

# City Council Work Session Transcript – 10/30/2018

Title: City of Austin

Description: 24/7

Channel: 6 - COAUS

Recorded On: 10/30/2018 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 10/30/2018

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[9:11:39 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Let's go ahead and we'll start with the briefing of the airport while we wait for people to come for the government as works. We need more council for that. It is October 30th, 2018. It is 9:12. And we are in the boards and commissions here at 301 west second street. We'll start with the briefing this morning, government -- on airport and then we'll go to government that works. And we'll let some of our colleagues come in for the government that works conversation. You need to turn on your microphone.

>> I'm Jim Smith with the airport. With me is Shane what are binson, sis sent director the airport. We're here to present the 20-year mayor pro master plan that we're obligated to submit to the fat as part of -- the F.A.A. As part of our federal requirements. The first slide talks about why we need a master plan. First and foremost it's a federal requirement that require all U.S. Airports to maintain a master plan to designate . Various portions of the property that will be used for the uses necessary to support the future growth of all the airports. In addition, executing our strategy as an airport, since all airports are in a competitive environment, the master plan is key to our success and being able to Pete long range.

-- Compete long range. The real foundation for the master plan is focusing on growth and our projections for growth because that tells us how quickly and how much we have to add. The first slide on there on the Texas triangle talks about what the growth of the area will be. And within the 20 year time frame that we're talking about for this master plan, the austin-san Antonio corridor will be larger than the dfw corridor is today, so you can start picturing what is going to be necessary to be added to the airport in order to cope with the type of growth that you see up there in the dfw area.

[9:13:57 AM]

Next slide goes over the area that we draw our passengers from. You can see it's pretty much concentrated on the I-35 corridor going down to San Antonio and up to Waco, out to College Station,

and into the hill country. So we have basically anybody within a two-hour driving distance we are a competitor for their air service. And we've been successful in doing that. Next one deals with the economic impact of the airport and why we do the master plan. The state of Texas just recently updated the economic study of all airports in the state and their economic impact on the community. And Austin was listed as a \$7.6 billion impact in supporting over 75,000 jobs. And that's up from just \$2.4 billion in impact 10 years ago. So the airport and its rapid growth has had a strong impact on the local economy. Next two slides are the crux of what we have to do and when we have to do it, which is our forecast for growth rates. The first one is a four and a half percent compound annual growth rate that says within the next 10 years we will have about 24 million passengers we have to deal with. And to put that in context, today we're pushing about 16 million passengers for the -- through the facility now. The second chart shows that at an eight percent annual growth rate, which we think is going to be more realistic, we'd be pushing about 32 million passengers through the airport within the 10-year window. So within the next 10 years somewhere between 24 and 32 million passengers will be going through the airport, and that's what we have to prepare for with the facilities that we need to put in place. The next two slides deal with the process that we've used. We did extensive outreach over the last year and a half we've been doing the master planning process with different groups to explore the alternatives for facility growth at the airport, and which ones receive the most support, and those were the ones that were included in the master plan.

[9:16:24 AM]

The master plan itself breaks down into three functional areas, the terminal itself, the landing needs and the land side. In terminal needs we're talking about adding 20 new Gates at the airport. So we need those Gates desperately to accommodate the demand from the airlines to put more service into our market. In addition we need more ticket, baggage space, security space to process that many more passengers. The second 10 years in the terminal would need an additional 12 Gates. Over the 20 year time frame we're talking about for the master plan we're talking about an additional 32 Gates added to the airport. The next slide is a-- from a planning perspective, a designation of what it could look like. Everything which is in that Orange color would be new and we're proposing that would have to be done in the next 10 years. Furthest right is a parallel concourse that would initially contain 20 Gates, but within 20 you would gain 32 Gates. That would be connected to the Barbara Jordan terminal by a bridge that planes could pass under. Out in front of the Barbara Jordan terminal throat side is a new processing center or terminal. That would go where the parking garage is today. The parking garage, which is right in front of the airport, would come down in order to accommodate our ability to build a new terminal in that space. And then the roadway network would be moved to where it accesses the terminal today to move it to the front of the new terminal which would be just in front of the rental car garage as well as the new garage which we are about to complete in a couple of months. So those are the things from a terminal perspective that we are saying we need to get moving on relatively quickly and because it's needed within the first 10 years of the master plan.

[9:18:34 AM]

The next couple of slides are just renderings. Obviously no design has been done yet nor projected identified. This is just a planning exercise. But that shows you what the new terminal could potentially look like. The next slide is just a cutaway of what it would look like from the parking garages to the terminal and from the terminal into the Barbara Jordan facility. And the third one is just a nighttime aerial view of what it could look like in 10 years. In terms of airfield improvements in the next 10 years we need some taxiway improvements in order to make the airfields safer and more efficient as we increase the volume of planes using it. The good news is we don't need a new runway in the first 10 years of this master plan but the runway will be needed by the time the 20-year scope of the master plan. So initially it would be primarily basically pouring more concrete for overnight parking for the planes well as taxiway improvements. Further down the row the next slide lists the next 10 years and what some of the things would be included, including as I said the runway. Right now we're contemplating if when we have to add that runway in about 15 to 20 years, that would go inside the existing west runway so it would have limited needs to expand the land owned by the airport as well as they would have limited impact relative to most new runways in terms of noise, contours around the airport. Next slide just tries to illustrate that, which is basically everything in blue is either taxiway or runway improvements that would be needed over the next 20 years.

[9:20:35 AM]

In terms of landside improvements, again in the first 10 years we're talking about additional parking spaces that would have to be added. And a new interchange with highway 71. If you've been out to the airport lately you know that that traffic light on presidential boulevard does back up traffic significantly and we need to figure out a way to eliminate that light to get people direct access to the highway so they can enter and exit the airport more cleanly. Finally, on a longer term perspective we need a new ground transportation center at the airport that allows us to integrate all of the high capacity transportation that the community is working on trying to come up with a game plan for as well as the Uber, Lyft, taxis and everybody else who wants access to the airport. We need to make it easier for people to come to the curb and pick up their passengers. Next slide just is one to show that we have reserved corridors on the airport property so that whatever method of high capacity transit that the community chooses that we will have the land available to give that transportation access to the main terminal. In addition, we are talking with txdot and other transportation officials about the potential long-term of moving 71 closer to the Colorado river so that we can unite the land that we own, which is currently on the northside of 71 and make it contiguous to the existing airport property, which gives us more flexibility on how we can utilize that land. Next slide is basically what we get back from the state because once the council sets the airport master plan we send it to F.A.A., F.A.A. Approves it and then they approve an airport layout plan and that becomes our guide in the next 10 to 20 years in terms of where we locate various facilities on airport property.

[9:22:56 AM]

Obviously everything we talked about costs a lot of money. Right now everything that we just listed is north of three billion dollars' worth of work. We obviously do not have the capacity to fund three billion dollars' worth of work today, but in terms of breaking these projects up into discrete elements and pacing them over a period of time, we feel that this is a manageable program that can be delivered and delivered in a way that allows the air service to continue to grow. On the left-hand side of that slide are the number of the options of different financing approaches we could take depending on what the project is and we will obviously be exploring all of those to 59 the projects and -- define the projects and the method of funding. Finally, the last slide on there just shows you what the ultimate buildout of the airport could look like. You can see the airport would be a series of parallel concourses, very similar to if you've flown into Denver or Atlanta this is the model they use. But what it does show is the 4200 acres that we have currently at the airport can serve this community for a fairly long time and get us up to to 70 million passengers locating the facilities appropriately. So we feel pretty good about the ability of this site to serve the community for quite a ways, as well as allow us to be very competitive to become the largest airport in central Texas and dominate the traffic flow that the airlines want to put into the market here. So with that, that's a brief overview of a lot of material that we will be sending the F.A.A., and I'll be happy to answer any questions you may have.

>> Mayor Adler: Ann?

>> Kitchen: Just to -- a question about what we're -- what we're approve approving.

[9:24:57 AM]

And I'm specifically curious about the transportation improvements. So what we're asked to be approved now includes the relocation of sh 71, right, and the high capacity transit. So that's a component of what we're being asked to approve right now, is that right?

>> We're just showing you from a planning perspective those are some of the things being considered. We have to come back to you with a very discrete project and bring it to council with how we're going to fund it. That's when it would actually become a project or something in a specific location, specific, serving a specific function. This is just 10,000-foot scale planning exercise. We would have to come back to the council a minimum of three more times relative to the implementation of any one component of the plan.

>> Kitchen: The reason I ask is I'm not saying I disagree at this point. I just really need to think through it, you know. And I'm not prepared to say that sh 71 should be relocated. And maybe it should, but I'm just not prepared to say that right now. So I don't want to approve something and then it's a done deal. So that's why I'm asking.

>> No, nothing in here is a done deal. >>

>> Kitchen: Then with regard to the high capacity transit, have we talked to cap metro. Have you been in conversations with cap metro about this?

>> Yes, we've talked to capital metro. And there is no defined plan yet, so what we've done is listen to them and try and accommodate what future may occur and just reserve the corridors to try and accomplish that.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Just to touch base as we get into the details on this, the airport is one of the things that's working really well and has historically in this city, both competitively and in terms of growth, in terms of operation.

[9:26:58 AM]

You and your staff deserve a lot of credit for that, and I just want to say thank you. From a planning perspective it's good to know that should we decide we want to expand the airport to that level or should the city continue to grow, it's good to see that it can all fit in what we have. Alison?

>> Alter: Thank you. I want to first of all also echo that I believe that the airport functions very well. My husband travels all the time and every time I manage to be on the same flight with him we always walk out singing the praises of the airport as the best one in the U.S. I do have some questions about this plan. So we see a lot of master plan. They usually look a lot bigger than this. Is it just the map that you're sending in because that's all that was in backup. And I have searched my email and have not found an actual plan that we are supposed to have reviewed for this that we're being asked to vote on Thursday beyond graphics, and that makes me unorthodox. Am I missing something about what has to go in?

>> No, you're correct that ultimately it goes to the F.A.A. For their approval is called an airport layout program and it's the diagram that the F.A.A. Will recruitment and what their review is looking at is safety considerations, runway protections, protections of the nav AIDS and line of sight, but ultimately it is the airport layout plan that the F.A.A. Will be stamping and approving and then will be implementing future projects from that approval.

>> Alter: So the only thing that goes forward to them is just the one map?

>> Yes, one large map with backup with it, meaning the data that creates that map.

>> Alter: Is there data beyond this powerpoint that establish the needs and goes through kind of all of the pieces?

[9:28:59 AM]

>> There's a lot of data collected over the year and a half process of the public meetings. Several volumes of that. That basically documents existing conditions. And then forecasts the growth and then looks at alternative ways of serving that growth. And as part of the master planning exercise and public discussions we explored those options with the public and settled on these options as the

recommendation. But if you would like, we can get you copies of the other materials that have all of that information in it.

>> Alter: I guess I'm trying to understand is that often we have -- there will be a map and there's all sorts of other things that are part of that that makeup the plan, not necessarily interested in all of the data that airport has on everything under the sun. I just want to make sure that what we're approving is just the map or are there other things in there that we should be aware of that we're not aware of? And I don't know -- this is a federal process that you're going through and so it may be very different than what we go through as a city. And I'm just seeking some clarity on that. And I'm not clear that I have that yet.

>> I think the easiest way to look at it is this is not a recommendation or approval for anything which is a cip. We have to come back to you with a five-year cip program that lays out the specific project that we're proposing to implement and how we would fund them. So that's where we would actually start defining a project. This is again just a very high level. These are the types of things that we would need in order to accommodate 30 million passengers in the next 10 years.

>> Alter: Okay. So I want to make sure I'm understanding you correctly because it's a different process interfacing with the feds on this. You are saying that really what we're forwarding on to them is underlying at that time and the analysis is really in the map of what we need, and that is what we're approving.

[9:31:10 AM]

There's not another document that -- when you get to the cip you will be basing it off of this. And so you know, I want to be able to give the feedback at the appropriate time. And --

>> You can always provide feedback, but cip is traditionally the way that we have implemented things in the past. 20 years ago when we had our first master plan it was pretty much done and then the council really only discussed cip issues after that. We never really returned to a discussion of the master plan. And I would foresee this the same way. This is really a land preservation plan. They want to see the airport has taken into consideration the types of things that are necessary to take care of 30 million passengers from '16 to today. And then they want to make sure as you progress with your cip projects that you're accomplishing some of the goals that you established in the master plan in terms of making sure that that airport can accommodate that growth.

