, talked with the applicant and they are amenable having a monitor and archaeological monitor on this site during the construction and then we made sure to get the site analysis that was done in 2014 out to the various folks who wanted to see it and I'm hoping to get feedback from folks to let he know any additional questions or issues they may have with that. But I was really please, sirred to see that it was an idea that was acceptable to all parties. So I think I'll probably have an amendment along those lines on Thursday. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ms. Kitchen? >> Kitchen: When you said start an hour early, did you mean start the grove at 3:00? >> Mayor Adler: To leave us the opportunity to start at 3:00. Let's work through as much of the other stuff on the agenda as we can because I imagine we'll have people showing up for the Austin oaks pud. If we're going to say that we're going do that after our break because that would

[9:49:49 AM]

put that starting at 6:30, as much as we can clear out before that starts I'd like to do. So my preference would be to not set a no sooner than 4:00 on grove, but enable us on the dais to be able to call that up earlier. If we did that at 3:00, that sounds more reasonable and gives us an additional hour. And goodness knows there's a lot we can have to work through before 3:00, but I think we should try to

work through as much of that as we can so we have time to be able to visit beginning at about 3:00. >> Kitchen: Okay. I -- I pulled also item 31 just to -- just to explain to folks in case anybody has a question. This is the one that I've been talking about which is the pilot program for employee-assisted housing. The way we had to do this is we had to do both a resolution and language in the pud agreement. So the resolution authorizes our staff to move forward with the pilot program and then the -- I have a motion sheet that we're working out the exact language on for the language that will actually go into the pud agreement. The motion sheet speaks to what the -- what the responsibilities are of the developer or landowner, which is essentially just affirmatively marketing housing opportunities to the employers and employees within a two-mile radius. So that language is in the motion sheet and then the resolution authorizes our staff to provide the funding to support the pilot program and just some language around that. It's the same language that I passed out before. And I want to also clarify that the funding for this from the city's perspective

[9:51:49 AM]

is not to pay for the housing. This kind of pilot program is set up where the employer that participates paid the difference between the affordable housing level and differential. So the employer pays the differential between the employee's income, which is approximately 40% of mfi, which is what we're expecting for the employees that may participant. And affordable units at the grove, which would be approximately 60% mfi. So that's where that funding comes to pay for that differential. The funding I'm referencing authorizes the staff to move forward with is just any funding they might need as staff to actually work with this pilot program. So hopefully that's -- hopefully that's clear. Do you guys have any questions about that? >> Mayor Adler: I'm going to need to look at it. I didn't quite understand it, but I think I need to sit down with it, but I love the purpose of it. >> Kitchen: So at this point can you identify any questions you might have? No? I think the other thing to remember that some people have asked me about is this resolution does not attempt to create the details of the pilot program. The kinds of details about exactly who is eligible and how long they're eligible and how that would be done, that is something that our staff would work out with the employers that are participating. So that level of detail is not appropriate at this point. What's appropriate at this point is authorizing our staff to move forward with this pilot program. And then directing in our pud agreement that the expectation is that the developer would participate, developer/landowner. I guess landowner is the appropriate term. But the landowner will participate and will market those units to employers that may participate in this program. So we're hopeful, of course. This is not the kind of pilot program that you can say -- we cannot require an

[9:53:50 AM]

employer to participate. But this is an effort to -- these kinds of employer assisted housing programs have been done in other cities and they're a way to tap into another segment of the community to assist with affordable housing and they show returns for employers. So this gives us a great opportunity in our community to pilot a program, show the results and then hopefully continue to work with employers in the community to help out their low wage employees. And it assists employers with things like

retention, productivity, and it helps the employees, of course, with housing and transportation and those kinds of things. >> Mayor Adler: All right, thank you. Did you have something? Next topic? Next pool. >> Pool: I think that is a great initiative in particularly as it could from the employer's perspective ensure that staff aren't delayed by traffic and that sort of thing. So attendance and everything would be improved. I would like to see an element in with what the staff brings back or is looking at whenever they define this, I would like to understand if the employer is paying the delta between the -- what the staffer can afford and what the unit costs, and if the employer -- if that employee advances in the job and their salary goes up, does that narrow down the delta of what the employer would then pay? And if that delta gets to zero, what happens when that element disappears? Do you know? >> Kitchen: I think that a briefing from staff would be fine. I really would be concerned about as a council trying to determine those criteria because this is a pilot

[9:55:53 AM]

program. In order for it to work the employer has to frame it with our staff in the way that it will work. I really don't want us dictating what those requirements are because the kinds of -- I think that is absolutely critical because we don't want to be saying "Employer, you must do this, this and this." First off, the employer is paying the differential. So they have to design the program in a way that matches their goals and that's part of what they're trying to prove with the pilot is that you can as an employer make sense for you because it's employee retention. There's such a churn of low wage employees because they can't get there, they can't afford it because of transportation and lots of things like that. I think we really have to leave the flexibility. I think a report back to us would be great so that we can hear how it's going, but I don't want to get into a situation where we're trying to tell our staff and the employer how to design it. >> Pool: And I don't think I was -- I don't think I was -- >> Kitchen: I don't mean that for you. I'm just saying that for everyone else. >> Pool: I don't think I was suggesting that, but if the intention of the program is to help low wage workers live nearby where they work and the day arrives that they are still working there, but they're not a low wage worker anymore, then by the very definition of the program is it still a program that is helping with retention based on a salary level? >> Could I speak to that? It could. It certainly could be. The details of that individual's circumstance we can't know, and I wouldn't want the employer to be stuck with a provision that says, okay, this person's salary was raised by a little bit and so now maybe

[9:57:54 AM]

they're one dollar over. So they're going to have to follow the objective criteria that we set for that. I think we have to allow the folks in this wage level, they're not going to be jumping from here to here. Unfortunately it doesn't happen like that. And I just think it's really important that we allow the staff to work on this program with the employers to tell them they have to do this or that. >> Pool: I don't think it has to be anything specific, but I think it will be asked and I would like to ask it early in the process and have staff have a look at it and talk with the employer as well. And if the employer is the one managing the program, the employer is going to want to have input and the flexibility into how it works. And if the program is going to be in place for a long time, it could be that -- we just don't even know. So I'm curious

I'm curious and would just like to see what staff and the various employers come back to us with. Again, I'm not trying to put any criteria on, but it is, I think, a reasonable question from a policy perspective >> Yeah, Rosie Truelove, interim director of neighborhood housing and community development. Your point is well made as is councilmember Kitchen's. We don't have the detail of the program yet. That's a good question that we can think about and raise as we're trying to formulate the program, but I think it's possible that things could vary slightly, even if we have more than one employer that's interested in participating in this, they could have some criteria that's applicable to their employees that could be different from another one's and we have to have that

[9:59:55 AM]

flexibility in our minds as we're going into it, to see if we can make it work, but it's a good point that's raised and noted. >> Pool: Thank you. That sounds good. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar. >> Casar: If it's appropriate now, I do want to pass out some potential amendments that I want -- I don't have a particular preferred amendment at this time, but some ideas for providing more affordable housing and guaranteeing that on-site getting more units than we had in our last reading. What might actually be helpful, is it possible for me to get it up on that screen and stand up there. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. >> Casar: As I talk through this? My staff has been working hard and talked to nhcd about the methodology of this, so I will hop over there and explain it so that folks know what I'm talking about. So what we have on this chart is what we currently have on the table in the far left column, which is second reading with the office space reduced, producing 139 affordable units. Since before the mediation, I know that I and several other councilmembers had been discussing how we could get more affordable units. What I had been urging was for us to get to over 160 units. And that would hopefully provide us over 14% of the rental units and over 7.5% or about 7.5% of the ownership units as below-market rate. And one potential option is here in the second column, which says second reading, keeping the office space reduced and getting it over 160 units. So I just want to walk through for people that it seems to me that we could still get over

[10:02:01 AM]

160 units without utilizing other levers like the square footage of the office space. The subsidy for -- and the cost of getting over 160 units is about \$4.3 million. And in, you know, push to go get the best deal that we can, right now what -- my understanding of what is on the table is that would require the city to cover 3.4 of those 4.3, which we would get the last \$900,000 from the developer, and the city putting up \$13.6 million of the cost, ultimately achieving 162 affordable units. That's a great thing. And the bottom line here is the subsidy per unit for the city, which is about 83.9 -- \$38,950. From our -- \$83,950. From our housing meeting we had discussion on our strategic housing plan and I believe the number was between 120,000 to \$130,000. Even at \$84,000 a unit in one of the highest opportunity areas in the city it still seems like a pretty -- like a viable option. We're getting it for less because this is part of a P.U.D. And part of an entitlement bonus program, and so that's how we can get units at less than we do when our sort of traditional housing deals. So that's still a pretty good number. And that leaves the office space at reduced by 25,000 square feet. If I'll recall from the zap recommendation to what we passed on

second reading we reduced the office space by 25,000 square feet. What I asked was and I believe other councilmembers pressed on this point as well, if we

[10:04:01 AM]

put office space on the table and we say what -- how much would it cost us to get to over 160 affordable units if we restored the office space back to where it was, where zap recommended it, so I'll see here in the bottom column instead of minus 25,000 an office we would leave the office space where it was recommended by zap, we could achieve those 160 affordable units now by only investing 2.2 million more from the affordable housing trust fund. At that point we're essentially going 50/50, us putting up just over 2 million, the developer putting in just over 2 million for us to achieve those extra units to get us over 160. And I would see that as sort of a middle ground, where we could utilize the office space lever and some additional city subsidy to get ourselves to over 160 affordable units if the project is fully built out. The third column here was something that was in discussion before mediation in which we would grant 50,000 in office space above what zap recommended and in that case you can see that we can achieve over 160 units of affordable housing, only putting \$1.2 million from the city's side. You can see down here in this column. And the developer would put up the remaining 4 million in subsidy there. Ultimately in this final column the city is putting in fewer dollars and leveraging a lot from the developer, but that would require \$50,000 in office above and beyond what zap recommended. Only reason I lay this out here is not because I necessarily had a preferred option and we can actually even mix and match some of these options but since this has become a cornerstone of our conversation around the

[10:06:02 AM]

grove and other projects I think it's good for us to have a transparent look at the various offers on the table and for us to understand that if we want to achieve more affordable units and guarantee that we're going to get them because weekend that -- we understand that P.U.D.S are this voluntary process, we can commit more subsidy and, frankly, we're getting a pretty good deal at this location for how much we're putting in per unit, especially given how expensive the neighborhood is. But the other tool on the table is for us to utilize density and utilize the office space as a chip and lever for us to get more affordable units. If y'all have any questions about this, I just wanted to run us through it at the highest level possible, but this essentially, as far as I can tell -- and I haven't gotten nhcd totally caught up on this, compares with how we would get from our existing 16 -- to a guaranteed 162 if this was fully built out ask it amounts from higher amounts of subsidy to lower amounts of subsidy required by the city but in exchange for the lower amount of subsidy utilizing office space as the lever and the chip provided by the city to get us those additional units. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: Thank you, councilmember Casar. I think this is really interesting work. I need to ask a few questions and I apologize if this was something covered in last week's public hearing. I haven't had an opportunity to hear all of that yet. Can you help me understand where the calculations are coming from? Are these numbers from the developer? >> Casar: No. >> Tovo: With regard to the total cost. I think before I left last Tuesday there was an assertion that three-fourths of the housing was being -- of the cost of the housing was being paid by the developer but I never -- I believe my staff has requested some information

[10:08:03 AM]

about how that calculation was arrived at, but it sounds like maybe you have some numbers. >> Casar: No. So my understanding [overlapping speakers] is that neighborhood housing has been able to calculate, especially for column 1, and verify the amount of subsidy required, the actual cost of an -- an opportunity cost of the below market rate units. And so essentially, just to answer your question, the methodology was one that we've worked with nhcd and talked to them -- talked with them about. The amount of units is of course a negotiation and so it's been offers that we have received for this development. That didn't have water in it. >> Tovo: The number of units is clear. >> Casar: Exactly. So the number of units is how much it is that we -- yeah, the number of units is our ask,. >> Tovo: Mm-hmm. >> Casar: And of course it's a negotiation and so it's the amount -- the amount the developer puts up versus how much the city would be willing to put up is just confirmed offers from the developer. But then the actual cost and subsidy per unit has been something that nhcd confirmed during the last meeting and then we just utilized that same formula to calculate the cost to the developer and the cost to the city in the speed through my own council office. >> Tovo: It sounds like -- and I will go back to the tape but I think what would be easier and, again, I think my staff requested this but if not I will submit it through the q&a and maybe that's appropriate so the public can see it away. If you can through the q&a provide the formula and calculations that have allowed for a total cost for there to be an amount that is the total cost of the developer's, in particular I'm interested to know whether you've gotten those figures from the developer about what their total cost is, what is that per square foot, and how these

[10:10:05 AM]

total costs to the developer has been arrived at, as well the total subsidy. I assume the total subsidy to the city is pretty clear cut because we know how much we're going to have to put in to get those units and those are also I assume based on per square footage cost to the developers but, again, I really would like to understand those back. The calculations and the formulas that gave rise to those. >> Sure. We've provided some of that information but we'll provide it again through the q&a and try and break it down so that it's clearly laid out. >> Tovo: That would be really helpful. And then where are we in -- and I apologize. It's likely somewhere in our ordinance or somewhere else, but is there language anywhere in this agreement that talks about the bedroom count on these units beyond square footage but in expectation of bedroom count? >> Gina with neighborhood housing. There is a language in the ordinance that requires a proportional mix for both the rental and the ownership. And on the ownership, at least 50% of the units that are affordable must be two bedroom. >> Tovo: And has there been any conversation with the developer about changing those so that it's maybe not proportional? I mean, one of the things that continues to happen is that it's cost effective for the developers and it's marketably attractive to do lots of efficiencies in one bedrooms, and I would really like to see this affordable housing serve families with children or other family members. And so can we shift that from proportional mix to some expectations about minimum. >> Bedroom count. >> Tovo: Minimum number of apartments with bedrooms [indiscernible] In the same way you did for ownership.

[10:12:07 AM]

The 50%, as I understood what you were saying and as my memory of the ordinance talks about 50% of those, as you said, be two bedroom or more. Can the same minimum standards be set for rental? >> I believe so, if they're proposing to do two bedroom. >> Tovo: For 50% of the units? >> Yes. >> We can go back and have a conversation with the developer and community wheel house and get that clarified. >> Tovo: All right, thanks. >> Casar: Thanks. Are there other questions on this? I'm just interested to hear what folks think. >> Pool: Thanks. This is great. I -- in one of the amendments that I had put forward on the affordable housing I was targeting 167 to 168 so this moves in that direction. I wanted to just check in on the ownership at 120mfi. My understanding that was an error in the document, the mediated agreement, that the agreement was actually 80% was the top because we really are trying to get lower income folks and I think that that was one of the errors that was worked out with the two parties. So we may need to rework this and put that 120 mfi down to 180 and I don't know if that means 46 or 56 or what but that is a calculation that can be adjusted. I'm gonna want to spend more time with this, see where we're at. My inclination is, you know, I want to see as much affordable housing as we can get in there. This was a -- so we'll see where we are I guess on Thursday. I have concerns about taking the cap off of the office spaces, as you recognize. >> Casar: Yeah. >> Pool: So if there's some ways we can do this without moving in that direction I think it would be beneficial for the entire development.