>> Alter: Okay. So if I'm understanding the goals, the goals are not listed on the map, they're elsewhere. So -- is nobody else having any question?

[Laughter].

>> Kitchen: To just ask us to approve a map without any information behind it is not very detailed. So we're asking for more information.

>> Wing the question is will you be -- I think the question is will you be sending the map with the powerpoints to the feds?

>> All the chapters that were used to create this, they were be combined and sent to the F.A.A. In draft form as well. When they approve the airport layout plan, then the draft would become a final report with that -- that supports the airport layout plan.

[9:33:12 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: But that's not something that's prepared. There's no document or volumes that councilmember alter could see.

>> There are chapters now being created for it.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem?

>> Tovo: I was going to suggest if we're being asked to approve it, then anything that's going off as part of that approval should be in our backup.

>> Mayor Adler: Leslie.

>> Pool: So I want to thank you for coming and talking to me last week about this master plan for 2040. I apologize for my voice. I think the change of season is lodged in my voice. I think what I'm hearing from a couple of my colleagues is yes, the additional details we'd like to see what those are because we know once the feds have this master plan and they approve it, then we're kind of irrevocably on that course of action. And so we would just want to have a little bit more granular information. My question -- two specific questions is where the ground transportation, the taxis, for example, will be located with the new plan? I think they're further away from where they are now because we're going to be -- the plan shows the terminal taking up that space. So if you could bring that slide back and show that. And then my second question is could you just give us a good, if high level, explanation of the state approval and funding process if sh 71, which I understand is a state highway, and I guess there are some federal dollars involved in that too, what all the various streams of revenue would be and what generally the -- what we would have to do as a city to get txdot to agree to move that road. This was a piece that I don't remember talking about in my office with you guys. So I would like to dig in a little bit on that one piece.

[9:35:13 AM]

So first, where would the ground transportation vehicles be relocated?

>> On your document it would be number 13, non-aeronautical development area. It's the area where the two alignments for the high capacity transit enter the airport property off of 71.

>> The two high transit lines that bring to the terminal on 71 we've reserved two areas of 13 called non-aeronautical that would be a transit center or some type of -- we have is on the curb site and the staging area.

>> [Inaudible - no mic].

>> It's probably a good mile between here and the terminal. And then what the line would have go all the way to the terminal, the high capacity line. You can see the corridor connects to the terminal. That is whatever the fight that capital metro has plans for connecting the various downtown areas with the airport could be -- it could be a light rail type of system or Aton must vehicles, rapid buses.

[9:37:30 AM]

Autonomous vehicles. Could be anything.

>> Pool: You're not asking for people to walk that distance. There will be an organized and regularly scheduled shuttle, program, whatever. That's real helpful. So thank you for that. And then generally can you give us a high level, but informed description of what the approval process would be at the state and the federal level should the feds are involved in order to move a state highway?

>> The discussions very early and preliminary with -- at this stage of the game. It's something that would take place over the next five to seven years of discussions to see whether or not it made sense. There's also the regional mobility authority is participating in case that section of 71 that becomes a toll road somewhere down the road, they would have a role in playing that. So all we're really doing is putting that out there for planning consideration. There's no active movement on part of anybody to adopt it at this stage of the game.

>> Pool: Right. So one of the elements of the funding for it, should it happen, would be a toll on that road for people coming and going on the airport?

>> There's a potential for that and also the potential federal or state funding or airport funding depending on what scenario we end up with.

>> Pool: Okay. I think at some point as this moves forward, and I'm supportive, obviously, as I told you both, I do want to get some additional information and dig into the details and better understand the financing, but I think at some point here this panel should probably take up the issue of technology and folks whether they're just visiting Austin, coming for business, or residents here coming and leaving, what the financial impact will be on them. I think that's a pretty critical element of this whole plan locally.

[9:39:34 AM]

Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: I gather that's something we need to do over the next five years. And I guess just to understand, I'm just not clear what it is that is our function at this point on this. Are we parceling the particular elements of this? I'm not sure what -- it seems like what this is is the feds want to know if we



can accommodate a 30-year demand on that site. One way of doing it so that if we ever start doing anything else out there, at some point when this is approved the feds can come back and say wait a second, can you still hit your 30-year goal? Like we want to put an amusement park in part of this, whatever we want to do, somebody will raise their hand and say wait a second. But we're not picking design or location or function or any of those things now or are we? I'm uncertain as to what is our role right now. It didn't say if txdot ever builds a road out there certainly we want them to touch base on interests and if somebody wants to build an amusement park out there they will have to address the airport. I don't know at what level we're supposed to be giving you feedback.

>> Your explanation is accurate. That's the way it would be handled. And the process in the past has always been when we're ready to build something we come up with a design for a cip and a proposal. We bring it to council as part of the plan and we bring it back to council again as an individual project. And the council gets a chance to vote on it. It gets sent to F.A.A. For F.A.A. To match it up against the master plan document to make sure that we're using the land consistently with the way we told them we should be using it over the next 20 years. That's really the only function this serves.

>> Jimmy?

[9:41:34 AM]

>> Flannigan: So 10 years from now we're engaging in conversations about high capacity transportation to the airport and it doesn't go where this document says it should go, is there a plan amendment document with the F.A.A.? We should say there's a better way and we found another revenue source or we passed a bond or whatever it is?

>> Yes.

>> This locks us into the extent that we can always say, well, -- actually, we think there's a better way. It's just the check-in with the feds, right?

>> It only locks you in until you tell them you want to make an amendment to it. And then you go about the process of changing it.

>> Flannigan: Right. And the fta review on these plans and/or amendments, is it -- I don't know how to ask the question, nor how you will answer it. Is it difficult, is it laborious? There are parts of federal approval that are very difficult that you would avoid almost at all costs and sometimes it's good, check.

>> No, sometimes it requires us to repeat what we just did as part of the master plan in presentation for sending it to the F.A.A. But it's not a long, extensive, laborious process to get that approval.

>> Flannigan: What you mean by what we just did, you mean the community engagement stuff?

>> Yes. To go over what the options would be and getting feedback on those types of things and then looking at the different costs of different options before we make a recommendation and go forward.

>> Flannigan: All right. That makes sense to me. I appreciate you guys coming into my office and walking me through this as well. It seems fairly straightforward that this is a guidance document, but not one

that is immediately going to result in spending or concrete pouring. There's many check-ins to come later and this is really, as the mayor said, prior councils did a good job in securing this location so that whatever plan -- and this being the one as a guidance document, where we're set up as a community for the future.

[9:43:38 AM]

And I think that's pretty exciting. And to councilmember alter's point, every time I walk through that airport I always stand up a little taller and beam with pride with the work you all have done in giving us a first class airport. Thank you.

>> Tovo: Thanks very much. I had an opportunity to share some of these comments with director Smith when we met, but I just want to indicate that I think we have a terrific airport. I'm excited to see it growing and expanding and so many visitors coming in and out. I really think that this is a great opportunity, though, to live up to our commitment, which was made before any of us -- not any of us, but any of the councilmembers got here, which was the council affirmed goal of becoming the most family friendly city in the nation. So I'm going to address some direction or amendment or once we figure out exactly what we're approving what the right vehicle is to make sure that as we move forward with improvements at the airport that we're very mindful of incorporating some of the best family friendly practices possible. As I go -- my children are a little older, but there are always, as you all know, families traveling with young kids and it makes a giant differences in terms of everybody's experience on the actual flights to have amenities in the airport that are family friendly. Little play areas -- many of the airports I go through now have small play areas, they have rocking chairs, they have interactive art. I think our city should really embrace and integrate those. I know we have some kind of computer games here and there, but everything those play areas I think are really important. And again, I think they're important not just for the enjoyment of families while they're in the airport, but the enjoyment of everybody on their flight once they get on the plane. Again, I'm going to provide some direction, but it's been interesting doing very, very limited research about this. And the airports used to be a place where lots of kids would go when they weren't flying and kind of learn about travel and I think it was one way of introducing them to the world outside of their own city and with the security and whatnot, that's not encouraging what -- a term I just learned about called air-mindedness, isn't something we can do necessarily at our airport, but I think we could make really good use of the time they have there to have exhibits not just about Austin, but also about some of the other cultures.

[9:46:03 AM]

So that's going to be the thrust of my amendment. I'll try to keep it on the same scale the report is. I think there are lots of great examples of actual practices that we should be integrating here in Austin. And rocking chairs. Sorry. I've mentioned rocking chairs a half a dozen times.

>> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston.

>> Houston: Thank you suspect for the presentation. I think my only concern is the distance of the self parking with the children and with seniors who have walkers to be able to transfer twice or from that distance to get through the terminal seems to be a little far because we've got a lot of seniors that are coming into and leaving town with equipment that they need to move back and forth. So I would ask you to consider something close by for families with children or people with different abilities so they can park closer to the facility.

>> Alter: Can you walk me through the one that says terminal space? You went through it quickly and I wanted to make sure I'm oriented with where we are with the existing.

>> Barbara Jordan terminal is the white section in between the two Orange sections.

[9:48:04 AM]

If you go to the right of that, which is the Orange section, that's what we're proposing would be built. That's where the 20 Gates in the first 10 years, 12 Gates in the second 10 years would be built. Parallel to the Barbara Jordan terminal. You would have a bridge that would go from the Barbara Jordan terminal to that facility to get from there to there. In front of the Barbara Jordan terminal today is the parking garage. We're proposing that parking garage would come down to build the new expanded terminal to accommodate all of the growth. And the road network would move out further so that it would have access immediately to the front of the new terminal and and be also in front of the rental car facility, called the conrac, and the new 6,000 space garage, which is currently under construction, will be finished by January. That road would then become the main road in and out of the airport.

>> Alter: So the middle part would be replacing the existing parking structures. The middle Orange part?

>> Yes. That would be the new terminal. That's where you would do your ticket counter check-in, hand in your bags, go through security. That's become the new processing center. And those functions would be removed from the Barbara Jordan terminal where they are today.

>> Alter: Okay. How time sensitive is this if we were to think about considering this on the 15th?

>> The 15th is not an issue.

>> Alter: Okay. I have a meeting set with you for tomorrow. I wasn't able to do it before this meeting. And I will see -- I understand that we are approving kind of a on gross map with little blocks and things on it, but I think it has larger implications.

[9:50:05 AM]

And while I have nothing but positive experiences with the airport and the work you do and trust that it is put together with the utmost care is still our responsibility as a council to be reviewing things. And at this point before our conversation I'm not sure that I feel like I know what the master plan is enough to

be able to vote on it. But I will figure that out unless others share my concern tomorrow. And if necessary we'll ask for that postponement for additional time. And again, it is not from any reason that I have to be skeptical, but just taking seriously the responsibility that we have and making sure that the public who may not have been aware of the process understands what they're looking at. It is very unusual for us to have a master plan that's in our backup that is a single map with very little explanation. So hopefully today's presentation provides some light for folks, but we talk about the goals. The goals are not on that map. And if goals are part of a master plan and that's where we're going, then we need to be upfront about those. They may be in this powerpoint. But I do have a process concern and I will need to think through appropriate next steps. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Anything else on this? Thank you very much. Let's go to government that works.

>> Flannigan: Mayor, I can kick this off. So this will be the third installment, if you will, of the discussion that we're having at work sessions on the government that works outcome. We provided -- got feedback from you. Appreciate the feedback on prioritizing the lists of topics that could be discussed at these work sessions.

[9:52:05 AM]

We'll have three more or we're scheduling for three more throughout the rest of the year. Today there was a lot of feedback on having a conversation on boards and commissions. And we're going to keep this at the high level, but I'm going to turn it over to Kim Oliveras, who will just describe what has been the role of boards and commissions. We would really appreciate some discussion here, maybe we'll take 15 minutes on each of these questions that's in front of you, but really what Valero have you scenes out of the boards and commissions.

-- What values have you seen out of the boards and commissions. Have they achieved what you want as a council. Do we need to make adjustments to be sure they're providing that value for you. And if there are any changes we want to make going forward W that I'll turn it over to Kim.

>> Good morning, council, Kim Oliveras, chief performance officer. I want to echo the comments, thanks to you for all the time you spent with us as well as the prioritization of the different topics. I know there were quite a few on there that made it difficult to pick from. Based on all of that, boards and commissions definitely was one of the top vote receivers or checked receivers rather. What we were thinking as we step through each of these three kind of topic subject areas within boards and commissions, we spend about 15 minutes R. Minutes per and then we can spend the next 15 minutes quickly going through what we've heard and what our next steps may be. So as we have the conversation around each of these three different areas within boards and commissions, what we are asking for in particular is direction whenever possible so that we can be very confident moving forward and to figuring out what those next steps may be. So the first topic area that we have is what does council see the role of boards and commissions? What do you want them to focus on and how does that function -- how does the function of subcommittees play into this?

[9:54:07 AM]

As I was going back through the city code to look thro some more specifics around boards and commissions, because who doesn't read the city code for fun?

[Laughter]. I did note that in general it states that the boards and commissions are supposed to be fulfilling an advisory role only unless they're granted a very specific authority when they're created. And then as you read through this very lengthy part of code, each boards and commissions has their specific authority that's granted on them. So at this point with keeping that in mind, we want to open it up for conversation amongst all of you in terms of those questions.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Jimmy?

>> Flannigan: Just speaking for myself, but in conversations I think we've all had before, and I have with my appointees to those boards and commissions, is there's a level of frustration both the effort required to participate and in many cases the perception that their work kind of goes down a rabbit hole, doesn't seem to actually be that operative. And I certainly at times have felt overwhelmed by the number of recommendations coming from boards and commissions. The emails come in -- and I've told my commissioners, at least, if there's a recommendation that your commission makes, you've got to call me on the phone if you want me to work on it. That's just as a measu of priority for my office. But we also have like 40 or 50 appointees each and it's very difficult for me to have substantive engagement with my appointees on a regular basis so that they're understand be the perspective that I've got and what I'm seeing in terms of the broader picture that we're all tasked with managing.

[9:56:11 AM]

I don't -- and then my other frustration is more unknown. The amount of staff time that's being invested in boards and commissions, the staff liaisons and the things that the liaisons are being asked to do and the trickle then that staff does then to support commissions. So if we have on one hand commissions making recommendations that have varying utility, but all the commissions are demanding of staff, some level of time and resource, understanding that balance. And if we're happy with it and however much we're spending on staff to do it, that's fine, but I don't know what that is. And I don't know that it's the best way to spend that staff time, much less the time of our volunteers who are serving on these commissions. And then it varies, right? So obviously the planning and zoning commissions, that job is entirely different than quality of life commissions, than technical commissions. And there's probably a different conversation to have about each of those. That's just my first thought.

>> Mayor Adler: Pio.

>> Renteria: You know, during the imagine Austin plan there was a committee that looked into all the -- all these boards and commissions and made a recommendation. Do you know whether any of that recommendation was followed through? I think they might have just asked us to follow it through here? So I just would like to know if -- have y'all looked into that report?

>> The previous council before the 10-1 council created what we affectionately called the task force on boards and commissions, the board and commission task force. They did review and look at all of the current boards and commissions.

[9:58:14 AM]

They made some recommendations. Some of the recommendations were incorporated, some were not. There are probably disagreeing opinions on, you know, on how to maybe consolidate or how much we split apart different boards and commissions. That was some of the struggle they face. So one of the things they did discuss but they did not make a recommendation on was potentially creating -- I can't believe I'm saying this, but concentrating a board and commission that was kind of a sunset board and commission that could provide council with some feedback and potentially look at some of the annual reports and different -- how well they're meeting, are they having issues with quorum and all of those things and provide some information to council. They basically kind of ran out of time. It was a volunteer in addition to their other board and commission responsibilities, so they kind of ran out of time to probably flesh out all of their ideas but that was another idea that they at least had some discussion on. The clerks office actually just sent out a short little survey to the staff liaisons trying to figure out how many hours they spend supporting the boards and commissions. And different questions like that, so we could get some more data for you that might be helpful as you move forward with some of this discussion. I do think there's probably better ways that we can staff some of the boards and commissions because one of the complaints we hear often, not only from staff, but from some of the commission members, is the different level of support that boards and commissions get because of just however many -- how much time someone has to spend with a board and commission.

[10:00:33 AM]

So I think there's potentially some better ways that we could standardize that. I've had some of those conversation was couple of your offices, so I think there are some ideas that we could float out there as far as staffing models for boards and commissions.

>> Renteria: And the reason I was bringing that up also is that I'm really concerned because some of the comments that I have been hearing about, you know, some of these members on the board or commission don't realize that there are some advisory-level and I'm hearing that there has been some disruption out there in some of these committee meetings and I'm kind of concerned about that. You know, these -- my whole intention when I appoint someone is that, you know, they go in there as a team player and to really work together for the best interests of whatever they're representing, whether it's a park or a cultural center or art funding or whatever that is, you know, that they are just an advisory person and not really out there to have the responsibility of telling the staff what to do and stuff like that. You know, so that's becoming a really concerning matter because I'm getting some feedback from the community, from other board members, that there's been a lot of disruption lately in some of these

committees, and I was hoping that you can come back and give us a report on what's really happening out there and what seems to be the problem on some of these committees. Is it getting to that point? I know that we used to be an advisory there at the park level, at the rec centers, and they did away with the advisory boards, which they still meet, but they just don't have the title of being -- is they're not required to have staff support.

[10:02:45 AM]

But they still meet and they still make recommendations. I'm just wondering if we do get to that point, where we eliminate some of these committees, what would happen to that, the -- their goal and what they're supposed to be recommending. That's one of the problems I see that we're having right now, so I would like to have that copy also, what the recommendation was and what your recommendation would be on how we can --

>> I'd be happy to send out the report that the board and commission task force created for the previous council, and you can review it. And I'm happy to talk to you about any of the -- I mean, councilmember Renteria's point on the tension that sometimes develops between the staff and the board members is kind of a common concern that gets raised to the clerk's office from both sides. So I think there are some ways that we can help address that with -- potentially with a different staffing model maybe.

>> Renteria: Thank you.

>> Kitchen: I just want to say that, well, in general I think that -- in general I think the boards and commissions process works well and has been a big help to my office. Now, I'm thinking in general in terms of the areas that I've focused on. For example, the senior commission has been very helpful to us in working through some issues. So we have actually brought issues to their attention and asked for their advice. And then that's an example of a commission that, for example, brought forward the age friendly action plan to the entire council.

[10:04:49 AM]

So to my mind, that's I think just one example of a commission that is active and has proven to be of value, at least from my perspective. So I think we have to be -- so my perspective is that I would not go through the process that we just went through four years ago of reexamining every commission. I think that that work has been done and I don't think we need to redo it. Now, I do think if there are particular commissions that individual councilmembers or the commissions themselves have questions about their function, then it would be useful to look at those. But a wholesale review of the number of boards and commissions I don't think is a good use of time because we did it recently. The other thing I would say is that I think it just varies for all of us, how we deal with our appointees or how we work with our appointees and I think that's good that everybody has their own perspective of how they do it. For

example, for our office, when we appoint people, we ask them to be proactive with us. And so we may meet with them periodically, but we expect them, as part of their function, to be proactive with us and bring to our attention and we appoint -- we try. I mean, we don't always do it perfectly, of course, but we try to appoint people that are interested in the area and will give us feedback if they feel like either the board and commission is not functioning correctly or if they decide it's not a role for them. You know, so I guess what I'm saying is I think that there's a lot of -- I don't want to -- I guess what I want to say is there's a lot of value to these boards and commissions, and, yes, they take time, and, yes, there's a lot of them, but each one of them is there for a reason and I would not want to wholesale just redo the system or throw it out.

[10:06:56 AM]

I just don't think that's necessary. So I guess that's the point that I'm trying to make. Happy to hear from particular -- individual commission members if they think a particular commission is not necessary anymore, but -- and with regard to the tension between the staff and the board members, yes, we should think of ways to reduce that, but I also want our board members to ask questions. I want them to be, you know, pushing a little bit to staff, not in a -- you know, in a respectful way what all those kinds of things, but that's one reason we appoint them, is to kind of represent what the concerns are in the community. And a lot of them bring a lot of expertise to the table and that's good for our staff. So anyway that's just the perspective I bring.

>> Mayor Adler: Leslie.

>> Pool: Yeah. I agree with what councilmember kitchen is saying about that. It's important to have -- that's the diversity of input that we talk about and that I think we really benefit from. I do think, to the point that you were making, the city clerk was making, there's an unevenness, I think, in the training, and there's an uneven work burden on some of our liaisons, which I've talked about a little bit to your staff and to some of the department heads just to try to balance things out. I think some of the liaisons have larger assignments as far as time and the critical nature of the work that they're doing and that that needs to be looked at. I think there's some unevenness in knowledge base with regard to standard protocols like who does the agenda, whether Robert's rules are used and followed and what does that mean? We mostly don't have parliament arjans, which kind of rests the whole official running of the meeting piece with the chair and I guess ideally with help from the liaison and Robert's rules is really simple, it's a pretty complex, sophisticated document, at some levels, obviously.

[10:09:18 AM]

There's some straightforward stuff but when you get into the tangle of the debate, it can be pretty hard to untangle as we found. I think everybody would benefit to have some stepped-up training, including recusals and conflict of interest. Robert's rules, autonomy, and whose responsibility is it to approve an agenda? Is it the chair of the commission or is the chair simply rubber stamping what the staff says



should be on the agenda? I have some concerns about that -- I want to make sure our board and commission and their chairs understand what their role is with regard to items that are on an agenda. Having served on I guess about four different commissions over time and one time as a chair and also as a vice chair, I know that there are opportunities -- it's supposed to be an entry point for communication from the community and touch point for volunteers who are stepping up to take the job without pay and at considerable expense of other things, and they're there for a reason. I am pretty careful on who I appoint as well and give my -- and let my nominees know that I'm looking for them to use their best critical judgment and that they have autonomy. There are many examples -- autonomy in their decisions, but that I also have pretty high standards for behavior. And to a large extent, I think it all -- everybody is an adult, mostly, and it seems to work out pretty well. We had a specific instance earlier this year that the library commission I felt like really stepped up to the plate and they took the time that they needed in order to get complete consensus on addressing the first amendment challenges that were brought to the standard with regard to petitioners, and I am really proud of the work that the library commission did.

[10:11:18 AM]

They took the time they needed and came up with a good resolution, I thought. So there's so much to be said positive about the boards and commissions, the missions that they have, their roles traditionally and conventionally over the many, many decades that they've been in existence, and I agree with what everyone was saying earlier, they were reviewed just four, five years ago, I would not want a wholesale sunseting of all those commissions and I think maybe if we wanted to ask them, we can ask them, how can we make your job easier, to the extent that you understand your mission, is there something that we could do to help you? Is kind of what I would like that flow information to come from us. So I, too, find the boards and commissions quite valuable. I'd like to see the unevenness and the training and the standards to be addressed, and I also want to look back at the organizing ordinances that set forth all of the commissions to make sure that all of the boards' staff are spending time with -- are indian official -- indeed chartered council. My understanding is that staff resources are only to be directed to those that have an ordinance underpinning their existence and that goes to the nominations process we do here, so we can ensure that we have ties to those boards and commissions, that they recognize they have an accountability and responsibility as well back to us, as well as the community, and that we are expending city resources on officially recognized and sanctioned committees and work groups.

>> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston. Then Kathie, then Jimmy.

>> Houston: Thank you, mayor. First of all, I appreciate all the work that you've done on this. This has been an issue for me for several years now. And, yes, I do appreciate all the work that volunteer commissioners do for the city of Austin and for the citizens of Austin and for the various districtts and the mayor, who represent the folks in the area.

[10:13:27 AM]

But there are some concerns. The issue that councilmember Renteria brought up is that we tried to have that discussion a couple years ago about the transition committee's report, and we never finished the conversation. We just -- you came and kind of presented something to us, but we never had that conversation. And I think at that point we had -- they got us down to, was it 53 boards and commissions?