[10:14:07 AM]

Thank you. >> Casar: And thank you for your consideration of it, and if folks have questions and you can't talk to me -- you can talk to me, always swing by and do so or post it on the message board. I understand the sensitivity around the mediated agreement and amount of office currently existing, and I really, you know, appreciate and respect many of the neighbors who have fought really hard to get some of their concerns addressed. And I want to make sure that I'm respectful of that work and also fair. You know, some folks in my district have spoken to me and brought up to me there's a similarly size the parcel in the highland malredevelopment, there's different characteristics and different history to that parcel but we're doing over 800,000 square feet of office on that 80-acre parse expel so 200 -- going from 185,000 on this tract to just over 200,000 on this tract in order to get to some of this affordable housing is something that I would ask the council to think about and consider and something that I would want to meet with the bcrc and other people about because I want to make sure that we're fair and thoughtful while wisely using the house trust fund and if we ramp up the office we don't have to invest as much housing trust fund to get over that 160. And I do think that it will be helpful to take a look at those 120 mfi home ownership units and see how we can get them to 80 and if there were any mistakes in the mediated agreement that would be helpful for know understand as well. >> Pool: I had another question. What kind of time line do we have on this sort of thing? My understanding is the build without would take place over considerable number of years. How then does the cost to the city -- when do we start paying? How does that time line work? Do we wait until ground is broken and the units are

[10:16:09 AM]

built? I think one of the things for government is you can't pay something until you actually have the result. Or that might not apply here, but can you help me understand what the time line is and how many -- how much money we would be paying at what point. >> I would estimate -- so the time line, I think, is ten year build-out, could be more. And we anticipate that those payments would be made as units are delivered. >> Pool: All right. So it wouldn't be a hit in one annual budget. It would be spread out over a period of time that's currently not really defined because nothing has started yet. >> That's correct. Since we're talking about the funding source being the property tax revenues that the offshoot into the housing trust fund, that would make sense it would be more of an in time as things are delivered rather than some advanced kind of thing. >> Pool: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Do you have a feel for what the contribution is to the housing trust fund from this development? >> I don't have that yet. Staff has been working with financial services and I don't think we've gotten an answer on that but we can check on that and get back to you. >> Mayor Adler: Would you check on that and let the council know that number? >> Absolutely. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: So if I understood the question you just asked it would be what -- how much we would have to take from the affordable housing trust fund to come up with a subsidy? Was that your question? >> Mayor Adler: That I can see. What I'd like to know is if there's more coming into the trust fund from this development than we're pulling out from the trust fund. The question I asked was how much is going into the housing trust fund through the ad valorem tax increment on this tract. >> Tovo: Is it certain we

[10:18:10 AM]

would use the affordable housing trust fund for the subsidy? We could also use general obligation bond funds. >> We could use general obligation funds. That's in my mind a bit more problematic. It's a pretty significant break from precedent interest what we've done in the past. We haven't gone through review process, not something we talked to the voters about necessarily. We would have to earmark funds in the future that might even take us beyond the current bond series that we're in. >> Tovo: I see. >> So it's got some problems but it's not technically infeasible. >> Tovo: Thank you for those considerations. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, Ms. Kitchen. >> Kitchen: I'll just add I wouldn't want to not go through the bond review process. I think it's important that we keep with that. >> Agree. >> Tovo: Yeah. I appreciate the considerations. I'm in agreement that there would be some problems on that front. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mr. Casar. >> Casar: Because I know we'll be short on time on Thursday I've gotten a sense from some of councilmember pool's initial thoughts, does anybody else -- I don't want to put myself through a best of your knowledge of meetings asking folks about how they feel about these two. Are there other folks that are open to considering looking at leveraging some of the office space to subsidize some of the housing as opposed to the money? I know folks are really fresh with the spreadsheet. I'm not asking you to comment on that. But if anybody has anything else I'd be interested in knowing. >> Kitchen: I'd say I'm open to getting more housing. I don't know yet what -- you know, I want to honor the mediated settlement. I also think it's very important to get more affordable housing so I'd have to think about the route to do that. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: Yeah. I really appreciate, as I said at the hearing last week, the work that went into the mediated settlement. But as I said when we sent

[10:20:11 AM]

people off to do that mediation, it was really important to me to make sure that this project meets some important city goals and affordable housing is in my mind one of the key ones. So I'm gonna really consider these options in light of how they yield to affordable housing and meet community values while stick to go the spirit of the mediated agreement. But I really appreciate the work that's gone into seeing how we can achieve some of those, so thank you. >> Renteria: Mayor, I also feel like we're not getting the amount of -- amount of affordable housing that I had planned, I had hoped for, you know. This is an opportunity that, you know, we should really look at increasing the affordable housing, especially in this area. So I'm gonna be leaning toward adding more affordable housing to this. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston. >> Houston: I think it's an interesting way to look at it. And so thank you for bringing this to us. My balance is between the affordable housing and the additional traffic, that there using the commercial space will bring. Those those are the kinds of things that I'll be looking at. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Garza. >> Garza: Yeah. And I really feel like this addresses a lot. You know, we could not -- we could leave it as the mediated agreement and see the options available to us. For me, I feel like we should be - I frankly -- I'm okay with adding more office space and keeping the subsidy down. If that means we can build 20 more affordable units somewhere else in the city, that's what I would support. So I think this -- I've said it a million times. This is an amazing opportunity to put some very necessary affordable housing in the part

[10:22:11 AM]

of the city that we won't have a chance like this for a while. And I think we have to be really serious about saying that affordable housing is important and understanding that there are ways for us to get there, and this provides three options for us to get more affordable housing for this development. And I know -- I don't know if we're moving on to something else, but I also -- my big issues in these kind of developments are how much affordable housing can we get and connectivity and unfortunately I wasn't able to be here for second reading but I feel like that agreement is -- like that agreement took away two of the most important things to me. It took away some affordable housing and it took away connectivity. And I'm really concerned about those two things. So if I had to choose between the most I guess some would consider maybe extreme options here and connectivity, I would pick affordable housing. I'm not gonna say -- I understand there's big issues about that, you know, that Jackson, and so if I had to choose between the two I would pick one of these options and possibly be okay with that, the loss of that connectivity. I have big concerns about that because that was where -- I think that was capital metro's planned turn-around. As a member of the capital metro board that's important to me as well. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston, did you have Ms. Kitchen? >> Kitchen: I have a question. So when I look at the details on this, my question would just be the extent to which your numbers depend on the buckets you put the additional in. Because I'm noticing that on the rental most of it goes into the 80 mfi, not the 60 mfi. I would be concerned about that. I think we're -- I think we need more in the 60 mfi

[10:24:13 AM]

bucket. So I don't know how much your numbers are dependent on that, but I would rather see if we're

gonna do some shifting I'd rather at least see it equally shifted in that direction. I'm also concerned about -- we already talked about the 120 mfi because we've got the same thing going on in the ownership. And so I would want better distribution across those, and if it was just me I'd put it all in 60. >> Casar: And if it were I, I would do the same. I think what you would likely see is to continue to see that required city contribution go up and we would continue having trouble leveraging continued developer dollars in that respect. And so by giving that piece of feedback, I feel the same way, I would be interested in seeing if we shall push for some of those units at 60. However, I think then if the city subsidy starts getting really large and we're starting to pay over 85, over \$90,000 a unit down here in the bottom, that's where I see, frankly, restoring the office to zap levels, for example, as a potential tool for bringing down the city's subsidy because instead of putting in dollars we are restoring office. And so I think that ultimately those 60% mfi units are extremely important and they obviously cost more. And we -- I think, you know, this work session here is ultimately also directed at the developers to sort of push a negotiation and see how much it is we can ultimately get. And so if we can -- if we're willing to try to get there I think it may continue to be a required push for us to think about, both entitlement and subsidy, for us to get there. >> Kitchen: It might be useful to see the numbers. >> Casar: Yeah. >> Kitchen: With that kind of option. >> Casar: Yeah. Thank you for bringing that up. And councilmember Garza, thank you for letting me know a little bit about your position

[10:26:14 AM]

on that. I am interested in hearing about Jackson from our transportation staff just so that I can sort of also have some idea of where the levers are to pull because for me, the affordable housing component is the most important but I do want to know what the impact to the city is on that Jackson connection and we didn't have time for me to fully understand that during the last council meeting. So we could do that either on Thursday or I'd be interested in hearing just a little bit about it today. >> Mayor Adler: By way of feedback, I'm also interested in trying to get more affordable housing here, and I think you've done a good job of kind of setting out the levers. I mean, as -- it's obviously what we would like to have, is 30% and the highest possible number. There's a cost associated both with having the highest possible number and driving to 30%. So the cost associated with the unit is the spread between the market rent and the subsidized rent. So the spread gets greater the greater the -- how deep you want to go with affordability. So if you take a unit in this neighborhood and put it at 120%, that's a pretty significant discount just because of where this property is. Which is why it's such a valuable opportunity for affordable housing, because even people at 120% of median family income can't live here -- can't buy here. So you get more units if you go only to 120% mfi. For the same amount of money you can go down to 30% mfi but then the spread between market and subsidized rent is even greater. So for the same amount of money, you get fewer units. So I think what this shows, going back to councilmember kitchen's question, those are

[10:28:14 AM]

the levers. It would be possible under any one of these to have more at 60% and to keep the math exactly the same, but then the number of units would go down. Or you can keep the number of units up,

or you can make the developer pay more or you could go into the more of the trust funds. So those I think are all the levers and I think this helps. My flexibility is probably a little bit different than what you just said because my understanding is that we pay on the average about \$120,000 a unit when we do this kind of affordable residences. And most of the residences that we do are not in as high opportunity area as this, which means that the spread between the market in this area and the 60% mfi or 80% mfi is greater here than it would be in projects in many of the other parts of our city. The 60% mfi or the 80% mfi stays constant, and what changes is that the market value of the unit is higher. So if our Normal investment, average investment, is at 120% per door and we can drive units here at less than what the average amount is. Then I would -- obviously on Thursday or before then take advice from housing people but it almost seems like we would want to max out as much of that as we can, still keeping the character of a mixed income opportunity so you still have those benefits. But I'm not sure there's a better place for us to spend our housing trust fund dollars than on a project like this if you can get really high opportunity at a relatively lower cost. So that's one of the things that I'd be taking a look at

[10:30:15 AM]

with respect to this. And my tolerance for where we invest the money probably would be higher at the end of the project. >> Casar: And I think that what I'm hearing from folks is there may be some mixing and matching of what's available here that folks are interested in. If we want to drive to a lower mfi and folks are willing to continue paying for more subsidy given the lowest -- pretty low cost per unit that we're getting in this deal, then maybe there is a way of both getting to lower mfi here and even adding more units by seeing if we can just put the office space maybe right around where zap was, putting in a little extra money, and seeing what the offer is in return. And of course if the offer in return is not sufficient to meet the council's expectations then we just wouldn't do it because as we know, this is all ultimately a negotiation. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool and then Ms. Kitchen. >> Pool: Wanted to address the number of affordable units because I think it's really important. The -- where the applicant was before mediation and where the applicant was after mediation and what that change was. It's not really reflected on here because what councilmember Casar is showing us is what came out after the mediation but I want it to be clear the applicant had offered 109 units, additional 30%, additional 30 units came from the mediation. My amendment was the higher number, about 167. So I just wanted to make sure everybody knew the additional affordable units came from the mediation and came from the neighborhood parties who really pressed and have been talking for a long time about their desire to have more. They would like to have more. I think the question for us is -- and I think it has been answered, frankly, in their conversations, to the extent they've been able to talk to each of you individually, is

[10:32:17 AM]

increasing the office space is going to overwhelm this area and if the cost is to get additional affordable units, what I would ask is two things. How does this affordable housing plan integrate with the pilot that councilmember kitchen is looking at, which is their subsidies or matches from employers in the areas so that would also reduce -- I don't know if that's after it's built but it goes to how much is spent to live in

that unit. And so I think there may be some elasticity there and support so that maybe we don't have to go into the housing trust fund. But then the more important question -- actually lingers from the summer of 2014, when the community came to that council then and said, please, let's buy this property and it's a perfect applicant for the 9% tax credit. So if that's the case then maybe that -- I don't know. But I'd like also to explore that because that would help I think with the financing for this area and maybe take some of the pressure off of us using city tax dollars. Or trust fund monies. >> Kitchen: My -- I'm not thinking the pilot helps, and the reason for that is that the thought behind the pilot -- maybe I'm wrong about this but the thought behinds the pilot is the employer pays the differential between like a 40% mfi and 60% mfi, not between 40 and 80 or for the and 120. So it doesn't impact the dollars here. It just makes it possible for the lower-wage workers that work like at Westminster or Seton to get in these units because without the employer-assisted housing they're not eligible at 60% mfi. >> Pool: Then that makes me wonder if maybe, for example, Westminster might like to invest in this development,

[10:34:17 AM]

you know, and build housing for their workers themselves. >> Kitchen: That's a lot of money for -- I doubt that they're gonna want to build housing. >> Pool: Okay. Just a thought. >> Kitchen: You know -- >> And I don't know that we would be able to restrict to a certain employer. Part of what we've been talking about with the employer-assisted housing is having it be kind of a broader call to employers within a certain radius to -- >> Kitchen: I was giving an example. >> Pool: What I'm aiming for is just other ways for us to fund this without increasing the office space because I think that hurts this development and I also want to be real clear over the time line that the monies would be paid out because it sounds like it would be at least ten years so the impact on any one given fiscal year would be minimized. That would be the case in any P.U.D., I would think, including some of the ones we've already approved this year. Then if there are any other creative ways to approach the financing -- and y'all have that expertise. So appreciate anything you guys can bring back to help with the conversation. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: So I think what I'm still trying to understand is really how much city subsidy we have in the additional affordable housing from various means. And so I think the first thing I want to do is ask a question of councilmember pool. You talked about the number of units prior to the mediation being 109 and they be it came out of mediation at wen 39. But as I recall it also came out of mediation with a request to use affordable housing trust fund money for those additional units. Am I remembering that correctly? >> Pool: I think there was interest in -- maybe our staff can respond to that. >> Tovo: Sure. Maybe that's a better question for staff. It seems to me that the increase was -- the increase premediation and post mediation was in part funded by the city.