>> Possibly. I lose -- honestly, I lose count of how many we have at any given time.

>> Houston: But now we have much more than that.

>> We have more, yes.

>> Houston: We have more than what they even got us to as they tried to prepare from the at-large council to the 10-1 council so there's some associated entities that still function as boards and commissions to staff, not to elected officials. So I don't have esentatives on those associated entities. I don't know who they report to. I don't know how their resolutions get into the funnel. That's a concern that I've had and I've expressed. And the other thing is that I think that when we ask people to do this work, that we need to be mindful of the resolutions that they bring up. But I have about 60 people who I've appointed to various boards and commissions and I ask for reports back on a regular basis. I ask if there's something that's coming to council that's going to be controversial that they will let me know, and many do that, but many don't have the ability to do that or don't. And so I call or we call, but it's not just that. It's how do we streamline and make efficient our city government so that people who work on these boards and commissions who can dive deeply into the issues have -- get that elevated to a point where we hear it.

[10:15:32 AM]

So many of our resolutions never come to light. They haven't in the past and I doubt if they will any time soon because there are just so many of them. Sometimes I get a resolution page with four on a page from a board or commission and those thing just lapse and people have put a lot of work into that. So it's about how do we streamline those boards and commissions so the work that they do does get elevated and we can address those? I think that we need to have everything relate to strategic outcomes. I mean, that's the way we set ourselves. That's the way we set our budget. The boards and commissions should also set themselves because sometimes they come up with some interesting things that they're interested in but it's not a citywide issue so, you know, that kind of thing. For a year now or two years now we've been talking about the health and human services council commission -- council committee and the fact that we have all kinds of boards and commissions underneath health and human services but there is no health commission. It's one of the biggest things -- public health is a big issue in this town and there is no one body that looks at public health in the city or the county. And we've been kind of asking for that since Shannon Jones was here, but nobody wants to add a new commission. But this is one that I think needs to be separated. The health commission. Under health -- you know, we tackle from animal services to immigration, and so we got a lot of variety of resolutions

coming forth. They're not just transportation or, you know, energy or water, wastewater. It's a wide range of stuff. So I think we need to really look, maybe not do the whole thing again, but we need to look at some ways where there are some compatible opportunities for a committee to merge with some other one and let one go.

[10:17:34 AM]

Because if we keep doing this, had I don't know -- you know, I don't know how we continue to do this in good faith because it's just too much work for our volunteers. We don't look at what they're asking us to do and then their people that I have no appointee on that they are able to get things passed and I don't know who they are, how they got there. Seems to be self-appointed.

>> I agree with councilmember kitchen that we shouldn't repeat that process of the committee on committees, but I do think that we should have -- I think it might be useful for audit and finance or some other body, I guess that's probably the right one, to look at some different information about our boards and commissions, if this isn't too cumbersome for the staff to prepare. I think it would be nice to have in one place a list of all of them, how many times they failed to meet quorum, how many resolutions they've produced in the last couple years. How often they meet. We have a lot but some of our boards and commissions only meet quarterly so that's not as demanding. I think the original intent of looking at staff time as what it is, which is a taxpayer resource, and really making sure that we're using that taxpayer resource in ways that are the highest value makes sense and trying to pair down the number of commissions made sense. In the end there were some recommended for removal that people came and advocated strongly to keep. One I remember was the women's commission, and, you know, I'm so glad we kept that. And it's become more active, and it's been involved in some of the real key work we've done since. There are some commissions that I think -- that I look to, they are dealing with important bodies of policy, but they're not tremendously active, and I don't know what we could do to make sure that they're really getting into the meat of recommendations and getting those recommendations to us. I think probably, you know, I don't know if part of it is that they don't see enough -- that some of the commissions don't see enough result from their work.

[10:19:40 AM]

So anyway, I guess I think that we should always be looking toward paring those down if possible because we don't want to keep commissions going that are just there because they've been here for decades and we're continuing them and maybe getting some sense of how productive they are, how interested the members seem to be in terms of making it to meetings, of how often the council has actually picked up on policy recommendations and moved them forward into action would give us some sense of which commissions, you know, continue to be vital ones for our city and I think more regular review of a list like that would be helpful. I think, too, that probably, I mean, for me, in reading the recommendations that come forward, it has the same -- it replicates the same issue that our city staff

communications do. You know, it comes through as a headline that is very generic, then you have to click on the link to go to the page to see recommendations. When had you get hundreds of emails everyday that sounds like a very easy process, and it is of course a very easy process but in the midst of a hundred other emails it just takes a lot to identify really what the issues are that are contained within the recommendation. So I would just suggest that if there's a way to look at how those policy recommendations could come via email that might be helpful too. That's all I got.

>> Flannigan: So I appreciate the way you laid that out, mayor pro tem, and I would also love to see that list and see the -- who is facing quorum challenges and the frequency and is the number of resolutions -- what other metrics are there for measuring value, right? Not just production of resolutions. I would love to see commissions have another option than can you get a majority on specific language, which we often struggle to do, but other opportunities for them to say, you know, we have a fuzzy recommendation and you should -- council really should go look at this and look at this, I mean, there's got to be some more interesting and easier way for folks that don't necessarily tie right into Robert's rules as councilmember pool said.

[10:22:01 AM]

One of the small things that I've also heard from my commissioners is the posting delays and the backup for agenda items coming very late. And we moved it back to two weeks, and I thought at least from my own experience it's been very valuable and I don't know if that's something to consider for committees, to go from the state mandated 72 hours to a week and just giving them that extra time. I mean, we're here full-time with staff and the volunteers have to do it when they get home from work and spend time away from their families. So that would be one thing that I think would be valuable. And I don't know that any of us are suggesting that we would completely redo or throw out the boards and commissions. I think it's one of the values of the community. As I've talked to some of my friends who are on city councils elsewhere and I tell them how many commissions we have, their eyes jump out of their heads. But we have a very big city and folks in the city want to have a role. I think my struggle is I don't know that we've actually given them a substantive role but for certain exceptions. Maybe the bottom line is you just have to have a really good chair and really good appointees and maybe that's just the way it falls. Councilmember Kitchen, I've had the same experience with the senior's commission. My appointee to the senior's commission routinely shows up in my office and talks me on a regular basis and she was just bragging how she got the commission to have their meeting out in district 6, which as you can imagine is not an easy thing to get a commission to agree to. Then there are other commissions that's, you know, that that's a struggle. So I would be curious to know to the extent that we can the diversity numbers on commissions and so that we at least have a sense of when openings come up, are there the certain perspectives we need to ensure are being heard on each of these commissions? And then to what extent can we leverage our council committees to daylight the issues coming out of the commissions.

[10:24:11 AM]

So if we were to contemplate that and maybe we pick one commission -- or one committee and we assign them, like, five commissions and the resolutions that come out of those commissions are reviewed at that council committee's meeting and that's the thing that a commission can force us to do, right? They can't force us to do anything now okay, but for the handful of sovereign boards. But to say, look, if you pass a resolution, then these four or five councilmembers at that meeting in August, it's gonna be on their agenda to talk about. And that might at least give them a little bit of value to say, all right, we're gonna make this -- we're gonna elevate these issues and here's exactly where they go to elevate and then we can review them and say this is great, we're actually going to go David Ondich this next year and you guys didn't know we were doing that next year, we knew that, or it's in conflict with this other thing we're doing. That maybe one option. I would love to find a way so our commissioners feel the value of their work, and not a lot of them do, and certainly if the end game of a resolution is falling into our in-boxes, it's not a productive end game, I think.

>> Mayor Adler: I like those comments, and I like also what mayor pro tem asked in terms of more basic information. Sorry. I said I liked Jimmy's comments and mayor pro tem, because there's a lot of information I don't have which I think would be helpful to evaluate those questions. I would also add and I don't know how we resolve this, everybody appoints their folks independently, so after that happens, when the group gets together, there's no ability to make sure that each commission has the diversity on it that we would want it to have, except when people come off and then we're kind of retrofitting that. I don't know if there's a way for the council to pool or daylight everybody making appointments before we actually make the appointments to make sure that each commission has representation of different points of view and different experiences from around the community.

[10:26:18 AM]

So I don't know the function of that would be. Trying to have the commissions, if they're not organized by strategic area, report back up through strategic area makes sense to me and having our committees really focus on strategic areas makes sense to me as well. Alison?

>> Alter: Thank you. Having served on a board, I really understand the value that they can bring, and there's a lot of variation. So we've had very strong commissioners on the parks board, worked with them on bringing forward recycling in the parks or the women's commission to bring forward the victims' services type stuff. I think that I agree with mayor pro tem about the need for additional data and I want to highlight two more things that I think would be useful. So some of the boards do lots of other things besides resolutions, and some of those may be sovereign boards but, you know, when I was on the parks board there were contracts, all the contracts get reviewed with a once-over there, which I think is super helpful for us in that extra level of review but there are park master plans that don't rise to the level of Lamar beach and those get discussed and reviewed by people focusing on the marks and other kinds of things. Whether or not the waterlines get laid through a park, those are kinds of things the parks board is doing that then we don't have to deal with them at council so it saves us time yet there is an opportunity for people come talk to a board and daylight things and it can be raised to our level

when needed and I think those are very important. But I don't know that we have a sense of of that variation of what some of the boards are doing and accomplishing beyond kind of getting together and chitchatting, and I think there's quite a bit of variation. I think that would be useful to have there.

[10:28:19 AM]

The other thing that the boards and commissions serve is a place for citizens to come and comment and raise issuances, whether they're on the agenda or not, so I think it would be useful as part of the data to see if there are particular commissions where more people are coming and speaking and if there's any patterns that those staff who are running or those chairs are highlighting. So I think that those would be important. I really like councilmember Flannigan's idea of having the board and commission recommendations channeled to particular council committees. That doesn't take the place of a councilmember grabbing a recommendation and saying they want to move forward, but at least it will get reviewed in the council committee and maybe that board or commission's chair or the person who put it forward would have an opportunity to present to their council committee so that we see that. Our -- part of what makes Austin great is our citizen engagement, and so we really need to take pride in our boards and commissions and take this exercise as a way to improve them as a mechanism for feedback, a mechanism for getting things done that then we don't have to do. When we do that, I think we're gonna find that really the issues that have been mentioned about, you know, how do we do it in a way that doesn't overtax staff, how do we do it in a way that we can hear it and act on it are going to be the biggest issues that surface, so I would focus there rather than a full revamp, as others have already stated.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's stop this in 15 minutes. Let's go around one more time for people to talk and then we'll get to the pulled items. Greg.

>> Casar: So I think in summary of some of what I'm hearing is -- especially that resonates with me, is that, you know, there's some

[10:30:19 AM]

[indiscernible] That are constantly doing key work and I don't think we're having a conversation around, for example, planning commission or zap or any of those folks. With some of the others it seems to me like there are really important surges and spikes in their work that we should be thinking about because it sounds like in people's examples, right, the age friendly action plan in front of the senior's commission or the hot tax in front of the arts commission it was really key to have those groups to adjudicate sort of key issues before they councilmember tovo came to council. While I'm sure some of them were doing work in between, one of the questions is who has it been really key for us and it happens to be in spikes and surges. As you think about the staffing model and how it is we can be most effective with their time and ours, just think creatively about how it is that we handle those spikes, whether that's, like, the way that they schedule themselves, how they convene themselves, whether they feel like they have to

convene and staff has to staff them when there isn't as much going on, especially right after they did a critical big piece of work. That might be one place we don't have to tread into this recommissioning on commissions but instead using their time effectively. I really liked councilmember Flannigan's idea around how is it that they can provide value and an oversight and suggestions totaff and to departments without it having to be a resolution that gets passed up to us that's a whole policy conversation. Ultimately our department directors have a lot of -- and the city manager have a lot of discretion to approve operations and the lives of people in the city. If there are ways that there can just be productive conversations so our board and commission members can have input -- and I know this happens probably somewhat informally already but if we can make sure folks feel like there are ways they can be shaming the city for the better without having to get something on the dais that may be helpful in our own attempts to reduce the amount of congestion and time on the dais ourselves. I do believe that from our committee ordinance we actually did have some pipelining of committee -- of boards and commissions to committees, but the challenge that I've seen chairing a couple of different committees have been that often times there's demand from departments and from committee members when we have limited committee meetings that our ordinance requires cosponsors to put something on and there just has to be sort of some level of selectivity around what's going to be on a committee agenda, again, because we're trying to increase the amount of time we're able to work in the community and not just be in a ton of meetings.

[10:32:54 AM]

So while I'm interested in that, I would just, again, remind us that some of that currently exists but may not be working the way that we really want it to be working so we should learn from what it is we tried writing in the past on that. But to me I think part of what we've learned is when you create a board or commission it is very rare and hard for it to go squaw sometimes it's from a really good reason, because we really needed it. I think it's also a great way to build leadership and activism in the community and that's all really good and important but I'd say the last thing I haven't heard mentioned is as we create new ones we should think about sunsets and scope, et cetera, and then sometimes just decide that we need it and we're not going to get rid of it and that's that. For example, the lgbtq quality of life one, if we were creating that this week, even with this knowledge, I'd say we needed this and we should keep it but I just think it's clear that it's very difficult because of the value that we create in boards and commissions as we create new ones that we -- especially if they're task forces that we set up sunsets and are thoughtful about which ones we're going to keep and not given the amount of staff time. And if there is -- if there's anything that council needs to be doing on making sure that board and commission members and staff feel respected in all of these places, let's continue that conversation. I know that we - - having a process for people to file legitimate complaints so that everybody can feel safe and respected in these is of course of utmost important and I'm talking about making sure our staff, who oftentimes are salaried and working overtime and not making overtime for their time here at night, at least get the treatment we expect for the staff and boards and commission members.

[10:34:54 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Tovo: I like very much the notion of flexible scheduling so we don't have boards that are in the practice of meeting every month if there's not something pressing. I think that would really limit staff time on some of those boards. Just to back up to what I was saying about how we measure or how we begin to evaluate different boards and whether they should continue, I guess in my perspective -- you know, I think a little bit about what some community members and I suggested years ago about the joint subcommittee, it was a body that had a lot of potential, it includes representation from the school district, the county, and the city, but primarily it would become a board where the members would gather and hear presentation after presentation after presentation. It wasn't action oriented and I think it needed to be. I think every one of our boards and commissions should be action oriented. By no means am I suggesting we measure the effectiveness of a board but how many resolutions they produce. Some San Francisco those will come to us are not actionable, they're statements of position and those are valuable. Anyway, I guess in my perspective I think all of our boards and commissions should be action oriented and should have a purpose. And sometimes that purpose is to provide a space for the community to come here and speak and sometimes that purpose is community engagement on - around a particular issue, but there should be -- and sometimes, as councilmember alter said, it's a planning commission and they are making decisions about cases. And some of our boards fall in between. But if they're primarily hearing presentations from staff about an issue area, that's not really action oriented, and so some consideration of what their purpose is and what the actions that resulting from their purpose would be helpful. And that's gonna be different for different kinds of boards. But flexible scheduling I think might be something we should really consider.

>> Mayor Adler: Jimmy.

>> Flannigan: I would agree with a lot of that. I like Greg what you pointed out about this spike of energy that comes from different commissions.

[10:36:55 AM]

I think that's a really valuable perspective to think through. And then, mayor, the LGBTQ commission solved that diversity challenge you outlined by allowing the commission to appoint four or five more people after the 11 were seated specifically so that that moment could occur. And I don't know that that's necessarily appropriate for every commission, but that's at least one way that we solved it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ms. Houston.

>> Houston: One of the things that I think might be helpful is to -- how many commissions are assigned to each department? So of the boards and commissions, how many are tendon each department? And then D assigned to each department and are there duplication in staff liaison? So does the staff liaison have several boards and commissions? That would be information that I would appreciate. The other thing is we talk about diversity. We talk about diversity of thought. But there's some boards and commissions that are staffed primarily with advocacy members. All the commissions are of one mind,



and I don't know how you break that, that cycle, but that's one of the concerns that some of the commissions are -- people that think the same way on everything. And so there's no diversity of thought. I'm not just talking about the way people look, you know, I'm talking about how people think. And there ought to be a way to have conversations with people that you don't agree with and they be able to be heard, so that's a concern of mine as well.

>> Mayor Adler: Alison.

>> Alter: I wanted to also maybe suggest that we think about having an additional type of training that maybe is not run by the clerk's office, but maybe periodically a couple councilmembers who have served on commission or some commissioners that have served on multiple commissions share some of their lessons about how to be effective because there's -- I think part of it is we have expanded the number-people who are engaged in boards and commissions, which is really important, but we haven't provided the training for those who haven't done it before on how to be effective.

[10:39:14 AM]

And if you don't naturally come with a political sensibility of how to get from A to Z it doesn't come naturally and there's a really long lead time. I think that broad ear mentoring or training might be useful. I think the other thing is to think about should we be asking certain types of commissions to have a strategic plan and to focus in on a couple issues that maybe they developed and that council committee provides some extra feedback and then they do a deeper dive into some of those issues. One of the things that I've heard from some of my commissioners on the quality of life commissions is that there's a lack of strategy and there's a lack of strategic planning and when they do do the strategic planning that's when they really hit the home runs and are able to move things forward. But that's something that you have to kind of train or you have to have the right person in there and not every commissioner comes to with that knowledge. But we have so many commissioners who have served over many years and know how to make these commissions work, and these commissions can serve a very important policy function for us for highlighting where the needs are and figuring out some solution that's then we can refine and they can do that more if they have skills beyond how to avoid breaking quorum and how to do Robert's rules of order. That's the thing we've asked staff to do in the past. I think the same is true of our staff liaisons and I know there's been additional training as a result of the committee on committees for our staff, but I think sometimes the staff vary in their ability to use the commissions strategically to help the departments that are associated with it get the feedback and engagement they need on the issues that are part of their strategic plan. So I don't know exactly how you would do both of those okay, but focusing it in that way I think -- and providing that training could be very useful.

[10:41:15 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Ann.

>> Kitchen: Okay. Two things that I think may not have been mentioned yet. I'm trying not to repeat what people have said, but I think it would be interesting also to consider how we have involved the boards and commissions in our budget process. I know we did some new things with them this year, and I think examining that and potentially expanding it would be useful. I think the way the quality of life commissions were involved sounded like it worked very well, and so I'm curious about going beyond that to other boards and commissions and I know that may have been done already to some extent but I think it's very, very helpful. Second thing, I think it would be useful to survey the board and commission members. I think there was mention of surveying the staff, but I think it would be useful to survey the appointees just, you know, a simple short survey to get their ideas. So then the last thing I would say is in terms of next steps, I assume that you guys will kind of capture everything people said. There's six points just really at a high level that I'm hearing. There's a lot more detail of course that y'all need to think through in terms of what people have said but in terms of next steps, primarily I was hearing that -- a couple I just mentioned, survey the board and commission members, consider involving them in the budget process, but the training, we've had a lot of ideas around training, the third thing is the data for the audit committee review. I think that's a good idea. Fourth we talked about aligning council committees with boards and commissions. And the committees reviewing of resolutions. I think each council committee needs to think through how to do that. And then I like the idea of the strategic plan for some commissions. And perhaps identification of issues for some commissions to work more closely with us on.

[10:43:16 AM]

So I may have missed some is but those are the sort of six things I saw as next steps.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. I think those are all the comments. I think it's important to note that when we went from seven member council to an 11 member council we increased the participation pretty significantly just by increasing the membership in terms of public engagement. Go ahead.

>> So I asked my team to come down here while everyone is discussing to be able to take notes on exactly what everyone was saying, and do some synthesizing on the fly to be able to come up with kind of some of those next steps. Thank you, councilmember kitchen, for summarizing that because that was a good check point for us. So what I'm going to do is I'm going to ask Jill to kind of just quickly run through what we have as possible action next steps and once she gets through that, if we can do a quick fist to five to make sure that we're generally on the same page as to what direction we're heading, and then from there we'll figure out kind of all the details like you had noted of really what it takes to get those moving forward. So I'll let jd those off.

>> Yeah, Jill Goodman, office of performance management, lots of good bullet points, we tried to roll it up into big themes. Possible action would be provide a copy of the board commission's task force recommendations. Also, topics for staff to explore, one being streamline and elevate the work of boards and commissions. Part of this including leveraging the commissions as valuable community input and policy mechanism, exploring options to report back around council's strategic outcome areas, more options for reporting to council committees. Looking at generally the scope of boards and commissions,

both when there's a new commission and it sounds like with existing commissions, do they have a strategic plan or what are sort of those big issues that they're working on.

[10:45:22 AM]

Then also options for flexible scheduling. Big kind of key area was just -- it sounds like you guys want more data, so having some baseline data around commission activity and feedback from staff and commissions on their ideas for improvement. So everything from their action oriented, how often they meet, quorum, what they're doing, patterns of community feedback, looking at the work of staff liaisons, how many in each department, is there duplicates, and possibly surveying staff commissioners to get their take. And then also another big area was around rethinking their staffing models and ensuring sort of standard protocols and training, both for commissioners and staff. Elements of, you know, looking into ideas to ensure there's mutual respect, explore peer mentoring of commissioners can share with other commissioners, and then also y'all wanted to hear recommendations from the city clerk and staff. There was some comments around just one -- the process of making the appointments and then at the end how do you achieve that diversity of thought.

>> Okay. So at this point those are the major areas that we'd be looking going forward with, and we would obviously report out on kind of where the -- further on the direction that we're going. So at this point I guess if we wanted to do a quick fist to five and if there's additional comments from focuses --

>> Mayor Adler: What are you looking for a fist to five on?

>> If what we summarized here is what we were hearing, is that -- do you -- as a body, do you agree is -- that's generally what you heard as well in terms of the discussion around the boards and commissions?

>> Mayor Adler: That's generally what I heard. I think there were some other ideas that weren't captured that people raised so it might be good to take a look at the video of the moment.

[10:47:28 AM]

Because I think there were some ideas. I don't remember all of them but I think it might be good to take a look back at the video and I wouldn't mind you taking a look at all of those things and giving us the data associated with those and to think about all of those things. I will point out I didn't get to see these questions until just before we got here and I think I'll be able to give you better feedback if I had seen these early enough to think about them, last night or this morning before I walked in. So the earlier you can get kind of the topic prompts I think you might also increase the quality of the feedback that you get back. Ann?

>> Kitchen: I also -- I think that was a good summary is but it doesn't tell me what the next steps are. So I would want -- and I know you probably need to go back and think about that some, but I would like to understand concretely what the next steps are. So, for example, we -- you captured the conversation

about surveying board and commission members and staff but I didn't hear, yes, we are now going to do that. So that's -- I was looking for more of a to-do list, so that may be something that you guys could share with us after you have time to think about it. But that's more what I'm interested in doing a five on, is the action steps.

>> All right.

>> Mayor Adler: Kathie.

>> Tovo: And I thought the specifics that councilmember kitchen had were not necessarily reflected in those, so I would say that list is important too. I'm not sure -- and I apologize, I missed the questions, but I'm not sure if we've really answered the question that councilmember Houston I think has asked a few times about how people are appointed for a couple of those boards. I think we know the answer to that, how they're appointed. I guess the question really is do we want to make a change to that and I think it's -- I would support making a change to the couple commissions that we have that are self-appointing. And so that would seem to me probably to be a council resolution and I just wanted to express my support, councilmember Houston, if you intend to bring forward something to make that change, I would support that.

[10:49:41 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston.

>> Houston: Mayor, I just want to say it's not only diversity of thought, but complexion.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. It's ten to 11:00. Leslie?

>> Pool: So just to wrap it up, the list sounds great. If I were gonna indicate support I'd say five but I agree with what the mayor said, could you go back and make sure you've picked up all the detailed stuff. I think a couple things I was looking for may not have made it onto the list multiply maybe I wasn't listening properly. If you could send us that list that would be really helpful. I think generally the -- from what I gather, generally we want y'all to move forward with it.

>> Mayor Adler: Manager, you want to close us out?