[10:36:17 AM]

That was part of how that increase was being achieved. >> I think so. >> Tovo: Let me just say it doesn't make it -- I mean, I'm thrilled that the neighborhood supported that goal. I just want to be really clear that it wasn't -- it's not like -- it appeared to me that through the negotiations it wasn't that the developer increased the commitment to providing affordable housing as part of the -- their cost. It was we'll provide this level but it has to be accompanied by this support from the city. >> So we go back to

where we were before we started the mediation, which was 10% rental and 5% ownership. And the amount of city subsidy that was going to potentially come through this concept of the hundred percent fee waivers through smart housing which we know is is is not really something we're -- considering right now. When you look at where these numbers initially started from it was looking at with the goal of the percentages that we were talking be and the different categories they all fall into you got to an affordable housing plan that had a price tag on it and there was a city contribution based on what was potentially coming from the fee waivers and the developer was going to be funding the rest of that affordable housing plan. So then when they came back and the developer proposed the 12.25% rental and the 6.13% ownership, that difference, you know, results in additional funding through the city, which we proposed in lieu of fee waivers on -- we've proposed the housing trust fund, the income that would come from the tax regs. >> Tovo: Okay. So I think to cut to the chase, I think the answer was yes. I mean, part of that increase is being funded by additional

[10:38:17 AM]

city subsidy. >> Yes. >> Tovo: So then I think what I now want to understand is the extent to which the fee waivers are reflected in the chart before us. Does this reflect subsidy based on the affordable housing trust fund or does it also take into account the fee waivers that are coming to the developer as part of a smart housing program? >> So yes. It does take into consideration the development services fee waivers. >> And we would need to break that down to show you what that looks like, and we can work to assist on that so that you can see what amounts we would get through the development services fee waivers and then the balance of that right now as proposed is coming out of the trust fund. >> Tovo: I would absolutely like to see that breakdown. Just to be very clear, there are no other fee waivers contemplated beyond development services? >> Correct. >> Tovo: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: To that -- just to pin on that real fast, just to know what the number is there are some potential fee waivers under smart housing that would relate just to those units that are affordable? >> Tovo: So are we -- >> Mayor Adler: That are not part of this. >> Correct. They are not part of this right now, but we can do capital recovery fees waived on the affordable units if we chose to but then there are restriction that's go along with that. >> Tovo: >> Mayor Adler: I understand. >> Tovo: Are those numbers reflected in these charts? >> The developer has proposed no capital recovery fee waivers. >> Tovo: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: I'd like to know what -- >> Tovo: I believe I remember seeing some of that language codified in the stuff that we saw last week. So it will be -- >> Yes. >> Tovo: They will be restricted from using capital recovery fees, including on the affordable units? >> That is correct. >> Tovo: All right, thanks. >> Mayor Adler: I would just like to though what that number is and what the associated restrictions are. >> We can get you the information on that.

[10:40:18 AM]

We'll get that laid out. >> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry. Thank you, mayor pro tem. Mr. Casar. >> Casar: And from my perspective on the mediated agreement, I do appreciate, I do, that the number of affordable units went up through that mediation. However, I think a lot of us on the council hallway had known and seen that there were options on the table prior to the mediation of going above 160, and so the

challenge for me was coming out of the mediation it didn't hit my mark of trying to get up towards -- up towards, you know, 15% of the rental, 14% of the rental. So the mediation didn't get -- to mayor pro tem tovo's point, I think we said similar thing when the mediation happened, was we wanted the neighbors to work on this but one of our priorities was affordable housing and I appreciate that the mediation got close to that 160 number, but before we went into it I knew we could get to 160 and not seeing it quite get there is a challenge and we could just make it up with a negotiation on subsidy, or we could make it up partly with, you know, some office space in the 25,000 square feet in office essentially buys us a million dollars from this chart in affordable housing subsidy. We could hold on to that million dollars in affordable housing subsidy and spend it somewhere else or we could put it in here because we -- because one or two office tenants would cause traffic concerns. And I sympathize and understand with those traffic concerns, but one or two office tenants is -- seems to me within the realm of what can be negotiated and reasoned and is a hard call. Again, I have to look back at my own district where we're talking about 800,000 square feet of office tenants on an 80-acre tract and we have

[10:42:18 AM]

great neighborhood support for that project so it's just something auto that I'm -- something that I'm wrestling with. >> Pool: The tract that you're talking about is the highland maltract, right? >> Casar: Right. >> Pool: It has unique characteristics. >> Casar: I understand it's different and that's why I'm not advocating for that on this tract. There are differences -- >> Pool: The total square footage on this tract is close to 3 million square feet. >> Casar: Much more residential and has way fewer estimated trips than the highland tract would, and that's okay. I'm not -- again, I'm not comparing them so as to say they should be the same. I'm comparing them so as to say that an additional 25,000 or additional few office tenants is something that I think it makes sense for us to consider and to see -- and it sounds like there's some support for it, and some not support for it on the dais. That's okay. I just wanted to know before I walk down the path if there was some support or none. If there was none, you know, I would stop then. >> Pool: We just need to remember this is in the middle of a neighborhood. And it has one allowed. It has one road to take the traffic in and out unless you demolish two affordable units that current are for rent. It's not high-priced housing currently there in that neighborhood, in oakmont heights, Ridgely. What will be built there will spike up their property values and make it difficult for them to probably stay. That's a real concern. But the homes that are there are working class, they were built 50, 60 years ago, they have car ports or a one-car garage. The roads are without sidewalks and without improvements. So taking all of that into consideration, there are significant differences and a

[10:44:19 AM]

number of the other large developments that have happened in this city over the past three, four, five years. And I just would like those differences to be acknowledged and respected. So thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything further to discuss on the grove? Ms. Kitchen, your light is on it. >> Kitchen: I'm sorry. >> Mayor Adler: That's okay. All right. Then we will move past the grove. Thank you very much. Yes, I'm sorry. >> Garza: I didn't know -- can I ask transportation about -- because I wasn't here on Tuesday. Is transportation here to ask a question about Jackson? >> Mayor Adler: Yeah, we could. And I

just -- one real general question. With taking that option off the table and then I was also -- my understanding that we're also possibly asking for transportation to move money that may have been used for other areas of the town, to improve areas here, does our transportation staff think that this P.U.D. Is superior for transportation purposes? Because, you know, that's a goal of all P.U.D.S, is for us to have a superior project. >> Councilmembers, Robert spillar, director of transportation. Let me try to answer your question. Your question was would we consider this superior. With the loss of Jackson street. And the absence of tdm being mentioned in the resolution that was passed by council. I think it would be hard for us to consider this to be a superior transportation development. The Jackson street connection, as you know, was recommended by my staff as well as dsd

[10:46:23 AM]

staff, as -- from our perspective, from a safety and mobility perspective, an important element of that concept. With those two elements, we had said, yes, it would be -- we would think it as superior. >> Garza: Okay. Thank you. >> Casar: Can either a capital metro board members or maybe you speak on the bus issues related to this? >> Yes. >> Casar: I wasn't fully aware of those. >> Yes, in the connections 2025 plan capital metro showed one of their routes, I believe it's 318 but please don't hold me to that exact number, circulating through the heart of the development and out the Jackson street connection. That said, I think that that bus could be rerouted back down, I think it's their market main street back onto bull creek. But that would require that bus to go through the bull creek at 45th street interchange twice, and I do not know if that would be -- add inconvenience or reduced efficiency to that route, but it would not go through the -- all the way to 45th street. >> Casar: And based on sort of your models, would having this connection to Jackson make there be more or less potential sort of cut-through traffic through niche neighborhoods to get to the amenities in the development? >> The proposed design of the Jackson street connection was to only allow ride in and ride out, to specifically prevent the traffic that might be on Jackson from continuing north of 45th into the intersection there. Understand that the neighborhoods were concerned that a signal might be put in there at some point that could encourage more through traffic into those neighborhoods Normal of 45th street. That was not the intent of the design nor contemplated. The real benefit that Jackson would give is a direct

[10:48:23 AM]

pedestrian access to the trail and park system that's being proposed inside the grove development. Without, you know, the trail system that's proposed internal to the development was in lieu of being able to provide a sidewalk on 45th street, on the south side of handling street. The idea is connect -- south side of handling street. The idea is connecting a pedestrian hybrid beacon across to the sidewalk infrastructure on the another side and really give a sort of southern connection. But that also gives bicycle and pedestrian connection for residents north of 45th street to access the park facilities directly. Without Jackson, the trail as well as the park really starts to resemble more like harbor trails down south near the Costco where people drive to the trail to walk or drive to the park facilities there to walk. Because the only entrances will be off of 45th street. Now, there is the potential at some point to have a bridge, as you know, connecting over to shoal creek. But that right-of-way -- or those easements still

need to be negotiated and achieved. >> Casar: So to -- and that's helpful to understand that a pedestrian connection would be helpful so that all sorts of people could access that. But as far as the right in, right out, notwithstanding any future decisions by council or the city, as far as the ride in, ride out, does it have a -- having the ride in, ride out, is that a net increase in sort of cut-through traffic in the neighborhoods or does that actually decrease it? I'm not trying to to have a leading question. I actually just don't know. >> That's fine. In my professional opinion, I'm not sure that it would add or reduce cut-through traffic on to Jackson. I think it would -- with the limitation of the ride in, ride out, I think it would limit the traffic that would

[10:50:23 AM]

be coming into the development to development-oriented traffic. It would draw traffic demand away from the 45th street at bull creek intersection by a couple thousand trips a day. It would move those trips to that secondary entrance and exit, which would be some relief at the intersection. >> Casar: One of those primarily contentious intersections at 45th and bull creek without the ride in, ride out gets a couple thousand more trips? >> I believe that's the number yes? Correct? Is that correct? >> Eric bol lock, Austin transportation department. Yes, one of the itas submitted last spring didn't have peak hours only using that extension to 45th street, sort of extrapolating that to daily trips it was probably a couple thousand estimated for Jackson. >> That's not to say the intersection can't handle that, but they're long-term projections so there is some uncertainty. >> Casar: Thank you. That's helpful to understand, and I imagine that the nearby neighbors would prefer there not to be a Jackson expectation I've heard there arethers that prefer that the -- the less traffic at that intersection, and I'll look forward to sort of the discussion on that. >> Councilmember, one other issue with regards to the Jackson street that I did not bring up is our understanding is that emergency access to this area would come from the north. There's three different fire stations to the north of 45th. One is actually on 45th street, but we would essentially all have to come through and go down bull creek to get into this new development, high density very many, as you will. The concern there is if there is a incident right at the mouth of bull creek as it goes into 45th street and yet still an emergency internal to the development, we really would then have to rely on emergency vehicles coming from the south

[10:52:24 AM]

if they couldn't get through that so it's a redundancy issue as well. That is lost. >> Casar: So your three primary reasons for recommending us -- the connection is, one, access for folks outside the development to be able to walk to the amenities. Second, there's an increase in congestion at bull creek and 45th if we don't have it and, third, the emergency service vehicles if they're coming from the north as opposed to the south. >> Yes. And I totally acknowledge the latter two are certainly possibility. There's a possibility that may not be an issue, but I think that it will be. >> Casar: Okay. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: Again, I apologize that I'm not completely caught up on everything that happened last week. I will be by Thursday, but not quite there yet. But I want to ask a related question about item 29. As I understand this resolution, I assume this was direction that was offered from the dais to come back with a resolution of this sort. But I just want to be clear that this

resolution, when that recommendation comes back from our city manager about how to fund offsite sidewalk and traffic-calming improvements, that that will be a separate and distinct vote from the one that we're contemplating taking on Thursday, whether or not to fund those offsite improvements in the amount of \$900,000 or is there now something that is part of the P.U.D. Ordinance that is going to require that we do this funding of offsite improvements? >> And, councilmember, I'm not sure that I can answer that specific question. I think that's a question for law. I would tell you that the additional -- funding of additional traffic-calming devices and item that are not included as part of the 400,000, we have standard processes for prioritizing those type of projects to deal

[10:54:24 AM]

with the most egregious traffic speeding and traffic-calming needs within the community. And so we would think that we would recognize the request from the council -- or not the council, but the citizens through this ordinance that they are saying they need help and we would evaluate those in the same priority as any others. Without subsequent direction by council, of course. >> Tovo: I'm sorry. What was the last thing you said, without -- >> Unless council directed us otherwise to by pass the Normal -- bypass the Normal prioritization method. >> Tovo: To me this looks like you're being asked to bypass the Normal prioritization, so I guess I have multiple questions. One is, is there something in the ordinance that we're contemplating on Tuesday -- I mean, on Thursday that will tie us to providing funding for offsite improvements? That's my think about one question. And -- that's my number 1 question. Then, if not, I guess that answers my second question about whether or not there would be a separate and distinct vote about whether to provide that funding in the amount of \$900,000. And then I guess I need then to circle back, based on your answers then I want to circle back to Mr. Spillar about how that fits into the prioritization, how this resolution fits into the prioritization scheme he's describing that we always follow for traffic-calming improvements. >> Assistant city attorney, f4 is he the city may contribute amount not to exceed 900,000 to provide supplemental funding for the traffic program so it's permissive and not mandatory up to 900,000. >> Tovo: Thank you. That wouldn't become a certainty until we approve whatever recommendation comes back from the city manager. >> Correct. >> Tovo: Okay. And then based on the language I guess Mr. Spillar, I don't mean to put you on the spot here, but the language in the resolution would seem, though, to direct a different kind of process from what you usually

[10:56:25 AM]

use. Is that your understanding of the resolution? >> I guess I would ask council to make that very explicit if that's what you're asking, because I did not interpret it that way. We have not had many requests from this area historically for traffic calming and then when we have, when those have been evaluated against the needs of other neighborhoods, they have not ranked highly. But that's not to say that things are changing with the new development, of course, and we're more than happy to take a look at that. The other issue is where that funding comings from. We don't have -- comes from. We don't have a large-standing revenue source that pays for traffic calming. We've been increasingly taking operations money and setting it into a C.I.P. To be able to do that on an annual basis. But those funds

are limited, and so, again, that would be the other consideration. >> Tovo: Okay. So absent the funding availability question aside, absensitive any additional language this would still be considered -- any needs in this sent would still be considered, ranked, prioritized alongside other needs, just as you always conduct that process? >> Yes, ma'am. And we would treat the agreement, once it's passed, as the indication as, hey, there's a desire for traffic calming in this area and start the process for those. >> Tovo: Start the process to evaluate those? >> Sure. >> Tovo: In your regular prioritization scheme. >> Yes, ma'am. That's the -- that's what I had interpreted. >> Tovo: Thanks for that clarification. >> Mayor Adler: On that element, in case that came up in my -- this is something that was called out at the mediation, I think. I think they were looking for different funding streams. I will tell you personally I have an issue with not being need-all righted before to two items, but that said, I think in file fairness, I think that

[10:58:27 AM]

the -- the question for staff to take a look at would include things like sales tax revenue being generated on the site, which would require a policy decision ultimately to be made. So I don't -- I don't think that the intent of the parties in the mediation agreement was to make the call now on those policy decisions, but, rather, to identify what that menu of things might be.. >> Pool: Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: But it real clear that in the ordinance as drafted right now there's no requirement for us to fund anything, although I think there is a requirement for the developer to put up his \$400,000 regardless. I think it had a time deadline where it wanted to have some kind of indication because there's some people that want the council to engage in that policy conversation. And I think that the intent of the folks was to present options which again I come from a place where things should be based on need, and I indicated that as we divide up money previously, but there was some desire to also consider -- if there was some desire for sales tax revenue, what would that then be, which would precipitate the policy conversation that you're speaking to. >> Tovo: So to be clear, that would be an extremely new policy direction where we then start funding sidewalk and traffic calming improvements based on revenue a particular site is generating. So let me say in addition -- while I also have concerns about allocating our resources in ways that are not responsive to needs I would have -- I haven't