>> Sure. Again, appreciate the discussion. I think this is very helpful as we look at ways to really tackle the government that works outcome. This was one topic area. We'll summarize the themes that were heard, bring that back to you to ensure that we have that sign-off and there will be things that are on that list that we could do immediately, things that will require more staff time, more resources, and so we'll try to delineate that as much as possible as well. I also appreciate the mayor's comment that for the next discussion, which is Teed up for the next work session, we currently have it around ifcs but we will give you questions well in advance so you can come better prepared for that conversation as well. So look for that memo, if not before the next work session, summarizing this, shortly thereafter, but we'll get that to you as soon as we can.

>> Mayor Adler: Great.

>> Kitchen: I have a question.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: My question is I know we said we were laying out -- I don't know I believe it was six or whatever, certain number of work sessions. I'd really like to know the schedule for all of them. So what the -- what the topic is for each one. There's a couple of topics that -- you know, we've got process topics and more content topics, and I'm concerned about getting to the more content topics sooner rather than later, like the -- I think councilmember Flannigan had recommended some related to the budgeting process, and sid recommended some too.

[10:51:50 AM]

So I consider these -- I consider all of these important. These are things everybody wants to talk about, but I'd really like to seat order that we're talking about. For example, I wouldn't take ifcs flex. In any case, I'd just like to see -- so I can be assured of when we're going to take up which topics.

>> Great. Appreciate that. I think our goal today was to start that conversation. This was all based on the feedback of your prioritization, and so these were the ones that really surfaced as having the most interest from the most number of councilmembers, but we'll give you that draft schedule and if you have feedback on that we'll take that into consideration.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Sounds good. Let's go ahead and move on to the pulled items. Thank you very much. See if we can do all the pulled items and then break for executive session and we're not coming back. We have some items to consider in executive session. Jimmy and Alison, you pulled item number 10, which was the meeting schedule. Jimmy?

>> Flannigan: So my suggestion is just in the first part of the year, where it starts on the 31st of January and then we end up with back to back meetings right before spring break and the spring festival season, is just to shift the first ones up, eliminate the double meeting, take the first ones and shift it up a week so that we give our new councilmembers -- because we know we'll have at least two -- a little bit of extra time to be prepared to get their staffs hired, especially if they're in run-offs. I know councilmember alter and I had decidedly different experiences after we got elected because I had the benefit of November and December to be prepared, but it was much more difficult, my understanding, is in that short time frame between a run-off election, Christmas, to get things lined up. Also, because of the 2-week agenda process, if these new councilmembers have things they want to see, you know, I certainly felt in my first meeting I wanted to be able to say this is what I did at my first meeting so I had the time to prepare for that and so shifting it up one week, getting that first meeting into February and eliminating the back to back before spring break would be my preference.

[10:54:03 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: So instead of meeting on the 14th and 28th we meet on the seventh and 21st of February?

>> Flannigan: Yeah.

>> Mayor Adler: Then we would in essence drop that January meeting. Alison.

>> Alter: So I support the part about moving off of February 14th. I'm concerned about us having meetings scheduled on February 14th and October 31 for our staff and their families and for our citizens who want to come speak to us. We're pretty much setting up those meetings to be meetings where we have lots of stuff postponed because of Valentine's day and Halloween, people will be less likely to show up or be focused on what's before us. So for October 31, I wanted to propose moving that to November 7. I understand that there maybe a national league of cities meeting on the 21st so my preference had been to do it on the seventh and 21st but if people are planning to go to the national league of cities for that meeting then I think it would be worth doing it on the seventh and 14th. We would have then two weeks between the last one and then we'd have two in a row but I'm concerned that, you know, otherwise we're gonna end up with just one meeting in November, one meeting in December and, you know, not being able to accomplish much on the 31st. I don't know how much of an issue November 21 is. For the jan/february part, those meetings, that first meeting can have a lot of items, and I am a little bit concerned if we don't have the meeting on the 31st and we move it to the seventh without having one on the seventh as well that we are going to jam pack the meetings in a way that could be very overwhelming for new councilmembers since we won't have had a meeting for something like seven or eight weeks.

[10:56:11 AM]

So I don't know -- you know, I'd be comfortable with having a meeting on the 31st and the seventh and maybe the 31st is everything but zoning and the seventh is zoning or something like that so it can be split a little bit to be more manageable. But I am a bit concerned about pushing -- the first meeting -- I understand we can't do it on the 24th because there's a mayor's conference. I do have some concerns on that. I would also like to suggest that for the first part of the year that we may need to be getting our calendar together sooner so that people can plan around the calendar and -- assuming something is changing. The last thing I wanted to mention and I did share this with the Latin America clerk on may 23rd I have my son's graduation, we don't need to move the meeting but I will not be there for the evening of that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So I think that -- does anybody have a problem moving the meetings right now on the 14th and 28th to the seventh and 21st?

>> Tovo: I would like to look at other options.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Because we're not making decisions right here.

>> Tovo: I agree we should move it off Halloween but I want to see what other options are available beyond moving it to the seventh.

>> Mayor Adler: I asked that question wrong because we're in a work session anyhow, we're not going to decide anything here. What I should have said moving the meetings in February from the 14th to the 28th, moving those to the seventh and 21st is something that works for me so that's something that I can support. The meeting on the 31st, whether or not we keep that or drop that, I mean, I'd really be interested in staff indicating to us, which you anticipated that calendar looking like. And if we were going to have the meeting on the 31st I think we'd have to make really clear that that meeting ended at a time certain so as to let people get back to their families that night, so a relatively earlier time and, you know, late afternoon maybe coinciding almost with the end of school.

[10:58:13 AM]

Ann.

>> Kitchen: I would just note -- and I think this is fine. I'm just noting for my colleagues, the mobility committee has typically been on the Thursdays that we don't have so we were targeting the seventh but we can move that. And we -- I've deliberately put the mobility committee, setting our agenda items after this is adopted. So this is just a heads-up, whatever the -- wherever the council ends up adopting we'll adjust our mobility committee meetings to fit. Because we were doing them the Thursdays that we didn't have the council meeting. With regard to January 31st, I'm open to whatever people want to do. I'm kind of -- lean towards keeping it just because of the long time period between meetings, but I don't have a -- I'm open to whatever people want to do with that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Leslie.

>> Pool: I'm open as well if we move the 31st of January to seven and then move the 14 to 21 that's fine or if we keep it as it is that's great too. I like the idea of maybe trying to end our meeting on Halloween early enough so people get home. On the other hand, it may not have the impact that we're imagining that it might at this point. So it's kind of just a crap shoot. But I'm -- I think that the calendar as staff had brought to us was fine.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Pool: I'm not opposed to the few small tweaks that are being offered.

>> Mayor Adler: Jimmy and then Alison.

>> Flannigan: You know, if the concern for January and February is the -- that there's too much work to remove a meeting, I feel like we've done a pretty good job over the last couple of months. I don't know who to credit for that so I won't, but I think we're doing pretty good there.

[11:00:19 AM]

Spencer. But, you know, if we still wanted four meetings before spring break and we were contemplating, you know, moving the 31st to the seventh and keeping the 14th and the 28th so you have two smaller meetings for the new councilmembers to come in on, that way they're back to back so you can think through things -- I mean, there's a couple of options there's. I just think given the two-week posting time, you've only given new councilmembers less than two weeks to get their stuff ready. I think that space in January is gonna be valuable.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Alison.

>> Alter: There's three weeks before the 31st, and we also had strategic planning last year and we managed to do it, but I wanted to point out we don't have any budget work sessions on here, and so we do need to figure those out and for folks who are traveling in July, knowing, you know, exactly when that first budget announcement is going to be so that we can plan accordingly if we're traveling at the end of July or if it's gonna be the next week, but just sort of having it set at a point would be good. I know that the process rked much better this year, but we still need to have those work sessions on our calendar. Otherwise it becomes difficult for us to be able to address things.

>> Mayor Adler: There's a corollary issue you might want to address, too, with respect to the budget. Historically we've allowed for three days for a budget in case we don't have more than six votes to pass the budget. And I guess if -- in some instances we might need seven. And we've usually built them on to the calendar, again, recognizing that it's easier to put them in earlier than later. I recognize this year we successfully did it just in one day, but if we can't do that, I just -- I would want to know what is the plan in case we're in a controversial place, which we conceivably could be next year, depending on what the legislature does.

[11:02:29 AM]

>> Renteria: Mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Pio.

>> Renteria: I don't -- I mean, I have no problem with the way the calendar is but I don't have any problem meeting, you know, two weeks in a row. I mean, that's -- we've done that before. If it's -- you know, comes to down to it. We do put a big block party every year on Halloween, and so for -- we entertain about 2,000 kids that come through our neighborhood so it's really a big thing, multigenerations. So if it's possible, if not, I mean, I'm willing to come and spend Halloween here with my fellow colleagues.

[ Laughter ]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Pool: Or we could go join the block party.

>> Mayor Adler: Kathie.



>> Tovo: I like, mayor, your idea of keeping it on Halloween and ending whatever the appropriate hour is whether it's 3:30, after school, or a little later, just to keep on track, but also acknowledge, like, a hard stop is going to be a hard stop, we're going to be done and gone and whatnot.

>> Mayor, council, I'll note as we're discussing this it is a little bit of an art and science and the goal here was to for planning purposes put forward a proposal that would be considered on the council for adoption into an ordinance but, again, the new term starts in Jan and so with that council they will have to also look at this calendar to make sure it works for them and there will be opportunities for amendments along the way. So this is really for planning purposes, and I want to ensure that we're getting this feedback, that we're trying to accommodate as many of the conflicts as possible and being thoughtful about how we can look at next year's schedule, but knowing that we really can't confirm anything until the new term starts as well.

>> Mayor Adler: Kind of like an airport plan. Anything else on this? Alison, did you mean your light to be on?

>> Alter: I just wanted to point out again that right now, in November and December, we have one meeting in each month.

[11:04:35 AM]

Then in January we will have very few meetings, as is the practice, and I just don't know that that is good planning and if it's not on there in December and November it will make it that much harder to do it. I'm perfectly happy to have meetings and cancel meetings or end early but if they're not on the calendar should we need them they become much harder to get the number of people we would most like to have on there, especially during that period of time.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: I would echo that too. I think having one meeting November, one in December, and one in January is not -- stuff is gonna come up so I think that's not good.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Concerned too. Let's move on to the next pulled item, item number 20. Councilmember alter, you pulled that.

>> Alter: Yes. Give me one second.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Alter: I have some questions for staff. Item 20 is the biosolids contract. Thank you for coming this morning. So it's my understanding that the authorization and monies for the current contract are running very low. Can you please tell us the drop dead date for getting this contract done without impacting our operations?

>> Judy Musgrove, Austin water. The contract is over end of December, but we're pretty much out of money right now. There's about \$100,000 left that's -- we can do land application off-site with that. All the compost is pretty much made and been obligated to -- the funds have been obligated to pay for that

so we are really out of money right now. There's been no additional biosolids pulled for come post since August.

>> Alter: Can you explain that last -- I've talked to you about it but I don't know that my colleague have gotten into the nitty-gritty about what's going on at Hornsby right now.

[11:06:44 AM]

>> The current contract pays for the compost as it leaves the plant so they have to make it, start making it, pull the raw biosolids in and then, you know, it's, like, three months later before it's even near ready to leave. So they had to stop pulling biosolids in August so they'd have -- they'd be able to leave before the end of December and get paid for that. They're just turning the dirt right now so they have not been taking any biosolids off the belt press since August to use for anything. We've just been storing it. Now we have additional solids coming down the sewer line because of the water plants had to discharge into the waterline, with all the solids they were receiving they couldn't fit them all into their plant so we've got those additional solids too that we're concerned about.

>> Alter: Thank you. This process has been going on for almost two years now. Can you please compare the contract before us to the contract that we have currently in terms of cost and environmental factors?

>> There's been three solicitations. The first one was an rfp that was canceled. The second one was an rfp that was canceled and this is the third one and it's actually an invitation for bid and it's the one that's gonna come before you. The second -- the scope of the second solicitation, the rfp and the scope for the ifp, are different in that we had required into the rfp the contractor make up his own fire prevention plan, death control plan, spill prevention plan, sampling plans -- I don't know if I'm forgetting one, but fire control, did I say that? Anyway, and then under -- oh, and odor control was the big one. So under this new solicitation we wrote all of those plans and have included them as an attachment to the scope. So they didn't -- that took all the unknowns out for them hopefully.

[11:08:49 AM]

>> Alter: I appreciate that information. I was actually trying to get the proposed contract versus the current contract that's in effect. As I understand there are cost savings and environmental improvements.

>> Right. The current contract includes land application of class biosolids and composting and this new contract would be 100% come posting so that's better right there. Also the new contract allows for dillo titter to be made by the -- dirt to be made by the contractor, we'll make it the first year and after that the dillo dirt will be made by the contractor under our specifications and watch.

>> Alter: Thank you. Part of the reason that I pulled this is that I'm ready to approve this this week so that we don't run into a dangerous and unpleasant situation with our biosolids, especially given what we have recently experienced with our water system. I know that zwac was not able to give a recommendation to council from their last meeting. I believe that was mostly process focused, though, and so I really wanted to get a sense of where my colleagues are at this point in time. My sense is this is urgent and that we need to move forward and that we have a better contract both environmentally and costwise and that this has been going on quite a long time and it's time to bring it to resolution. But I wanted to get a sense of where other folks are at this point.

>> Mayor Adler: Jimmy.

>> Flannigan: I agree with what you've laid out. I think it's time to close the book on this.

>> Mayor Adler: Pio.

>> Renteria: I also agree with that, that we need to move that, move and approve this contract.

>> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston? Okay. Leslie.

>> Pool: Where are we storing all the biosolids that haven't been purchased or picked up?

>> We have storage space on-site. We have storage bins that once we -- one is being used by arr for their grinding and the rest are available for storage and, you know, kind of staging.

[11:10:58 AM]

And we try and use the oldest first in the composting process so we don't get caught with having too much on-site that's a certain age. That's tcq law. Right now we just store in basins and take it out as needed but like I said none has been taken out of the basins since August. We've just been putting it there.

>> Pool: Do we have any storage of compost piles on other city properties?

>> No. It's all at Hornsby. The yard waste coming in also is a problem because it has not been used earlier because compost -- no composting has been going on. That's more of a concern actually than the compost, I mean, the biosolids. The biosolid, there's space for storage there. The yard waste there's no real space for that. We've just been kind of scattering around the property.

>> Pool: And our property is not growing --

>> No.

>> Pool: Our piles are. Are they dangerous to the extent -- I understand that sometimes with biosolids there's so much heat inside that they can --

>> It's more of an odor control issue for biosolids. The class B isn't so -- isn't flammable, necessarily. What's flammable is when you get the biosolids and the yard waste together, they start cooking. That's

what the heat source is. Or the yard waste if it were to get dry and get a spark from somewhere. But the biosolids themselves are not -- the problem is the odor.

>> Pool: Great. And we're keeping them separate?

>> Yes.

>> Sorry, councilmember. I was going to refer to you the memo yesterday, October 29, where we talk about some of the concerns of keeping them on-site longer. But Ms. Musgrove just covered that in more detail even than the memo.

>> Pool: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Anything else on this? Let's go to the next item. Item number 24, councilmembers pool, Flannigan and ality tar. Leslie, you want to start?

[11:12:59 AM]

>> Pool: Sure. I think we have staff here that can answer specifics about the plans that we have and budget availability. But just basically as they're coming up here I want to lay out my intention on the resolution and give y'all a bit of history and the context of what we're trying to do here. So the neighborhoods around this city-owned tract in the Lamar Justin tod have been talking about redeveloping it for many years, ever since the past council approved a resolution in 2013 to begin the process for evaluating the property for redevelopment and garnering community input about what should be built there. I believe the mayor pro tem also worked hard as did the previous council on those community discussions, and she can certainly weigh, in give us her perspective. Despite the hard work of so many the parcel remains underused so I restarted the conversation in the community a couple years ago with staff back in 2015 to see if we could move the needle on the property. Over that time we encouraged the community to develop a working group, one made up of four surrounding neighborhood areas, crestview to the west of Lamar, highland to the east, brentwood and midtown, all four of these neighborhoods are directly affected and are adjacent. And it was inclusive of homeowners and renters with a spectrum of viewpoints and expertise. So the working group conducted a robust survey with over 600 respondents, online and on paper, and conducted their survey outreach through block walking, emails, newsletters, fliers at homes and multi-family properties in all four neighborhoods surrounding the tract. Their efforts were immense and I congratulate them on the report, the survey and the collaboration among the communities that they made possible. The backup has a reference list with relevant city policy documents. It's got the strategic housing blueprint, pard's long-range plan, the tod regulating plan, and also recommendations from the Ryan drive working group that was the stakeholder group that I just described.

[11:15:00 AM]

If you read the report, I'm pleased to say that the community recommendations track with our adopted city policies and with our council priorities to gain maximum affordable housing, quality parceled, transit access and affordable creative space on a city-owned tract. Bear in mind this is just a 5-acre tract. It's really not that big but we're trying to get a lot of quality, amenities, and housing and parkland in this one small space. In fact, the policies also track with tod requirements, and I have hope of including affordable creative space, which is also a council priority. So this resolution is a next step to move us forward in evaluating the market possibilities on the tract and staff will talk to you about that. Checking back in with surrounding communities, crafting an rfp that helps us realize our priorities as a council and also moving the community forward. I understand from our real estate and economic development staff and from canally and the resolution represents their

[indiscernible] Maybe we can talk to our staff and how this fits into all of that.

>> Good afternoon, mayor, city manager, and councilmembers. Christine McGuire, economic development department -- this does track with the process that I do think moves us to a procurement, and begins with the intend mind and having a robust procurement that actually has more than one or several private sector, what I would consider master developers even though it's a 5-acre site. We are not the developer. We are asking a developer to partner with us, which is -- might seem a subtle point but it's a very important point, where we are asking for private sector entrepreneurial expertise and market savvy and access to capital for us to participate in a partnership to do a real estate transaction that results in public benefits but also meets the needs of the private sector.

[11:17:21 AM]

So I do think that this does track. I think it's important to -- when we have a successful procurement, what does that mean? That means multiple offers that we are able then as a council and as staff to compare apples to apples so we need to have a clearly articulated north star that really does involve community input. And I want to thank the councilmember and other councilmembers who have tracts in their district who have on their kind of own but no less mindful and circumspect engaged the community on their tracts. I think where kind of the value add we are seeking with consultant expertise is to bring together multidisciplinary team that form up and prove up and validate that work, but also infuse some very important overlays. The market context, the updated market context and market feasibility and financial feasibility and proving up different scenarios that have been cultivated with engagement and revalidate that. And if there needs to be a trade area definition for these different kinds of properties, that I think is important, that the trade area be defined, and we involve kind of the stakeholders in that trade area to be involved. And kind of acknowledge that these are city assets. And I do think that kind of the broader public has input on city assets. And so I think the work is not to be duplicated, but as a platform for validation and move forward and engagement process that is informed by legal, physical, financial, and market contexts to actually have an rfp that will have a pretty well-articulated north star but does permit the private sector to be able to provide us some of their special sauce to make a good public-private partnership happen that meets community goals.

[11:19:34 AM]

And I do think that that time line works but there are other things related to -- you know, there's an existing user on that site, which is Austin energy, so there's this other parallel tracts that happening, but that doesn't mean that parallel processes can't move forward.

>> Pool: Then I just wanted to let everybody know the 2013 resolution, if you want to look it up, I think we also have this in the backup, 2013-0117-ed 54, it talks about be in the second to the bottom where is on the first page that the 2005 transit oriented development ordinance sets the goal that 25% of housing near each commuter rail station be affordable. And I really hope we can get the 25%. I would like it to be higher even. I've called on us as a council to reallyllush those percentages higher, and so I'm just drawing your attention to this is one of the challenges and the goals that we have for this particular tract.

>> Articulating the goals is import, and that is where, when we get proposals back, where the council will have an opportunity to approve a preferred proposer. And then there's a negotiation of a public-private partnership which is really real estate gap financing. So if there are proposals that want to provide a greater percent affordability but that requires financial participation, low costs longer term, what have you participation, that's part of deal structuring and that is certainly something that will be future conversations but that is on the back end of the transaction but it is certainly something that is there that council will have an opportunity for all of these properties to discuss and procure.

>> Pool: And then I'd also draw everybody's attention to the second whereas at the top of the second page of that same 2013 resolution, it talks the families and children task force that recommends the city create and assist in funding pilot friendly development in one of the tods and that task force identified the large Lamar Justin lane parcel at 6909 Ryan drive as an option for that.

[11:21:51 AM]

I'm hoping we've got a lot of pent up desire in that part of the city for something to happen on this site along these lines but I know we're worlds away from the economy we had even in 2013 so I'm really crossing my fingers and hoping we can find a way to actualize and to implement the vision that previous city leaders saw for the site, which I agree with and join with them in and maybe we can get a really -- on a small tract, again, it's only 5 acres, maybe we can really do something special and important here for our community. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Jimmy.

>> Flannigan: I'm really interested kind of at a high level the role of citizen groups kind of operating outside of the formal public process. It's something that I've done. I did with Anderson mill road, the Asian community did for the resource center. And there's been kind of different staff response to the validity of that community work. So it's not really a commentary on the community work for Ryan drive but more kind of a higher level, are there guardrails the city should be providing for citizens that want to

get together and work on a thing that's important to them and, you know, we maybe don't have the staff resources to do it now but they want to do it, is there a tool kit, how to provide valuable citizen input and here are the things you should do and check boxes you should check off? I think that would be valuable to consider. It's something I'm thinking about doing next year on a couple of other corridors in my district that are not activity corridors, they're not in existing planning processes but missing sidewalk segments and want to engage the community in a bigger process but I don't need to take staff time to do it. So if there was here's how the community can do this in an effective way, in a way that will save staff time in the future and the Asian resource center has been a key element of that because we've been kind of working with staff on reducing the repeating of the process to the extent that it's -- you know, are he would just doing a cya thing or is it substantive and trying to understand that balance.

[11:24:03 AM]

Then just to I think -- just to make sure ierstand what you said that the adjacent pilot owned properties are being considered agency part of the overall plan and I think the working group recommendation, as we often -- the citizen group recommendation, as we often see, kind of asks for things that when you add them together are probably not possible. I think in one place they want 40% of the site to be a public park, and, you know, this is our natural job, is we have to balance the objectives we're trying to accomplish, but also that including this report doesn't mean we're -- that the council is approving the working group's recommendations as our recommendations. It's just additional info to inform, hey, there was a public -- there was a community-led process that happened and here's what they said. I asked you a couple things in the milling of that.

>> I'm gonna pick the easy ones first.

>> Flannigan: There you go.

>> Then we'll follow up. Just the city-owned property, so it does not involve the adjacent privately owned tracts. So I just wanted to be clear with that. I see a furrowed brow. But is it -- so we're -- so we are just procuring the 5.3 acres that the city owns.

>> Flannigan: Are we not contemplating partnering with the private properties that are adjacent?

>> What I --

>> Flannigan: To do a better project or bigger project?

>> We're not -- well, speaking within the boundaries of what our practice is, is we can only procure what we own. Now, that said, that does not mean that we exclude, in a competitive solicitation, that if this -- if any adjacent owner wants to bring forward as a potential development partner --

[11:26:11 AM]

>> Flannigan: I see.

>> -- The value add of what they can do for a larger assemblage, then that is welcome. I think this is interesting. It's, like, there is a real -- this actually come up with Mccullough place too. We have a site, all these sites are circumscribed by owners, either the city takes the time and back off and negotiate individually with these private owners and then think about a redevelopment plan or strategy as a whole, or we can let market forces help compel the right options to come forward. And we cannot compel a private owner to participate in any way. I think one of the things that we are balancing and are challenged as a city is right now we're in an upmarket cycle. That market cycle, increase what our reconnaissance is, we're having a window that's closing within the next 18 to 24 months, kind of delaying procurement. To kind of renegotiate maybe a potential assemblage or partnership with land that we don't own. That is certainly -- if that's the will of the dais we could move forward to that. However, what we can also do is encourage potential partners to come forward through a very structured and facilitated procurement to do the hard work for us if that is something that they seek to leverage.