[11:00:28 AM]

thought a lot about it, but my gut reaction is I would have wild and very serious concerns about trying to start to allocate your resources based on how much revenue a particular site is generating. But we can certainly have that policy conversation. >> Mayor Adler: My perception would be that it would be a very clear departure from where we were as well. >> And I wanted to make sure, mayor, if I could, there's also the \$400,000 that the consultant is contributing for sidewalks and traffic calming. And of course we would implement it that according to the agreement outside the agreement. >> Pool: My understanding from the conversations my staff has had with our conversation department folks, the 400,000 would be put into an escrow account and that money would be used first by traffic calming. My understanding is that is interior to the project. Not necessarily? >> My understanding is not necessarily. It could be used in general to address the needs of the surrounding traffic calming. >> Pool: And again we have the

element of time in all of this. And with the new source of funding that we are getting for sidewalks from our 720-million-dollar bond package I know that wasn't enough to fund all of the sidewalks needed across the city, but we do have additional monies. And over a period of years and as these things are needed, I think they should be evaluated in a sense of where else the needs are around the city. But clearly, as Mr. Spillar has pointed out, these neighborhoods have not really ever asked for any assistance in updating their infrastructure. And I mentioned that these neighborhoods have been in place for about 50, 60 years

[11:02:29 AM]

so you could imagine without sidewalks they're narrow streets. And limited parking off the streets so folks park in the street and then that's where the kids walk and play when they walk on their way to school as well. So the safety concerns and considerations as this gets built out, we will see the traffic increase and I think the city -- it's our responsibility to address those, but I don't expect this to happen next fy, but I do want us to keep in mind there are costs associated to the large size of this development that are going in place and it isn't -- on a policy perspective I think it's important for us to keep in mind that if we are allowing a major development on an otherwise sleepy part of the city that we also have to step up to the plate with our infrastructure, resources and support and acknowledge that we have a responsibility to address them and not shove them aside at all. So the whole thing has to be taken as -- in its entirety. >> Councilmember, our attorney also just did look on your original question in that 400,000 has to be spent off site, not on site. >> Pool: That's great and it will go a long way in doing the specific traffic calming that will be needed aside from the specific intersection fund work that is in a separate fund and the \$900,000 when the city puts that into play will August minute that. >> Garza: I was trying to point out -- take away from the conversation on Thursday on so it won't take too long. While I believe this mediation was useful in a lot of ways, there's a little bit of a flaw in it and it's been pointed out -- we've alluded to is, that the city wasn't at that table. It was the developer, and the neighborhood and there's a big party missing. So if I'm immediating -- I

[11:04:30 AM]

hope this never happens, a possible ex-husband and I say I don't want to pay for that and I say I don't want to pay for that. And we say let's have bill pay for that. Yeah, let's have bill pay for that. That's what's happening here. A lot of this agreement involves around having a party that wasn't at that table agree to it and possibly change how we prioritize needs throughout the city. Again I respect the process and the agreement, but there's still stuff left on the table that we need to decide. And I'm not comfortable changing the priority of how we prioritize improvements based on because we're allowing this development. We allow development throughout this city. Are we going to change every single time we change a development? We're going to say that now we're going to focus on that and put all our infrastructure dollars on that? The same thing goes for affordable housing too. I wanted to point that out that there was an important party missing from the table. >> Casar: I hope [indiscernible] Wasn't watching channel of in the last moment. I think I will feel comfortable moving forward in that these are decisions that will have to be made later on down the line. The challenge is that in the neighborhoods

and areas where we have the highest priority need sidewalks, folks have for a long time been left behind. So I certainly want to make sure that we are addressing some of the needs that may be generated by that development, but fact of the matter is in lots of parts of the city in each of our districts there have been people affected by lots and lots of development, some approved by the city and some not. And that's why we have areas of town where pedestrians actually regularly get hit by cars. And I want to make sure that

[11:06:32 AM]

whatever money we move to deal with this is not taking away money from that work, but I recognize that's not what we're deciding with this resolution and so I file comfortable with the developer putting in 400,000 dollars' worth of off site improvements in the nearby area and then having that assessment from staff. But I would just feel really reluctant to support that if we are -- because we don't want to leave some of these folks behind, continuing to neglect the people that have been left behind for the longest and most high need areas. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Kitchen? >> Kitchen: I'll just say I think we're all saying the same thing in terms of the additional dollars that are needed to be evaluated as part of the process for need going forward. I'm glad to hear that the 400,000-dollar used for areas outside the development. That should help. But I'll just say that we've got two problems. We basically have historical issues that we need to catch up on as fast as we possibly can and then we have a fast-growing city. So with regard to a fast-growing city I think it's important as we -- I think some of this we can do through codenext, but I think as we move forward through our development processes we have to look at the impact on the infrastructure as well as the development. So I think we're really starting moving in that direction and I think that's important. And I don't see it as an either or. So that's why I continue to say it's really important that we look at the impact of development on the transportation as well as water, wastewater, infrastructure, while at the same time making sure that we prioritize those areas that have been historically in need and we find some way to catch up for them. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else on the grove? Thank you very much.

[11:08:32 AM]

Ms. Houston, you had pulled the next item, which is the downtown recycling issue, item number 46. >> Houston: Thank you, mayor. Thank you for being here. And I've just got your memo that you're retiring, so good luck in Cincinnati. >> Thank you. Bob gedert, director of Austin resource recovery. >> Houston: Mr. Go ahead he either, I posted -- gedert, I posted several things. It seems this is a single source contract and why is that? >> This was not a single source. It was bid out and there were two bidders that responded. James Scarborough is here to speak on behalf of purchasing as well. Bid out and one was chosen. And it looks like to me that this one company will be doing all of the commercial collections, is that correct, or is it residential and commercial? Commercial collections. >> Commercial collections. >> Houston: In the city of Austin. And I'm not good at reading the contracts, but it also appears that we are saying that they have the rights to do all of the collections for major events in Austin. >> Allow me to explain, to answer that question. This contract is a consolidation of numerous efforts of the city to bid out waste services. It does not provide service to general commercial businesses throughout the city at

the commercial surprises that we're -- commercial enterprises that

[11:10:32 AM]

we're speaking of in here are commercial facilities. One purpose for this contract is to service city-owned facilities. The second is collection of operational needs, particularly in emergency responses. We've had some experiences with onion creek overflow and creating some type of a contract. They manage the waste flows from emergency needs like that. The third is the special events that you referred to. And I'll get back to that in just a second. And then the fourth is Austin energy's contract that went before council last December and we were redirected to move into a more consolidated contract with city facilities. So this is the result of that conversation from last December. So we have four different contractual opportunities that we combined into one. We rolled them into one in a consolidation fashion to gain cost efficiencies. You referred to the special events. The special events -- I do have expert staff, if we dive into it in detail I have expert staff that can answer some questions. The special events, Austin resource recovery is charged with providing cart service to smaller special events, but when it becomes a lot of trash and recycling and more economical to be serviced by trash dumpsters, our department doesn't own trash dumpsters, so we contract that out to a private company and that goes through the fee waiver process of council where there is consideration of waiving fees for the recycling cost but not the trash cost. So that is individually dealt with through council throughout the year on special events. What this contract does is itemize all those events. The event organizer still has the right to bargain for their own craft service. If it falls upon the city through arr as a provider of

[11:12:34 AM]

last resort. In contract would prevail. So we're looking at this as a fall back if the event organizer cannot manage their waste flows. >> Houston: So it appears to me we took a lot of things and put tomorrow in one and only two people bid and one person got it. To me that is still a sole source because people are still kind of locked into using that one provider. The second part of my question has to do with where are they going to be disposing all of these -- all of this trash, bio solids, recyclables, all this stuff that they collect? Where are they going to be dispose lising them and which landfill? That's not indicated in the documents that I read. >> There's the solicitation bid, the response bid from the hauler and then the negotiated contract. The solicitation bid does not mention a landfill of preference. It's asking for bids and their selection, but it does mention it must be environmentally safe and meeting all federal, state and local regulations. It must meet all regulations to be a safe disposal facility. >> When we received our question we reached out to the contractor and said that they would make it public at this time. We will be providing you with a written response to your question sometime today. But to answer your question, all municipal solid waste will be disposed of at the

[11:14:36 AM]

waste management Austin community landfill, which is at 9900 -- >> Houston: I know exactly where it is. So that's the concern. That's the concern because we had this conversation last year when we had this

same conversation is how do we move these from that landfill that has been a playing for the people who have lived in that community for years and we're still doing it. So that's one of the concerns that I have because we haven't negotiated that and there are also other landfills that they could take this to, this trash and whatever they pick up, but again, we're still doing the same thing we've always done is to use that landfill. So what is the city, what is the department doing about finding other landfills to use rather than continuing to use that? >> We did hear you and I was engaged in that conversation with you last December. >> Houston: But we're still doing it. >> We have responded. What we have done in our bids for our contracts for waste disposal is require a five-year compliance history. And we're trying to evaluate in the bid response system the safety and environmental standards of the landfill. What we cannot do -- here's the problem. We can flow the waste based on objective and environmental criteria. We cannot flow the waste away from a landfill because we don't like that landfill. The supreme court has ruled on that. It's called a Carbone decision in the 1990s and I have followed that ruling through the waste industry. And it's been refined in courts over time. The most recent application of that supreme court ruling was in Dallas as they were trying to negotiate waste contracts. So it's an issue and kind of

[11:16:37 AM]

like a warning to municipalities that we cannot simply say we don't like this landfill. It's a nuisance to the neighborhood. >> Houston: I'm not saying it's a nuisance. I'm saying it's an environmental hazard. >> And if we had objective data within the recent years, within the last five years, we could use that data to say you cannot use that landfill. I do think there's an opportunity to negotiate with this hauler in the contract signing stage, in the contract negotiation signing stage. >> Houston: So my next question has to do with when you presented this to us last year, how much was the cost and what is the increase to the cost now for this particular hauler? >> That's a good question, but I don't know the to what the cost was. This contract was for activities. So it's hard to take the bulk price. I would have to research the segment price that we use purchasing office's support to find that comparison. >> Houston: So we're taking all of the Austin energy's -- what do you call them? >> The special waste. Class 2. >> Houston: Class 2 waste and Austin water? >> This -- regarding Austin water and other departments, this services recycling, trash and organic food waste collection at all city facilities. That would include Austin water. This does not include what is considered in the boyio solids contract -- the biosolids contract and activity. This does have an emergency clause in the event Austin water is under a fire threat or something like that. This contract could be used in an emergency, but only upon innovation to city council. -- Upon notification to city council. >> Houston: Then the last

[11:18:39 AM]

question I would have on 46 is how many haulers do we have in the city? >> We have approximately 20 haulers. The ones that can haul industrial waste and commercial waste to this degree, the quantity and the number of dumpsters would be narrowed down to four haulers. >> Houston: So out of four haulers that have that specific ability to do what you need them to do, why couldn't we have done a rotation rather than a single source kind of thing? But you put so much stuff in the scope of work that people didn't have an opportunity or chose not to apply because there's so much there. So it looks like one

provider is being preferred for renewal projects because some -- preference because some of the people would do some of those things, but because there's so much lumped together only one person or two responded. >> I think I disagree. I respect your opinion -- >> Houston: No, I don't know anything about hauling waste. >> I believe the four largest haulers have the absolute capacity to do everything performed in this. I would say that the smaller haulers are somewhat crowded out from this opportunity, but the four largest haulers have all the bins, all the trucks, all the manpower to service this. Two chose not to bid. I can't control what one chooses because of the no contact rules of the city. The other chose because of distance from their facilities to the city and they would have more road travel than the others. And so we have two legitimate /bid/(ed) bids to reevaluate. >> Houston: One other thing. Under the special events program that has been carved out, more people could have applied for that. Just like we have a professional rotation list, we could have a professional

[11:20:39 AM]

waste hauler list and so people have that opportunity throughout the years to be able to do that service. >> I think my traditional response is I believe in the competitive bid process for low cost bidding. Rotational lists -- I've worked off engineering rotational lists and I'm generally not pleased with the pricing. I find I get more competitive and lower cost when I do the bidding. However, this is a policy decision of council really. >> Houston: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Troxclair. >> Troxclair: So what was the amount of the previous contract? >> Councilmember, we're reviewing the previous contract to try to make a straightforward comparison, but the scope of the previous contract was more limited than what we're recommending here, but it appears that the average spend was just over 700,000 per year. >> Troxclair: Okay. And this one is -- >> Over 3 million. >> And the primary differences we're dealing with four separate contractual opportunities into a consolidated contract. I would also add we're adding organics collection in there too. >> Troxclair: So what were we spending for all four of the previous contracts? >> There was no contract for the organics collection. So that would be a new business opportunity. But for the previous contract, we're compiling that now, but the type 2 waste I believe was -- I don't remember. I hate to speculate. We're gathering that information now. We should have it ready today. >> Troxclair: Okay. Is there a cost savings? Do we know generally if there's a cost savings? >> I think we'll have to compile that and find out. I do believe we've added in the organics which creates a wild card on the comparison.

[11:22:41 AM]

The intent is cost savings. I think we need to do a cost comparison to find out if there is. I'm reminded that there is contingency expenditures in there for emergency responses that were not encountered in a previous contract. And that moves the contract value up to some degree. We may not use those dollars, but they're there in terms of emergency response. >> Okay. >> I believe we could more thoroughly answer that question. >> Troxclair: Okay. And what was the reason that the swac unanimously denied this item? >> I have coming to you soon this afternoon a seven-page memo addressing each and every issue addressed at swac. My response to all the issues that were presented to swac. There was misinterpretations of intents, and I've addressed that issue pretty extensively in the

seven-page memo. So I believe I'm answering-- I could address them verbally right now or defer to the memo. >> Troxclair: Okay. I'm happy to read the memo. Is there any reason that we couldn't -- it sound like maybe we're rushing this a little bit. It sound like we don't necessarily have all the information at least today that I would need to make a decision about this. Is there a reason that we have to -- >> We could try to do that by Thursday. >> Troxclair: Could we consider this item at the end of January? >> I think that's a council -- well, I won'ting here in January, but staff will be here. Life goes on. [Laughter] So it can be deferred. I would say that just as a reminder, December 10th of last year, we were before council on the Austin energy contract. And we were asked to -- the

[11:24:42 AM]

contract was denied, Austin energy was -- has been using a temporary contract until we come back. And we were asked by council to come back within four to six months. We're coming back in 12 months because the consolidation of these contracts took a bit of professional work and bidding out and time for the bidders. And it really took 12 months. Another month is possible, but I would say we've been trying to respond in a quick fashion. >> Troxclair: Okay, thanks. >> Pool: I'm kind of along the same lines as councilmember troxclair and maybe some of my other colleagues here. I was a little concerned about the dillo dirt change. And I felt like that should have been a conversation maybe that we had at council because it strikes me as that's a bit of a policy decision, but there's some dramatic changes in the city policy. And I understand that there was not the ability for all of us to hear from the various parties because of the anti-lobbying ordinance. So that's -- this is 46? >> Houston: The biosolids is 53. >> Pool: I'm sorry, I've kind of mushed them all together here. That's right, just like the biosolids. Ew! [Laughter] But point being that there's a number of lingering questions and I'd like to take the time necessary to kind of dig into it. >> If there's any questions you want to toss out in writing we'll respond quickly. It's the council's prerogative to delay. I believe staff is ready to move forward with that discussion, but if you have more questions we'll answer. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Ms. Kitchen. >> Kitchen: I'm just seconding what councilmember

[11:26:42 AM]

troxclair and councilmember pool are speaking to. I share that concern and would be interested in delay. It sound like that would be okay. >> Today you will be receiving a memo answering some of those questions. They may not answer all of your questions. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mr. Gedert, just in case you're not called on Thursday here, I just want to say that you've done an incredible job for the city and your didn't has made such an incredible movement over the period of time that you've been in charge, and the kinds of things that you have done are being discussed nationally and internationally with respect to municipal systems and governance and the city is indebted to you. Thank you very much. You will be missed: >> Thank you very much. I have enjoyed the seven years here. Tremendous amount of progress on the zero waste goals. >> The defining of an implementation plan, the uro, the organics. I appreciate council's approval for moving forward. That will begin in June. My staff is very much into the implementation strategies of what we've accomplished by policy and my departure is not based on any business. It's a personal decision. I am getting married and moving to Cincinnati. Yes, mayor pro tem? >>

I want to second everything the mayor said. It really is true that the department has made tremendous strides under your leadership. And I want to highlight one other facet of your leadership. In watching you in all of these issues, one of the things that really impressed me is not just that you strive towards those goals and do so, so with such purpose, but the way in

[11:28:43 AM]

which you work with stakeholders is really unprecedented and in watching you my first experience really watching that firsthand was with the bag ban and the way that you continue to work with stakeholders until each our largest grocery, one of the biggest champions of it was remarkable. Not only for the goals you've achieved, but you've done it in every example really by building consensus and it's just a tremendous memorial day for all of us. So thank you. Thank you and best of luck. >> Not related to this topic, but the textile recycling, we're responding to the same way, working with the stakeholders that are interested. >> Houston: Item 52. Could you help us. I put that on the Q and a about the anti-lobbying and procurement. >> Mayor Adler: So tell me. Legal has suggested to us that before we discuss 52 and 53 that we touch base in executive session first. And we have 52, 53, which we could touch base first in executive session. It's probably appropriate for us to break for lunch to do that anyhow. We have three briefings that were on the calendar, the affordability, the east Austin homework survey and the draft equity assessment which we could also do right executive session. There's one additional item that is not one of those items. Ms. Garza, you pulled that. That was the driver disqualification issue.

[11:30:44 AM]

Quick question. >> Garza: What we changed in -- I don't remember what month it was, but has an unintended consequence for eliminating some drivers who have been driving for years. And so this is trying to correct that. My only concern was understanding how we adjudicate who we were going to allow to past drive and who we aren't. So I was just -- I'll probably put something on the bulletin board that -- it might be a transportation staff person having to decide whether someone's criminal history is. So that's just the amendment. I was going to put it on the bulletin board. But since Mr. Spillar just walked in, do you have a process in place of how this would work and who would be making that decision? >> Councilmember, Robert spillar, Austin transportation department. First of all, we have an appeals process if you are a chauffeured driver, meaning you're running a taxi or one of the other mobility services that requires a chauffeur's process. We've been using that before. We've been asked to consider the extenuating circumstances of the individual case. I'll tell you we've not had many appeals that have come to my desk and what I do and it's kept the person from getting their chauffeur's permit a violent crime and what the nature of that is and what the duration has

[11:32:46 AM]

been since then. Our ordinance does not have any discretion for staff to make decisions. I know there's been a number of incidents identified by council and there is no discretion on that. >> Do you have any feedback or option to us taking that appeals process off your plate and giving it to one of our municipal

judges? >> I haven't contemplated that. I don't know how to respond to that. >> Garza: My intention is not to slow this process down. I know there's drivers that need to get through that. I think what I will probably process is setting up a process to have staff come back to us with maybe a description of what the plan is, but in the meantime continue whatever the process is in place to process any drivers that need to get through that. But I just think I just felt more comfortable of somebody at least with a law degree making that decision. >> I would not disagree with you. I guess that means to say -- in line with the offenses that counsel gave direction on everything from felonies and violent crimes to whatever. >> Mayor Adler: Hang on Ms. Houston, then Ms. Kitchen. >> Houston: So how long have the A section and the B section been in place? >> I think I know what you mean.

[11:34:55 AM]

>> Houston: With the crimes, minor and major. >> That, I believe, was passed by council back this past spring, February, March time frame. >> Houston: Prior to that, there were no checks and balances on how long ago somebody had possession charges or anything like that? >> That established the tnc requirements for whether we could -- the companies, programs, before then, we had no criminal offenses identified for the chauffeurs, either, and so it was completely up to the discretion of the director and my predecessors, I think, were obliging then the council gave direction on in terms of the crimes that they would ignore or allow. But with the passage of the offenses that created the identifiers for disqualification, that happened in February-March, and we have had about 118 drivers being rejected. And some of them had been driving for some time before that that's absolutely correct. But when they came in for relicensure, that's when it appeared. >> Houston: And so when they come in for relicensure, and they are -- their license are revoked, although they might have been driving for 20 years or more -- >> Uh-huh. >> Houston: -- With no offenses during that time, do you tell them about the right to appeal? >> Yes, we do make them aware of the appeal. Again, the appeal process is only if it's a chauffeur's license. >> Houston: Right. >> Not the ride share. >> Houston: But the folks with the chauffeur licenses are told you have a right to appeal. >> That is my understanding. If somebody believes they didn't have that information, then just send them our way and we'll make sure they know they have the ability to appeal. >> Houston: Okay. >> And, councilmember Houston, we're in the process of responding to your question;

[11:36:55 AM]

just haven't gotten there yet. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Kitchen? >> Kitchen: So I think I'm understanding that this will align our appeal processes, and perhaps with the kind of amendment that councilmember Garza is talking about, perhaps put some more parameters around that appeal process, which is something we didn't do in the spring, so -- >> Councilmember, I would ask you to, on the offenses within seven years, to give me some guidance whether those -- you know, in terms of the appeal, one of the arguments, well, this was a useful indiscretion that happened many years ago. Is that more than seven years or less than seven years, thinking about the legislative positions we might want to think about that classification. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: First I want to say, councilmember Garza, I like your idea of adding the provision, and I also like the idea we would allow them to move forward so

it doesn't delay the review, but have that in place at some point. I think that makes good sense. I guess I want to understand, it was my -- it was my understanding that the problems were arising primarily in the area of chauffeured drivers. The person I heard from was representing super shuttle, and so I'm a little unclear as to why that -- why they -- why that's not being handled through the existing -- through the ordinance as is. >> So law just corrected me, and I apologize for this. They said as of July, when the ordinance took effect, essentially since I had no discretion on those crimes, it made it very difficult for people to appeal. >> Tovo: I see. Even if they had, as councilmember Houston described, a long period of -- okay. Thanks. >> Even though there's an appeal process identified, I have no discretion with regard to those crimes. >> Tovo: All right. Thank you very much. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. There was actually one more -- do you have a question on this one? There was one more.

[11:38:59 AM]

>> Tovo: No, 57, I think they might be the appropriate staff for that as well. >> Mayor Adler: Quickly related to the smart corridor deal, I just want everybody to know that apparently a few moments ago Google announced that what is reported to be the very first truly autonomous ride to place in Austin, fall of last year, that would be a car that was fully -- fully automated. Apparently a blind gentleman rode in the car. It was the first time he had ridden in a car alone in 12 years, which kind of makes Austin the kitty hawk of driverless vehicles, so it's good to see that there is being tweeted out now a video piece on that, apparently. Kind of cool. Ms. Troxclair. >> Troxclair: I just wanted to ask quickly about this membership in the austin-san Antonio corridor. So I know that the funding used to be split 50% -- or 50,000 from, I think, planning and 50,000 from transportation. We switched it all to transportation. And I think at the time that we approved this item in the last budget, or at least two years ago, campo -- there's been a lot of movement on the lone star rail issue since then. Does campo -- campo's recent decision to remove lone star rail from its long range plan impact this organization? >> Councilmember, thank you. I would suggest, no, that they have separate missions that the lone star rail, of course, was a separate project under the quarter council. But in addition to that, the quarter council actually provides that super regional

[11:41:00 AM]

coordinating body between San Antonio and Austin and the cities in between. Austin has participated in that organization since their beginnings, and this last year they've actually accomplished a number of things. One, we now have a hands-free corridor, I-35 corridor from Georgetown all the way down to San Antonio. They were instrumental in getting the last two cities, San Marcos and new braunfels, to adopt a hand-free program. And they've also been instrumental in supporting the my 35 project. They were the ones that helped sponsor the initial meetings that got the I-35 project concepts for the corridor put together. So I would argue that they're useful in and of themselves, separate from lone star rail. >> Troxclair: Is there a separate membership for lone star rail? >> There was, yes. >> Troxclair: And are we - - so there was a separate membership under this organization for lone star rail? >> Was a separate organization. It was simply staffed by the -- >> Troxclair: Okay. How much is that, and are we still paying it? >> I believe it was between 15 and 80000, and I do not [inaudible] >> Kitchen: Could I just insert

something? >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Kitchen. >> Kitchen: This is not -- lone star rail is a separate organization. It is not under greater Austin San Antonio corridor. They are a separate board, separate entity. They're not related entities at all. >> In the last budget it was removed, and I think the amount was about 49,000-something, and it was capped -- the amount was capped in the budget, but not allocated to lone star rail. It was dedicated to regional rail projects, but not specifically allocated to anyone. >> Okay. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ms. Pool? >> Pool: I had that same question, and I kind of got them mixed up, too, on lone star

[11:43:01 AM]

rail, and San Antonio -- the austin-san Antonio corridor. I think that goes to the development along I-35; right? And the plan years and years ago that we were going to develop on both sides of I-35 all the way down to San Antonio, which, you know, hasn't exactly worked out the way the planners anticipated it, but I think we should, though, be clear about the 49-five that I think was in the budget last year, but not appropriated to pull that out and use it for something else, since lone star has, I guess, done. >> And that is absolutely separate from this. >> Pool: Right. That's very separate from this. >> Mayor Adler: And it also has forums and meetings where it brings together staff and leadership from in that corridor to talk about regional issues that go way beyond just transportation or development, but it certainly includes -- includes both those. >> Yes, mayor. As we continue to grow into another sort of bar bell region worth or Seattle take comb a, I think you'll start to see the then austin-san Antonio to be the same way, to coordinate between those cities. Cities. >> Kitchen: By way of coordination, lone star rail is a legal body that remains in existence. It has not been -- councilmember Renteria sit on that body. It has not been dissolved, and it remains in existence. It might serve a purpose in the future. The only thing that was removed from it was the funding to proceed with the lone star rail analysis. So just by way of clarification. So I agree that it's not appropriate to -- to send membership dollars to it at the moment, but I want to make it clear that it has not been

[11:45:04 AM]

dissolved. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else on this? Thank you very much. All right, council. We have items 52 and 53, the three briefings. So we're going to go ahead and break for lunch, which is here. We'll get the briefings on 52 and 53. It is 11:45. Do we think that we can be back here at 12:45? Should we shoot for that? 1 o'clock? 12:45? Let's try that. So the city council is going to closed session to take up two items, pursuant to section 551.071, the government code, discuss item 52, which is waiving chapter 2-7, article 6, and 53, related to the proposed contract with sinegral. If there's no objection, we'll go into executive session. Hearing none, the council will now go into executive sir, hopefully to return about 12:45. [Executive session] [Executive session]

[1:01:35 PM]

>> Mayor adler: we have 52 and 53. Is there any discussion we want to have publicly with respect to 52 and 53? >> Houston: Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Houston: I think probably on Thursday I will be

moving to amend the current ordinance and delete section 3. >> Mayor Adler: 52 that's in backup? >> Houston: That's in backup, yeah. >> Mayor Adler: Moving past that, taking out section. >> Houston: Section 3. >> Houston: Just to give people -- >> Mayor Adler: Give people notice. That's good. Then I think there's some conversation about whether or not the past -- to pass 53 at all. >> Houston: 46. >> Mayor Adler: No, no. Passing 52, 53. 52 you'd be offering taking out section 3, and there's some conversation about whether we take any action on 53 at all or whether just let staff reinitiate the process with the same or similar scope. And then -- Ann, did you want to raise item number 56? >> Kitchen: Yeah. Idea we had signaled earlier that -- and had some discussion with Mr. Gerhart about postponing that one. So I guess what we're saying is that -- that we will be asking to postpone it. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. My sense is it may very well be a critical mass on the council to postpone 46. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: If that's the case then we won't take public testimony on it. We'll take public testimony when it comes back. But we'll poll the council first thing in the morning so the community has direction on that item or we'll just postpone it, one of the two. Those then are all of the pulled items. That gets us then to our

[1:03:38 PM]

briefings today. >> Tovo: Sorry to interrupt. >> Mayor Adler: You wanted to raise a timing issue. >> Tovo: If I could just talk for a second about expectations for Austin oaks on Thursday I'm assuming the expectation is we are hearing this on just one alleged but I wanted to hear in colleagues about whether that's their expectation as well? The reason for that is that we're looking at it and trying to work through some of the issues that have been raised and probably bringing forward some amendments, some of which aren't ready and some of which really require more discussion that I expect will have -- we'll have an opportunity for on Thursday, but if there's anything among our group who thinks it's gonna be heard on more than one reading I want want to escalate that process of working on trying to address some of the issues and making amendments. >> Mayor Adler: We haven't talked about this case as a group, and especially if you're thinking about bringing amendments and the like, seems to me it would be most appropriate just to approve on first reading. >> Tovo: All right, thanks. There anybody really keen on trying to do it on more than one reading on Thursday? Great. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Kitchen. >> Kitchen: Do we have -- we'll take public testimony, right? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Kitchen: Do we have -- what time certain is this set for? >> Mayor Adler: No earlier than 6:30. >> Kitchen: 6:30, okay. >> Mayor Adler: We'll try and clear out as of the of the agenda before we get there. >> Kitchen: I have a question. I don't know if this is something we can speak to today or not but I'm curious on -- we have quite a few zoning ones. Is it possible to have an indication right now about which ones we'll be discussing? >> Mayor Adler: Greg, how is that looking? >> Kitchen: Mr. Ms. Garza always let's -- Mr. Guernsey lets us know that morning but I'm curious if there's anything he can tell us now. >> Greg Guernsey, planning and zoning. I think it's not as bad as it looks. [Laughter]

[1:05:39 PM]

We do have the grove. We have Austin oaks. Depending on what happens at planning commission tonight, we might offer plaza saltio as consent, depending on what the commission does tonight. And

the rest are consent with maybe one or two postponements. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> So there is a briefing, though, on the stream development. This is the triangle at south first and Riverside. >> Mayor Adler: Which number? >> Item 91. So that will be a brief discussion on that because it's a briefing by staff on a new P.U.D. >> Kitchen: Also I might -- I'm sorry. Go ahead. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: Want to -- I want to talk about that and I can talk about it after. >> Mayor Adler: So on 72 through roughly 91, you're saying that most of them are consent with a couple postponements? >> Right. >> Mayor Adler: Then we have grove and Austin oaks. >> That's correct. >> Kitchen: I think I should speak to 80 briefly. That's the Thorton road. We're working on that right now, and we'll be able to determine tomorrow whether that might be postponed in February of -- the action. I think I mentioned before we're working with the developer and the neighbors about the potential of -- and also with Mr. Guernsey and other staff about the potential of doing a vision plan for Thorton road. And so we'll have the final meetings tomorrow and hopefully we'll come out of that meeting with agreement from all concerned. In which case we would probably postpone 80 or perhaps pass it just on second reading.

[1:07:40 PM]

So -- >> And it's only posted for second reading. >> Kitchen: Oh, that's right. It's only posted for second reading so pass or postpone but it wouldn't take a lot of time. So. . . >> Renteria: Mayor. >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Renteria: On the [indiscernible] I know they're getting a request to postpone that, on the planning commission. So I don't know exactly where it's going to end up. >> I think there might be a similar request at commission. So I think we're just waiting to see what happens at commission this evening and then we'll know what will happen probably at council. If commission postpones it, then staff will be making a request for postponement on Thursday, but as far as we know right now it's -- it would go. >> Mayor Adler: Generally speaking, if it gets considered tonight and anybody wants to postpone it so they have time to digest what happens tonight as a general rule I would be supporting that. Just because it's happening so fast, so close to the meeting that we have. >> Renteria: Also I'm going to be pulling for discussion two and three for Thursday. Two and three. >> Mayor Adler: Two and three? >> Renteria: Yeah, I'm requesting about -- >> Mayor Adler: About the rotation contracts? >> Renteria: Yes. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Okay. And there's something you wanted to raise, mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: Yeah. I wanted to talk about the P.U.D. Assessment briefing. So my concern about -- my concern about having this on our agenda is kind of the same concern I have about having today's briefings on our agenda. We have such a meaty and full agenda that I'm just really concerned that we're not going to be able to provide the level of attention and thoroughness because it's happening within such a packed

[1:09:40 PM]

agenda. So that's my concern. I understand from having reached out to staff and I understand that the developer's consultant is not keen on the idea of postponing it in part because, as I understand it, they cannot submit their paperwork -- they cannot submit the case until this briefing happens. And so I'm not entirely sure on what action I think is appropriate for Thursday. I would say, in my mind, it's not appropriate to have our briefing and to be providing the kind of specific feedback that the P.U.D.

Ordinance requires from us at that assessment, and so the very most I can imagine having on Thursday would be a very short briefing, with the understanding that in January we would have a fuller discussion at council. Because I'm not -- I am not supportive of having this discussion and really providing the feedback about things like bottom line -- baseline which are soville, I'm not comfortable doing that on Thursday in the context of this particular meeting. So I guess, Mr. Guernsey, do you want to jump in and just tell us, is that your understanding, that the applicant is concerned about a postponement for that reason? >> I think the applicant is concerned and would like to move forward. It's been in process for a little while. It is within the south central water front area, and they feel that they've submitted an application that would be in accordance with that, that plan. But I know that they do want to -- they're anxious to get moving on their project. We can certainly provide a briefing and then there's no action formally taken, but council could continue the item to your next meeting if that's your desire. >> Tovo: Well, there's no formal action taken. That's the opportunity for the council to provide thoughtful, considered, appropriate, useful comments about things like the baseline, and that is -- you know, that is really important, I think. I don't ever want to see a project combo forward again where we just decline to sort

[1:11:42 PM]

of set in or weigh in on a decline. I don't think it's helped us with regard to the grove discussion so I think really -- I think the practical reality of this agenda is that there are very few of us who are really able to dig into this case and really prepare for it prior to Thursday or even devote or full attention to it on Thursday. Again, I'm either gonna make a motion to postpone it or a motion that we hear it very briefly but with the agreement that welcome back and discuss it in January and really discuss it and provide the feedback that the P.U.D. Ordinance asks of us. >> Okay. >> Tovo: Does that seem like a reasonable proposition? >> If that's what council wishes to do we can certainly work with the applicant and make sure that that happens. >> Tovo: I guess I would ask my colleagues what their thoughts are at this point on this. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool. >> Pool: I'd support that, including having the applicant come and brief my staff and me and possibly our professional staff, if we have some additional questions, I'd like to have that input before we go public and give the additional feedback. I think I would like to be better prepared. That development is transformational, and in ways big and small. So I know I want to be absolutely ready to take that on, and I don't think I'll be there. In fact I know I won't be there on Thursday. >> Mayor Adler: I like the idea of having the quick review and then considering it longer because I think that will be better for the longer review if we've had the quick one. Sometimes -- and maybe this is something to raise at a different point, manager, we're about to have three briefings. It's really hard for me to get a briefing and then react to it, and I hate to lose the opportunity to have the staff that's here to do that briefing. They finish the briefing and say are there any thoughts or comments? The answer is no because I haven't had a chance to think about it. So it would be really helpful if we could to get them ahead of time, even if it meant

[1:13:43 PM]

scheduling the briefings later, then we would know what the issues were, people could come in with

questions or thoughts, maybe they get answered in the briefing but I would it will be more helpful to staff and more useful of their time if we could give them something back. Sometimes when the briefing comes and we hear, see the powerpoint, it's just really -- it's hard to react. >> I hair you, mayor -- I hear you, mayor. We'll try and work on that. Many cases we issue a memo in advance of the briefing and the briefing is our opportunity to allow you to q&a us but we'll work on where we can get you the information in advance we'll certainly try and do that. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Yes, mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: I completely disagree that's exactly the way I work too. I always think of questions I'm gonna ask a week after, when I've had time to really absorb the material. I want to suggest that we, one, consider maybe whether the P.U.D. Ordinance should be revised to reflect that. I think -- I mean, let's see how it works on this one but I think in some ways it makes better sense to have that briefing and then a little time to pass and ask questions and then provide that more formal feedback to that may be -- so that may be an adjustment we want to make to the P.U.D. Ordinance. I'd suggest that for today, and I've talked with a couple council offices about this idea, we have three briefings really important and several we waited for a long time and I'm really keen on having those conversations. On the other hand I think we'll really struggle to have those vigorous discussions today with our time remaining so I would ask maybe we keep open that opening of returning to these subjects in January and kind of continuing that discussion just in light of the time and the fact that, you know, we probably come to this meeting today with various levels of preparation in terms of having read those memos. >> Mayor Adler: Sounds right to me. We okay? Then let's go ahead and get to the briefings. We'll call them up one after another. Reserving the ability to call back staff to go at them again when we're back.

[1:15:45 PM]

Let's start with the affordability review update. >> Thank you. Corrie stokes, city auditor. Just Acevedo a reminder this affordability will have project is a special project that y'all requested earlier this year. We have a phased approach so the first phase is focused on identifying factors that affect affordability for Austin residents and then the second phase involves an inventory of city initiatives, programs and policies related to those identified factors. So today we'll be presenting the results of the first phase. This is basically in the form of a set of profiles which provide demographic and expenditure information both citywide and by each council district, Nikki raji was the manager of this project and she's gonna introduce those profiles and provide information to help interpret them. Then plough Dori, the lead will provide a brief overview on what to expect in the next phase related to the invoices. We know we're presenting a lot of data on a packed agenda with lots of other things y'all are focused on so we're certainly available to come back either collectively as discussed or also we're willing to discuss individually with council offices as requested. So keep that in mind. And Nikki. >> Hi. As Corey mentioned this is a data intensive project. We collected have forea variety of sources, on expenditures, socioeconomic as well demographic data. These are estimates and they're through the calendar year 2015. Before we go into the details of this presentation or of the profile, I wanted to go over some terminology and that is included in the inset cover of the handouts you have in front of you. This is the difference between households and families, and

[1:17:45 PM]

we wanted to stress the fact that households are a [indiscernible] Term. It includes occupied housing units, whether they are in single -- an individual living by themselves, a group of individuals that are related or a group of people of that a relationship like marriage, birth or adoption. Families are a subset of this unit. This is a concept we think is important to keep in mind especially when we discuss income because family income tends to be a here higher income than household income and also we notice that during the budget discussion, as well as in the budget document, income is discussed in terms of families and so the figures that we are presenting today may be looking lower to you than what you have seen in the past. Another distinction we wanted to stress is the median and averages, and the way in which we chose to summarize our information. Whenever the data allowed us to do we used median as a summary of statistics. We have an example in the slide of distribution of income, and it shows how the median is less influenced by outliers at either end of the distribution. And we have an example for the average and for the median, the household income in Austin is around \$52,000, and then average household income in Austin is \$77,000. So this is a snapshot of the citywide profile. We will go over some of the key information of this profile today, and I just wanted to stress the fact that all the profile have the same structure and provide similar information. It's just this is a citywide summary and the other have district-specific information. So starting from the top half

[1:19:46 PM]

of the first page, we have some information on Austin households. We have the total number of households in Austin being around 357,000, and the approximately 51% of these are family households. Then we provide information on the average household size. Wide it's 2.36. And the information about the median household income, whichwide, as I -- citywide as I mentioned is around \$52,000. As far as income on the back page of the handout, so on the back page of the citywide profile, we have information about income distribution. We have two charts. The one to the left includes information of the percentage of households that have income in those brackets we have identified. And the chart to the right that has distribution geographically by consequence block groups. We use consensus block groups because these are smaller geographies and provide more specificity to the information. And the color scheme, at the right, the -- the red and lighter colors indicate households income below the median income citywide, and the one in green and blue are the ones above citywide income of 52,000. And then we have also some areas in gray in the map and those are areas that do not have household information and included, for example, the airport or undeveloped areas. Both those charts, there is information regarding the distribution of household, whether they're renting or owning. And citywide the majority are renter household. Those are 57% of them, which equate to about 200,000 households.

[1:21:48 PM]

And then to the left of that we have information about expenditures. So we selected these expenditure categories because they would fall in the basic standard of living, and they are listed in terms of priorities. We wanted to assess the fact that we couldn't provide information on expenditures as median, so these are averages. Our annual averages by household. And also these are a selection of

expenditures. So though not include the total of expenditures that a household makes every year. For example, we didn't include recreational travel as categories of expenditures. And so on the back -- the back inside cover, you have information about what is included in each of these categories. I will mention just a few items. Housing, we were able to provide information by the renters or owners. And for renters information would include the rent, the insurance, and some maintenance costs. Owner would include information on mortgage, property tax, insurance and maintenance. Then for utilities, it would include expenditures for electricity, water, wastewater, gas, as well as phone expenditures. Food includes the food at home and away from home. Transportation includes expenditures for the cost of owning, leasing, renting a car, as well as public transportation. We have health care. That would include health insurance, medical, medicines and medical supplies. And then education and retirement. Education would include the cost of books, school supplies. And retirement includes social

[1:23:48 PM]

security contribution as well as contribution to retirement plans. So below we have the sum of these expenditures whether for renter or owner household and then we have additional costs, additional expenses for those households with children, which is child care, and we were able to provide an average per child and for the county. So we were not able in this case to provide a specific average for the city or for districts. >> Mayor Adler: The housing costs for the owner includes property taxes? >> It does include property taxes. >> Mayor Adler: And the charges that we charge that are on utility bills, fees, are necessity the utility expense? >> Yes. >> Yes. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. >> So I'll -- short answer is yes. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. >> So we have some reservation that we drew from comparing all the statistics to each other. One is the spending categories are fairly consistent across districts, so housing is the biggest expenditures, followed by transportation and then followed by food. However, when we look at the actual amount that is spent on each of these categories, that varied significantly among the districts. For this reason we have included information on the district profiles and Austin spending index. Here we have an example from district 9, on page 19 of your handouts, and next to the expenditures we have included an index. So when the index is above 100 it indicates that the households in that district spend more than the citywide average. That would be 100. And when it is below 100, then household in that district spend below the citywide average of 100. And questions? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Garza: I'm trying to

[1:25:49 PM]

understand the city -- the city -- excuse me, citywide renters spend 48% less on average on housing costs? >> We -- initially we started looking at housing costs and we did an average by household. Then we start noticing this pattern that if you rent, the expenditures are significantly higher when you own a house versus renting. And so we wanted to stress the difference in the costs. >> Garza: But that doesn't make sense to me. I mean, my [indiscernible] So I don't understand how -- I know that's not the only household cost but I'm trying to understand what was used to compile that data. >> If you'll look at the last page of the profile, there's the methodology there for housing costs for owners and all the different things that are factored in there. I can't explain exactly why that's true or why it would be so much

higher. >> Mayor Adler: Could it be because you're talking about an average, so on a homeownership you're going to have people that put in many millions of dollars worth of homes and you're not going to have an upside on the rent universe the same way you have on a home. So if I was looking at an average, as you talked about what average means, when I talked about the average it's going to skew homeownership higher just because there are more multimillion dollar homes than multimillion dollar rental properties. >> I think that is certainly a possibility. We can dig in more to those

[1:27:50 PM]

differences, but I think one of the things that jumped out at us as looking at these, some of the costs renters just don't pay. Large maintenance. So those things that are covered by perhaps landlord and not by the renter themselves are also factored into that owner average and not. >> The renter average for the most part. >> Garza: How were you able to compile homes that remodeled? >> It's included as an expenditure. So I guess that goes back to our data source. So the data source is based on a snapshot of expenditures. Citywide, basically, or of individual households that a private company compiles that information. So they basically go through and ask for expenses on various items. >> Just to add, the expenditure categories that we used come from the same categories used by the bureau of labor statistics when they do the consumer expenditure survey, which is one of the surveys and data sources that feeds the ultimately private data source that we used. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, Ms. >> Pool: Would it be like if your building or home needed a new roof the homeowner pays for that but the homeowner pays for it on the apartment. If you were spreading the cost out over all the people what live in the apartment it would be a smaller increment but 100% of people that own a home. Is that, for example, the maintenance piece you're talking about? I can -- I know from owning a home it's definitely the biggest expense that I have and it's different from when I rented because I'm responsible for everything, including the yard and all of the maintenance and upkeep. And which is not the case with a landlord situation. >> And this is the average of the expenditures that households having that specific -- have in that specific year. It may include some with major

[1:29:55 PM]

remodeling. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar. >> Casar: And I think that one point here is that homeowners, at least from the demographics I've seen in Austin and seems intuitive are usually -- skew much higher income and renters tend to skew lower income. So, I mean, it's not like you're saying the same renter at the same income and the same homeowner at the same income, that one necessarily spends more than the other. It seems to me to make a lot of sense that if you are -- if you have more money to spend you're more likely to be a homeowner and if you're more -- have more money to spend you're more likely to spend more on your housing because if you are poor you don't have extra money to spend on your housing. So another version of this slide might say the same, that renters have less money to spend on housing costs and therefore spend less money on housing and homeowners with more money tend to spend more money on housing because they have more money to spend. It's not like renters have a choice of spending that much more money on their housing. Does that make sense? >> I think we definitely -- >> Pool: Because I think it's a decision of the person who lives there how much they're going

to put into the maintenance of their home. >> Casar: I understand. I guess I'm saying is that one reason why -- to councilmember Garza's point of why it's -- you're seeing renters spending less on housing costs is because you have rent -- because renters skew lower income and therefore spend less -- aren't able to buy a home and so they're not gonna spend more money on housing costs. >> Pool: I think that might be part of it but I don't think that's the only thing. I think the other part is in an apartment, for example, there's so many more people sharing -- if you have to replace the roof and if that cost is gonna be -- show up in the rent, it would be a proportion of it but if it's your house, no matter how -- what your income is -- I don't know. I don't want to side track us

[1:31:55 PM]

entirely. It would be interesting if we could get a better feel for how you arrive -- because I noticed that too. That was gonna be my question, how did you get there. That surprised me as well. >> Certainly. >> Pool: I think we are also making some assumptions about -- generalizing over homeownership versus non-homeownership. >> Casar: I'm not generalizing. Just statistically homeowners skew higher income and renters skew lower income. I'm not saying every homeowner -- >> Pool: I don't know that that's true. >> Casar: I know that it is. >> Garza: One more point. Sorry. If your comparison is true though that because they make less -- this is still just a percentage of a whole. It's not, like, 1,000 versus 100. It's still the -- they intend 28538 -- 38 less on average as a percentage. Anyway, I guess that just -- that statistic makes it sound like it's cheaper to rent in Austin, Texas, than it is to buy, which I could maybe see that. But at the same time that doesn't take into account the equity you build as a homeowner, and that just - it presents a picture that makes it sound like it's a better deal, and maybe I'm just reading it that way, to rent. When really the equity you build as a homeowner is -- I mean, it's the best investment I've ever made, buying a home. >> And certainly that -- things like equity and net worth and all sorts of other things are not reflected here because we're really just trying to see what are the things that are kind of driving household costs. I will say a couple of things. One that you will see that kind of across the districts, the difference between those two numbers varies quite a bit. So in some districts there's gonna be less of a gap between the renter and owner costs. Some districts there's more. And then the other thing is that keep in mind that when we talked about households that includes roommates, for example, so in your -- you're

[1:33:56 PM]

unlikely to have roommates in a owner household, or at least owners that are roommates, but you are likely to have that in many renter households so that can also affect the amount that you pay. For example, in a household with multiple renters each one is paying a portion of that rent so their expense is lower than the full amount basically. Full amount basically. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Renter. >> Renteria: You just described my office. [Laughter] And I just went to -- I'm remodeling my house and -- and I'm still in the process of -- it's gonna cost me another \$36,000 this coming year to finish it all off. So that added a lot. And especially in my neighborhood, in my district, where the older homes are requiring a lot more maintenance. And there is a lot of people that are coming in and buying and building secondary units on top of that. So. . . But you're right. It's -- dependent on what kind of income you have. >> Mayor

Adler: Ms. Kitchen. >> Kitchen: My question is just -- and I apologize if I missed it, but can you help me remember where to look for the background information? I mean, this is -- this is a great document, and it really helps, you know, explain the sources, but if -- for my district, for example, I really wanted to look into the calculations, where would I look for that data? Has that been shared us? >> I think -- it has not. It's actually a proprietary data source so we pay for a license, basically, to the data. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> It's something we're happy to sit down with you individually and just talk about kind of where it came from and if there's additional analysis desired then -- >> Kitchen: We'll do it that way, thank you. >> Just in terms of kind of the data sources, a little more information on that is on the back cover, just kind of what's captured in each of the numbers and where did this data come from in the first

[1:35:57 PM]

place. >> Kitchen: It's a good level of detail for this document but there are items I'd like more detail on but we can do it by sitting down. >> Mayor Adler: Please continue, thank you. >> This is the end of my portion and I'll give it to Mary. >> All right. So as Nikki mentioned I'm Mary Dori and I'm the lead for the affordability project. I'll give you a brief overview of what's happening next. So it is Nikki and Corey mentioned this is a project being completed in multiple phases. Our first phase focused primarily on information about the residents in the districts. The next phase is going to focus on how the city affects those residents. Specifically, we're gonna be compiling what we're calling the inventory, and that's a catalog at a high level review. City of Austin that affects the key cost drivers we identified, things like housing, transportation, food, and so on. We're going to come back to y'all in February 2017 with kind of the results of what we've found but we wanted to give you a little bit of overview of what we've gathered so far. We've begun reaching out to departments and gathering information on the programs they're operating. We've noticed a real breadth in the type of programs and type of delivery, everything from a program that's run primarily by a single department, just as down payment assistance, which comes out of nhcd, as well as programs run through two or more departments, such as the customer assistance program and programs operated through a partnership with an external partner such as fresh food for families, done through the central Texas food bank and Austin public health. As you can imagine, putting together such an inventory requires a lot of information. The type of information we're collecting includes basic information about the program such as how does it run, what are eligibility requirements, what does it do. The affordability driver or drivers that are affected, funding amounts and sources, does it come from the city, is there an external source? What city funds are involved. What is the target population of the program? And information on performs measures and basket and

[1:37:59 PM]

downtown as -- and output as reported by the department. We'lling coming back to you with more information about the process hopefully in February 2017. For now that concludes our presentation and we're happy to take whatever questions you might have. >> Mayor Adler: Was the audit supposed to look at both those things, addressing affordability by making it more affordable and those things we're doing making it less affordable? >> This project we are looking at both of those. I think we have an easier time not surprisingly tying the -- kind of the outcome and results information for those programs

that are assisting with -- or assisting households with expenditures. It's kind of easier to quantify that, but certainly from a -- this program exists and it may be adversely affecting these cost drivers will have that information and we're working on that information. >> Mayor Adler: Even if the latter just identifies it qualitatively because you can't quantify it, I think having both those indications would be good for us. Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: Let's see. I had a question about the sources of information for the -- that you'll report back to us in February. I know that a number -- and I'm not sure how many of the city boards and commissions have given us reports on affordability. For example, I'm most familiar with the commission on seniors. So there's that. And then there's also the residential affordability committee. Where we had a presentation from a group in town called livable city that did a report. So are you looking at the different information that's already out there in terms of what those -- what those programs are that are impacting affordability? >> We've been tracking through the presentation and that is something we are considering. >> Kitchen: I would really like to have that included in what you bring back in February. And then tell us what you've included. Because I don't want to -- I

[1:40:01 PM]

don't want us to be doing some analysis right here that doesn't take into account the other information that's out there. You may decide you have to -- distill what you think is appropriate to include within your scope and what not, but I wouldn't want to come forward with this report and have it as say stand alone report that doesn't take into account what the commission on seniors has said or what the affordability committee has heard from or others, there may be others too. >> Our intention was exactly not to duplicate other types of -- >> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Very good information. Now we'll all let it sink in. Thank you. The next briefing that we have is the east Austin historic survey. >> Good afternoon, mayor, council, Greg Guernsey, planning and zoning. And I'm joined here today with some of my staff, Allen, Steve, and our consultant, and we're gonna give you an overview of the east Austin historic resource survey that we conducted. I'll turn it over to Cowan and she can kick this off. >> All right. Hello, good afternoon, mayor Adler, councilmembers. Let's get started on the

[1:42:01 PM]

briefing for our final draft of the east Austin historic resources survey. Okay. So this project began last October, when council allocated funding for a historic resources survey and context report for the south central portion of east Austin. So from spring of this year to October, hardy heckmore was selected to complete the survey and they researched and documented the structures within the survey area and they also formatted -- formulated historic context and recommendations during that period. So we had two public kickoff meetings at the beginning of that field work period and hardy heckmore also met with community members to interview and gather oral histories to inform the context report as well. In September they concluded their public draft, which is released for comments and suggestions from the community, stakeholders, the thc, Texas historical commission, as well as staff, and we had three public workshops during that comment period. So on the 26th of September, they -- we had a briefing for the historic landmark commission, and on the 24th of October hh incorporated all of the comments they

had received from our public comment period and completed the final survey. So just to recap our briefing schedule, November 21, we spoke to the historic landmark commission. On the 29th we went before the zoning and planning commission and the planning commission joint meeting to give a briefing and today we are here at the work session. So just to kind of explain a little bit about the background of this project. And what historic resources survey is. So basically this is to

[1:44:02 PM]

document the resources within an area in the simplest sense, building state structures and determine whether or not any of those resources are historic. Why we need one of these surveys is outlined here in the national register bill continue 24. We need to gather the information that we can in order to plan for resource use, and the national park service administers the national register, basically, you know, this describes the best practice on preservation, finding out what's there, documenting it, and then planning for its best use. And just a little brief recap of the objectives and the purpose. So in the simplest sense this project is meant to provide a comprehensive snapshot of the city's historic sites within the survey area. So it allows us to understand what exists in an area and that helps our community's plan for responsible development and preservation of any resources, as well as kind of generally promoting awareness for the community's history. Of course it also enhances our compliance as a city with the national and state preservation standards. This is one of the tools identified by the U.S. Department of the interior as essential for a preservation program. And it also is gonna be an invaluable research source for our landmark commission and for our city staff case manager. It helps to inform our research, it helps to cut down on the initial kind of research load, and it also gives us a place to start that's kind of backed one oral histories, field work, and our expert preservationists' recommendations. So let's see. Within this survey area there were two previous surveys. One of them -- this should be 1980, 1980 and 2000.

[1:46:02 PM]

Both are pretty dated. Some areas within the survey area have never been surveyed. So we kind of aimed to update what we do have, and cover what we haven't. As you can see, this is a pretty big swath of land. We have Manor Road to the north, I-35 to the west, Lady Bird Lake to the south and Pleasant Valley Road and Capital Metro line over to the east. Our preservation office determined boundaries based on known areas of high concentration of historic resources. So where we know things are that need to be documented. Areas that had never been surveyed or, you know, maybe were surveyed the last time in 1980 or 2000, and basically just the largest area that we could get within the approved budget into the survey area. And in hhm's executive summary, and you could find at the link on the bottom there, they -- our objectives were to have a survey that locates, identifies, and photographs structures that were potentially eligible and districts that were potentially eligible for decision as local landmarks and also as national registered designations. We also got a historical context report from this study, and it includes the history of Austin as a whole, as well as east Austin and the survey area in particular. And the narrative for these context reports covers 1839 to 1970, pretty extensive and provides a framework for understanding the events, trends and association that shaped east Austin and then expanded into the

city as a whole. So where east Austin fits into Austin's history. It illustrates the connections between the past and the resources that we found within

[1:48:04 PM]

the survey area. And it also provides a basis hhm's future eligibility recommendations. Okay. And they used a variety of research methods to get these context reports. So looking at historic maps and photos, previous surveys. There were a few from the Texas historical commission and our two older surveys, resident interviews, which provided the context for the oil histories, as well as written sources of course, books, dissertations, directories. We had some community input during the duration of this survey. So we had residents, local historians, interest groups, and the state of Texas historical commission weighed in during the public feedback period. And, you know, hhm also conducted oral histories, as we talked about, to inform those historic context reports. Our feedback was pretty varied. We got kind of basic corrections on information for individual structures, so build date, modifications, pianist histories -- occupancy histories. We had request to change individual eligibility recommendations or change boundaries of district recommendations. Corrections and conclusions to the narrative histories and historic context and we also had a lot of concerns that the survey would change zoning without owner input, which I do want to emphasize that it won't. A recommendation for eligibility does not change zoning. It doesn't initiate the rezoning process. This survey is an informational document only. So all the application that's come to us for historic zoning will still go through the same process. They're gonna be subject to additional research and review by our preservation office, case manager, as well as the landmark commission. So these eligibility recommendations kind of give us a place to start with

[1:50:05 PM]

evaluations that are in compliance with the criteria from our code and from the national register, but they're recommendations only. And to kind of go through these two sets of criteria, we have the national register criteria, which -- in order to be eligibility, a building must be 50 years old, has to have integrity, basically has to kind of maintain its original character, the builder could recognize it primebly. And it also has to achieve significance in criteria a through D. So association with events, people, architecture, or research potential, which usually means archaeological research. And our city decision is a little bit different. So it has to be 50 years old, structure has to have a previous designation like a national register designation. Or it can demonstrate significance in two of those categories, which are similar to the national register categories but we also have the addition of community value and landscape features as potential criteria. In the city of Austin. So there is a great section in the survey results page of the survey that has a breakdown of all the individually eligibility structures and districts. And this is just one of several charts that hhm has provided. As you can see, overwhelming number of recommended landmarks were residential structures. They ended up with documentation for 6600 structures, and 99 were recommended eligible as potential local larks and -- landmarks and we had an additional 199 recommended eligible for both potential landmark designation and inclusion in a possible future district.

[1:52:08 PM]

And the district criteria is very similar to the individual landmark criteria for both the -- for national register and for Austin it's a little bit different. National register districts, they are [indiscernible] Find areas possessing a concentration of buildings united by their history, and they have to possess significance under one of those four criteria, and they have to have integrity within the district bounds. In Austin, local historic districts are a little bit different in that they can only be community initiated, at least 51% of the principal buildings in the boundaries have to be contributing and that means that they retain integrity and are built within the period of significance. Basically just means that they add to the historic character of the neighborhood. And then in addition to that at least 51% of the owners of the land inside the district boundaries or 51% of the total number of property owners have to agree to initiate historic zoning for a district. Here is kind of a quick snapshot of the recommended historic districts. There's 24 in total. You can see that they are pretty spread out throughout the survey area. So on this map red are noncontributing resources and green are contributing. And we can pull up a map after the presentation too if you guys want to look at this a little more in depth. How are we gonna use this information moving forward? Of course our staff and commission and our council orientation hopefully will be able to use this research when evaluating historic zoning cases, for demolition cases. I know this is gonna be a really good starting point for our research just to cut down on the time that we spend.

[1:54:08 PM]

Now our case loads are getting higher and higher, and this information is gonna be a good jumping-off point for our resources on the east side. So community, of course you can use this to learn more about your community's history and also we're hoping that it's gonna be a good resource for those of us who have never done an application for historic district or historic zoning and are curious about it because this is a very daunting process, sometimes for first time applicants. This is gonna be a helpful resource to kind of get started on the research, figure out where to go and provide a lot of the information that the application from the city requires. And then other stakeholders of course, you know, developers, historians, anybody interested in Austin's development. You know, we're hoping that this is going to go allow us as a city to evaluate our existing resources, understand what's still there, and to help us better plan for responsible development. Especially of areas like this with high concentrations of resources. And then, finally, hhm provided us with some future survey recommendations for areas that should be prioritized as in need of future survey efforts. And these metrics are based on resource concentration and the demo rate. They appear in appendix F and G. All of the charts are there. There are maps of each individual area for recommendations, and as you can see, I think section U was identified as the top priority for a possible future survey. And all of this information is available in hard copy at our office at 505 Barton springs,

[1:56:11 PM]

as well as at the Austin history center, and you can download the entire report on our website, and you

can do it by section or the whole thing at once. And that's it. I'll turn it back over. >> Mayor Adler: Any comments? Ms. Pool. >> Pool: I wanted to thank Emily for the good work that hhm did and also everyone that worked on it. I missed your name. I'm sorry. >> Emily Payne. >> Pool: Yeah, yeah. >> I'm caly. >> Pool: Great. You made the presentation to the historic landmark commission a couple weeks ago, right? I happened to be there for that. I wanted just to check in, the historic landmark commission their vote in accepting this? >> Yes, they've endorsed it and we are excited to move forward. >> Pool: And the vote was -- was it unanimous? >> It was. >> Pool: To adopt this? I just think this is really good work, and I know that you did as much as you could with the amount of money that you had. Thank you. >> Thank you. >> Houston: And, mayor, as the district that has probably the fastest rate of demolitions, we would have seen a lot more green instead of the red that you see now if this had been completed earlier, but I am so thankful that you've been able to identify homes that continue to be in the enabled so that we're aware of their significance, either as a district or as a stand-alone landmark and we'll be able to help people repurpose those, because some of them are coming up for sale fairly quickly. >> Thank you, councilmember. >> Mayor Adler: Good work. Thank you very much. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. I'm sorry, hold on, please. >> Tovo: I have a couple questions. Thank you very much.

[1:58:12 PM]

I really look forward to now going back and looking at the report again and developing some additional questions. One question I do have is, on the map of future survey recommendations, are the rankings apparent by the letters you've chosen to designate the area? >> No. There's a separate table. Those areas kind of go from top to bottom. >> Tovo: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. It's so small I hardly caught it. Okay. So you as -- U is the highest. That as you said was based on the rate of demolition some in part? >> It's based on a imitation of the age of properties and the rate of -- combination of the age of properties and demolition. >> Tovo: My other question is, if you know off the top of your head, what are the areas within the east Austin survey that were not surveyed in any -- in the two previous survey study areas? >> The 2005 study was just the chestnut area, a somewhat small area about the 1984 survey, it's not a clean cut area. The methodology used for that survey was to do everything that was in the sand born historic map area, so it's kind of a jagged and random line, not a clean cut line. >> Tovo: Thank you. Which period of time from the sand born map? >> 50 years, 1984. I think it's to '32 is the most recent. >> Tovo: Thank you very much. I think as my colleagues have said this is really good work. You know, we are -- well, actually, that brings me to one >> There was a reference to the high case loads, and I wanted to understand whether that high caseload was related specifically to demolitions. >> It was. It was, yes. Steve was our case manager for every demo case.

[2:00:13 PM]

>> For every demo case. Yes, we've been seeing a much higher number of applications for total demolition over the past year and a half. >> Yeah, I've certainly seen those -- I've certainly seen those numbers. They're staggering. I think they're affecting a lot of the city districts. My district, district 9, is definitely impacted. I think it's a very concerning trend for this city. I hope as a council we can take some steps to address it. Certainly, this will provide us with some great information about this area in east

Austin and what we stand to lose if we don't take some different approaches toward the demolition of structures within our neighborhoods. >> I think this provides two things, two very important things that we've never had before. First is a resource for developers or people looking to buy property. If their intention is demolition, they now have a document that says this house has historical significance. If your plan is to demolish it, maybe you want to reconsider an option besides demolition. That may reduce the amount of demolition permit applications that we get. One thing we've never had before is it provide as context. As some of y'all remember, when we've had applications for historic zoning, the questions always come up, well, how many of this particular resource do we have? And how does this relate to other areas of the city or other architectural types? Now we have a document that sets all of that out. This is a tremendous document. It's going to provide a huge amount of new information and a level of service that we've not been able to provide this comprehensively in the past. >> Thank you. That really provides some really

[2:02:15 PM]

useful observations, I think, in which we can use this. I hope for the areas where there haven't been recent surveys but you have ranked them based on that connection between a high level of age of structure and demolition, I hope that developers and other potential purchasers will take note of that. These are areas that are identified as having potential historic structures in them. If you're purchasing a structure within those areas and intending to pursue a total demolition, that you will take note that may not be granted by the various boards that have to consider it. >> I will note that may not be a tried and true methodology. There are some methods, for instance, Hyde park, that rate is low, so that doesn't mean it's significant. So it's complicated because it is a good first-run approach. >> Sure. I see your point. Yeah, thank you. >> And we thank you for your support. >> Yes. >> Anything else? >> Thank you very much. >> All right. Our last briefing here is on the draft equity assessment. >> Mayor, it's not that equity is not important to me because it is, but I had something scheduled across down at 2:30. Thank you. I'm going to have to leave. >> Good afternoon. I'm chief equity officer Brian oaks. I wanted to actually give you an

[2:04:16 PM]

update of overall for the equity office and inform you about the progress to date since my hire. In addition, I will touch a little bit on the equity assessment report that was recently released on Friday via memo on December 9th. So I wanted to begin by talking about how we really sort of see the equity office moving forward. Really, what our ultimate goal is is to build a culture of equity within the city so that in everything we do, whether it's our planning, our budgeting, all of those functions we really sort of look at it with the equity lens. In order for us to do that, we're focused on three primarily core -- primary core areas. We want to normalize equity in the city. By normalizing, we want to make sure we have definitions for what equity is. We're also looking at training and development of our staff to actually do this scope of work, but it really is the beginning of the start of putting us into our Normal everyday conversations as city government as we move forward. We also want to focus on ensuring that we organize around equity. And by organizing, it's us looking at our internal infrastructure and capacity

to support this scope of work as well as a partnership with the community and other institutions to move equity forward within the city. Last but definitely not least, we focus on operationalizing around equity. That really is sort of, you know, having discussions around how do we start of integrate equity into everyday protocol as city government? I will talk about some of the things we're going to operationalize the equity, like the tool that the council passed

[2:06:18 PM]

resolution on for the city to adopt. So I wanted to focus, first, on the work that we've been doing so far to normalize equity within the city. A big part of us developing a shared understanding, it starts with the completion of our initial equity assessment by the government alliance on race and equity, which is called gear. The city commissioned gear before my arrival to come on board as a consultant to help develop and build out the equity office as well as sort of do this assessment so we can begin to get a baseline of what equity looked like for the city and within our various departments. So throughout that process, gear interviewed more than 40 key stakeholders and conducted both individually and in groups. They also did an analysis of previously existing sort of city projects or works we were doing, as well as looking at other data as our employees surveyed to get an idea of what the city was doing in regards to equity. They hosted two public town hall meetings that had more than 150 participants to sort of begin to develop that shared understanding and provide us with a baseline of equity. So one of the things I wanted to touch on very briefly were some of the elevated findings that came out of the gear equity assessment. A lot of these things you have heard and you all have sort of made it a priority for this city yourselves, but one of the things that really stood out to me is the city of Austin's communities of color must share in the city's economic prosperity. I think if we are talking about issues today, such as affordability and looking at the fact that our city is the most sort of economically segregated

[2:08:21 PM]

city in the nation are definitely themes that ring true. It range true in the gathering of the data from the town hall meetings and from what residents were saying. Another sort of key area that I will touch on, just really going in line with a lot of conversations we're having today is that residents have the right to remain in their neighborhoods in the face of escalating housing costs was another theme that really rang true. I will touch on two more that I thought was really important for this assessment. Keeping community voices centered is fundamental to the success of the efforts of the equity office. And that's one of the things that we really want to hang our hat on for the equity office. Every step of the way, we want to make sure that we are actively engaging communities and we're hearing those community voices because when you sort of really get to the root of some of the institutional changes we want to make, we can prevent those sort of adverse impacts or we can prevent some of the implicit bias in our planning and decision making by making sure that we listen to those community voices and keeping them front and present for us. So that really stands out. While there is pressure on the city to act quickly, thoughtful strategy at the forefront is imperative. For me, that was really the community saying that we understand there's a sense of urgency around this work, but we want this work to be done the right way, and we want to be included as we move forward in this scope of work. >> Mayor protom. >> I

have a question about the third bullet point up there. When you're talking about keeping community voices centered, as I heard you describe it, it's really keeping

[2:10:23 PM]

community voices at the center. Is that accurate? Is that what you intended by that? >> Yes. So in our planning process and how we operate, it's making sure that we listen and we engage those community voices on the front end for what we do as a city government. >> Okay. Thank you. This was also important that came out of the report. They asked what does equity look like to you? This is helping us build a frame for how we want to define equity and how we view equity for the city overall. Throughout those interviews and throughout the town hall meetings, the synthesis of it is about access and opportunity. It's about process and outcome. Understanding needs and the distribution of resources. Removing barriers and elevating the well-being of the entire community. Addressing institutional structures. Advancing dignity and integrity. Infusing with notions of justice and fairness. Acknowledging the reality of race and ultimately dealing with the movement of power. Really, those are all the things that we hope that we can be able to capture as we move forward with building the equity office and our initiatives within the city. >> I want to also touch on some of the work that we've been doing around organizing as it relates to equity. That's our internal and extorpidity infrastructure that we're building that will give us the capacity to do this work as we move forward. At the center of it is the formation of what we call our equity action team, or eat. The equity action team is a collection of community leaders, our equity champions, as well as city staff, who are coming together to actually co-create different components of our equity program as we move forward.

[2:12:23 PM]

I will talk a little bit about some of the work we've done around the equity action team, or eat, already. We're focused on capacity building. We have what we call our core city staff equity team. The core equity team of the city is composed of managers across all of our city departments. We have a total of 92 participants that are part of the core team. And the core team is really sort of focused on the training and development opportunities that we'll be rolling out with the equity office. This core team is actually already participated in one training that focused on implicit bias with work that was done with our consulting gear before my arrival. We have a racial equity work group. This was done by a grant that we received from living cities. So the city of Austin is a participant and co-part of five other cities that are all establishing their equity offices at the same time. And what's really unique about this opportunity is we get a chance to actually convene with these other cities and really sort of share best practices and plan in conjunction with each other as we all go on this journey to build and develop our equity initiatives. I will tell you that in addition to actually developing our equity initiatives, there's a component within this grant that actually says that we have to demonstrate what we're doing on an intervention that would address the disparities for youth between the ages of 16 to 24. So we're still not there in terms of looking at what that project would look like, but once we have the framework of our equity built out, that will be the next phase as part of the work group we're focusing on. Two other sort of areas that we want to build capacity in, and this will be work that we'll start to really do in the new

[2:14:24 PM]

year, is looking at department equity teams. So working at that department level to recruit a small group of staff within each department to kind of serve as equity leads within their particular departments. We would also like to work on an equity leadership team or senior leadership team. Not sure what that is going to look like further down the road. That's one of the things we would actually like to work with you on in terms of building out what the leadership structure would look like. In order to help us drive accountability. So this is really how we're working to operationalize equity. I will tell you this is our primary priority that we want to leave with the equity office. That's the development of an equity assessment tool. You all passed the resolution back in May of 2015 for the city manager to adopt an equity assessment tool. That's really the protocol, the primer that would deliver the consciousness of how our decisions as city government within those choice points could have a positive or negative impact on equity in our community. In order for us to really develop the equity assessment tool, we are using what I like to call a co-creation process. In your resolution, you really explicitly expressed that this equity tool had to be sort of built and developed with the collaboration of the community. So I've really taken that to heart. As a matter of fact, you listed out specific organizations you wanted us to work with to build this equity tool. We have all those organizations at the table. The vibrant woman, the Austin immigrants rights association.

[2:16:25 PM]

That's I.C.E. Out of Austin. It's three organizations listed in the resolution. We've reached out and engaged all of them to be equity champions for us. We also are going to be focused on looking at piloting the initial first version of the equity tool. With five or more departments. I've already begun reaching out to different departments and gauging their interest and being a pilot for the equity assessment tool. Last but not least, we want to utilize the equity assessment with the request for unmet needs. That usually happens around the April or May time frame. I will tell you that in my initial meeting with our budget and finance leads, my hiring -- in terms of the process and timing, we didn't think that we would be able to sort of have this co-creation process and engagement in the community to develop a tool quick enough for you all to use in that initial phase of the budget planning, which I think take place in February. We would be really rushed to kind of work with the community to do that. So we thought that our best second student for that from a timing standpoint would be the unmet needs. It is my hope that having the equity assessment on top of the request for unmet needs can sort of help bring some clarity to that. It can also help us prioritize the different areas that we focused that funding on. So we're really excited about the opportunity to do that and showcase the equity assessment tool. The last thing I will touch on is to sort of tell you about our equity visioning session which took place on December the 9th. The visioning session was the first meeting that we've had for our equity action team, which is

[2:18:25 PM]

really sort of representing our community stakeholders working in coordination with city staff to really move this thing forward. I would like to come back in January for you all to kind of sort of give you -- or detail the overview of the vision session. We had breakout sessions and asked questions of community stakeholders. What are the elements about the tool that you think is essential. In terms of data and how we look at impact helps us build the logic model as we move forward. I would like to provide you with a more synthesized report of the vision session itself, but I will tell you that at a high level, just sort of skimming the initial comments we got from breakout groups, our community stakeholder said the core elements of an equity assessment tool that were essential for us was first and foremost we had to sort of focus on human-centered design. As we build this tool, let's not forget the people at the end of the day whose lives it's going to impact and change. Although this is sort of very process driven, always sort of coming back to making sure that we keep emphasis on the human or the people that it really will impact at the end of the day. It also came out that we sort of have to make sure we engage residents in the decision-making process, especially those that are adversely affected by the current condition. Bring conscious attention to racial inequities and the impact before decisions get made. Almost this equity assessment tool is a former prevention for us, if you think about it in that sense as a city. Also helping to make sure that we can avoid or minimize the adverse impacts and unintended consequences of our actions as government. So looking forward, these are

[2:20:27 PM]

the key deliverables that the equity office is really going to be focused on as we move forward. One is that we're establishing our standard meeting for our eat team to begin. We had our first meeting last week. Then we'll have ongoing meetings, probably a pretty aggressive schedule. Our plan is we'll meet twice a month for the next four months so we can actually develop the first version of our equity assessment tool. We'll also be looking to secure commitments from five departments to power the pool by January 2017. We want to provide all departments with some guidance for at least this budget's cycle. If we don't have the full -- since we won't have the full tool completely ready by that time, we want to provide them with some guiding principles. We want to look at high-level questions and things they can start to consider for their budget process this year as we start to develop the full version of the tool. We have also want to establish an annual training schedule for our staff and core team by February 2017. We want to complete the first version of the equity assessment tool by April of 2017. I will open it up for questions. >> I think you're absolutely right. There are a lot of people in the community that are anxious for you to be rolling out this work. >> Yes. >> Rick? >> I just want to thank you for the work that you've already put in and thanks for the update and the deliberate process to try our best to get it right. Of course, it's going to be an ever living thing. We'll continue to work with you on it. >> I feel out of every department we have to walk the walk, so we have to really make sure that we embody the spirit of collaboration and co-creation with the community to really develop the tool and other

[2:22:28 PM]

components for the equity office as we move forward because that's really, to me, at the heart of how we begin to change our institution, right, and change the culture. >> Mayor protem? >> Thank you very

much for this update. I look forward to seeing the next iteration of the update. >> I have the gear initial assessment. One of the things -- just for the sake of time, I can come back for a council work group session, and we can talk about some of the recommendations that are actually within this initial assessment. There are quite a bit of recommendations that we'll need council's input on. But we can revisit that later. That's its own discussion in itself. >> That would be great. I would love to have a copy, if you're prepared to distribute this today. I want to mention. As my colleagues know, I attended the open government conference last week. I got asked several questions from people from other countries about this particular project because it is part of the work plan that the city of Austin has committed to do as part of the pioneer -- what is the rest of that program? Anyway, the pioneer program Austin was selected to participate in. >> I actually have to respond to an e-mail in Ontario, Canada. >> People kept asking me questions, and I kept directing them to staff on my team and putting them in touch with staff when I got back. There's interest in the work Austin is doing on several fronts, but the equity assessment was among them. >> They're very interested in seeing how we go about building our tool. >> Thank you. >> Anything else? >> Anything else for him or for

[2:24:30 PM]

the day? >> Anything else for Brion? >> Okay. Thanks, Brion. >> Thank you. >> If you could hand those out, that would be great. >> Do you have anything else? >> I wanted to note two things. One, a couple of us that were co-sponsors on the legal services ifc wanted to see if we could take that up as close to 11:00 as we could. I imagine there will be people here who could answer anybody's questions. Second, we have an item to dedicate money to the Rex center. There's folks in the community that have been working on the project had some questions. Hopefully we get it all sorted out between now and Thursday, but I may ask for some time. >> Okay. >> Can you remind us what number that is, council member? I will look from the agenda, and we can chat. >> Mayor, I want to correct something. I referred to the baseline question earlier. I was reminded it was not an issue for this because it's got clear-cut zoning. So the baseline won't be something we need to provide a lot of feedback on. Though I still contend there may be elements of that planned proposal that we do want to spend some time talking about. I guess we can see how it goes on Thursday, but my proposal might be we try to limit that discussion and revisit it? January. I wanted to correct that comment I made earlier. In case I get politifacted. >> I think that's all we have. It's 2:25. This meeting stands adjourned.