>> Flannigan: And I think just to the extent that potential bidders are paying attention to the thoughts of the dais, right, my preference is to do that in -- mostly because of just the practical reality that the private tracts that are immediately adjacent are the farthest ones away from the existing neighborhoods.

[11:28:13 AM]

So when you think about the regular pressures of when things get built, that is more likely to be able to get agreement across a broad spectrum of folks putting the denser elements of the project in the areas farthest away from single family neighborhoods using the park as a buffer, which is probably a more likely contemplated idea. That would be kind of what I would be hoping for in order to maximize the value of this adjacent to a train station property.

>> Mayor Adler: Alison.

>> Alter: So I pulled this to ask some kind of broader questions as well. I appreciate that in this case councilmember pool has been working on this with the community for a long time and that there's been a lot of input, but couldn't help but notice that a few weeks ago we had health south and we did an rfi, we have Travis county expo center is we're coming up with options and we're doing an rfp for this one. So help me understand why an rfp is the appropriate mechanism for this particular property.

>> So I have some rules of thumb. So I have some rules of thumb, but that doesn't mean rfis cannot happen. What I hear from the private sector is there is a lot of rfi fatigue out there. Here are some rules of thumb that are helpful in thinking why an rfi in certain situations and why just go to an rfp. Especially an rfp that will have a process that further intertwines with community and engagement with site planning feasibility and gap analysis. So it's not just lifting up and going straight to an rfp. An rfi in my experience, that is where the city really needs the expertise, especially for properties that are quite honestly odd.



[11:30:24 AM]

That they are very one off. They are high functional obsolescence. Health south to me was a pretty clear example where it was a former hospital and we as a staff need that market appetite to understand what can be done with either the physical structure or not. There's a clear fork in the road. An rfi, what it does is really inform. It's not part of the formal solicitation process. It helps inform a really good solicitation process, especially if there are clear forks in the road of demolish, not to demolish, crazy building or functionally obsolescence building, that kind of thing. I also think that rfis are really important in areas that are rapidly transforming, that have development pressures from many different areas. And again, that particular property is very interesting and that health south property was odd in that sense. Or if there isn't a whole lot of market reconnaissance coming from, say, rezonings or particular developments that are coming out of the ground in and around there. There really isn't a whole lot of information on that. But I do think the bottom line is that if you are going to do an rfi, it needs to be intentional in what kind of information or interest you're asking for. That would inform, I recommend a solicitation afterwards. It does not -- it's not a substitute for a formal proposal process. I hope that helps. I don't know if that really answers your question.

>> Alter: We can continue it offline if I have more questions. Thank you. So does this envision a lease or own with a partner?

[11:32:24 AM]

>> I think we would like to express that -- from what I've heard in past conversations from the dais, a desire and a preference for long-term lease and not to alienate in a sale. But you make a lease long enough, it becomes a ground lease where it can serve like a very predictable kind of -- and I put this in air quotes, sale, but we do not alienate our field interest, we just alienate our leasehold interest.

>> Alter: So I realize this is a five-acre property so it may not be the best candidate for this, but one of the things that I am broadly concerned about is that we are leasing property right and left as a city when we should be owning property for our city departments. And I would like to understand -- I know that there's an analysis that Mr. Gale and Mr. Canally are working on of our city office needs that we will be getting back in February that will help us to understand some of the choices before us in terms of leasing and owning. I'd like to understand, it wasn't listed in here at all, and I realize it was five acres, but it is a city-owned property of one of our utilities. Is there an opportunity here to consider any office space for city use as part of the broader mixed use development.

>> Alex gale, interim officer for the office of real estate. It is one of the sites that is part of that occupancy plan that we're working with our provider for, but because it is a site that is really just warehouse space, old are buildings, it wasn't a high priority site that we think we could use as potential office space at this point for needs that we have right now.

>> Alter: So Ms. Pool, I know I saw that you've now posted the backup with the report, but I haven't reviewed it yet.

[11:34:27 AM]

Is kind of office space part of the mixed use that's envisioned, just broadly speaking, whether it's city or not? I've seen parkland and creative spaces and affordable housing, but I didn't see office space as a part of that. It says mixed use development, but I just -- I wanted some clarity. Leslie, were you listening? I asked you a question.

>> Pool: [Inaudible].

>> Alter: I was wondering whether or not there was any office space contemplated city or otherwise as part of the mixed use on this tract.

>> Pool: Okay. So it's a really small tract and we're trying to put a whole lot of things there. Housing for low income families was the priority as well as trying to maximize the space for parkland. But then we also have the train tracks that are on the other side of the boundary lines so we're trying to get -- communicate with that to have some at grade crossing. We've had communications with cap metro on how that train is going to be tracked in the future years. And not commercial office space, but certainly space for artisans and it could even be live-work space. The industrial buildings there are pretty cool actually. And there are some developers in Austin who use them as they don't tear those structures down, they repurpose them. And they repurpose them like for welders to rent out or to purchase, I suppose, to do their work for artisan -- other types of artisans, for somebody who is looking for space to practice an instrument, so the goal is to bring the creatives into this space, have family housing, multigenerational. And have parkland so that that part of the city could have that particular amenity there.

[11:36:27 AM]

And the people who would live and work in that small space would also have it right at hand. The one thing that I think may not get as much -- as much as people might like would be parking. I think that might be the one thing that there isn't as much parking on that site as some people would like. Again, because it's so small and if you structure parking it gets really expensive. We're trying to write down the costs of all of this by maintaining ownership of the property so that we own the dirt.

>> Alter: Okay. Thank you. I think you answered my question. So in the future as we're looking at tracts of land we really need to be considering whether sites for city-owned departments, et cetera, to be able to be housed there be can continue to be mixed use. This one is not large enough. And I'm very much aware that there is parkland deficiency there because the council allowed crestwood station to go in without any park requirements. So as a consequence the neighborhood has a lot of people living in there and not enough parkland. And that does need to be remedied in the future.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem? Kathie.

>> Tovo: Thanks. I think councilmember pool may have referenced this in her opening remarks, but this site has been the subject of much discussion for a long time. And I first became aware of it on the families and children task force when Heather way actually made sure that it was included as a recommendation in that report that we try to consider having a pilot project of a family friendly development on that tract. And it was also -- it's been in lots of housing reports through the years as a potential site for housing. So let me just say how excited I am to see this moving forward into this new next. I had brought forward a resolution on this tract to look at redeveloping it with a priority for housing as well as parkland.

[11:38:31 AM]

And we did get some reports back from the staff and I would suggest that I think it would be useful to have that information included in the backup for this item as well. That earlier staff work that was done. And I want to suggest to councilmember pool that we incorporate a whereas, and I'm happy to work with your staff on it, that captures some of of that. We had the ability to see through the work. This is a topic really in part because of some of our community members in advocating for it to be used for this purpose. And so I think kind of reflecting back some of those recommendations that came from citizens' groups is important for people to be able to see the trajectory of how things like this happen. I think it's ideally suited for the users that are being discussed and I'm really so excited -- when we had those community discussions there were some in the neighborhood that wanted the whole site to be used as a park and so I just want to congratulate my colleague, councilmember pool, for the extent of the community conversations you had and in bringing forward some ideas that have community consensus around the need to meet both the suggestions for housing as well as that for park. The earlier resolution did set some goals of having this really be a model for storm water use and for environmental standards and I think that we should set some kind of basic standards for how we use our city property. One is, as you mentioned, as our staff mentioned, holding ownership of them. Especially if areas that we know are going to continue to become more and more vibrant places so that we have that right next on to the train station, an area where we have lots of new houses, businesses, transition housing. I think we need to hold on to the the ownership. But the other expectation we should have is the highest environmental standards for how those tracts are used.

[11:40:35 AM]

And to me those are opportunities for us to demonstrate to the private community that you can develop great projects economically and also have highest and best practices with regard to how we use water, how we use energy, et cetera. Hopefully we can again maybe -- I'll have to look back at the community report to see if that was one of the values that they identified, and if not, councilmember pool, I hope you would consider in addition to the amendment I mentioned that captures some of the history, an

amendment to prioritizing the following goals of environmental practices and adding in a bullet for that. So I'll be glad to develop that recommendation as well.

>> Both of those --

>> Pool: Both of those I would see as friendly. I reference the 2013 resolution, which -- if it's not in backup, it's supposed to be. And it talks about on page 3 about the report that the manager was asked to give to city council back in 2013. One of the bullet says to use the tract as a model energy efficient, affordable and family friendly multidevelopment and neighborhood pocket park. And that's so specific to what we're trying to do here. So to the extent that we're not saying that as clearly as we are in here, I'm absolutely happy to do that because that is our intention. To the extent that there are other reports out there that we haven't linked up to this to provide a larger context and the deeper history on it, I'm also a proponent of that. I'm glad you brought all that up so we can be sure to pull in all those threads.

>> Tovo: Yes. And I think that earlier resolution did some of that. So we can look back at it. And thank you. I had overlooked the families and task force report reference, and you've referenced it in advocating for parks. As I recall it had a specific recommendation about this tract that would be great to capture.

>> Pool: Absolutely. And I read from the second whereas on the second page of the 2013 resolution that specifically references the children and families task force and it recommends for a family friendly development in this tract and specifically identifies it as 6909 Ryan drive.

[11:42:49 AM]

>> Tovo: And I just want to express again how excited I am that we're starting to think about using our city-owned properties in various ways that will bring value to the community. This is an amazing -- it's a tract in an amazing location and I've walked it a couple of times and when you're sitting there next to this new multi-family development and the train station and we're using it to store poles, not that it's not useful and we don't need to do that but we don't need to do it there. This will be great.

>> Renteria: Reason this sounds like --

>> Renteria: This sounds like an important project and I'm going to be supporting it. It sounds like something we have talked about and envisioned to do with our city-owned land. So this is just a great opportunity. So I'll be supporting this.

>> Mayor Adler: Ann?

>> Kitchen: I want to say I also support this. I appreciate the work that councilmember pool has done in her neighborhoods to bring this forward. It's also a good -- it's a good model for us in terms of property in other parts of the city. So I think that's really a good model about how to bring the community together. And I think, councilmember pool, that you have also talked about adding some clarification language to make it clear that the affordable housing also includes the family housing as well as co-op housing as options. Not to direct that it has to be one of those, but just to emphasize that in the rfp so that the -- so that the responders can see that that's a particular emphasis. So I expect that there's -- I

think that there's language that you were thinking of to include. And I think that goes to what mayor pro tem was saying too. Right?

>> Pool: It's really important that we remember the centrally located public schools and this is right next to some really good elementary schools and junior highs, especially -- so the multigenerational aspect of this, which includes again low income folks of every age.

[11:45:02 AM]

I really hope they're able to find a place to live here.

>> Mayor Adler: Jimmy?

>> Flannigan: Two quick things. Are we engaging with cap metro at all on what they're trying to accomplish with the train stations? And that area is also pretty high, dense bus route, future corridor, et cetera, et cetera? Have they been participating at all?

>> They've been participating in vast planning efforts and we certainly will engage them as part of this and they will be engaged as part of this.

>> Flannigan: Another element of bringing in the private property owners that might bring value to the project is what Lamar street side stuff that cap metro may be experiencing. And as I've thinking about it out loud, the campo future of the rail crossing, there's a lot of stuff that we need to do right there that may be a slice of land here and a slice of land there that helps us get there. So I don't want to preclude those future opportunities. And mayor pro tem, to your point about being in a beautiful train station and then seeing warehouses, that is unfortunately a very common occurrence on the train line, not because of city owned land, but all the train stations. By the time the train is full you've picked up the train decision as where there are cows grazing on the other side of the train tracks. So we have a lot of opportunity to build up transit friendly amendment development in this community. And I hope to the extent the city doesn't own all those past years, there seems to be a lot of opportunity, hopefully we can bring those things forward in the land development code and find ways to streamline that process.

>> Mayor Adler: Greg.

>> Casar: I want so express my continued support for low income housing. And public space at this location, which is right bordering on my district at the border of councilmember pool's and mine. I also want to just for full transparency make sure that everybody is aware that on a parallel track on about the same timeline we're moving forward on the former homestead home Depot property so I want everybody to be aware of that process.

[11:47:19 AM]

I haven't contemplated being forward a similar resolution because my understanding is the staff is continuing to move forward with that, but I'm a co-sponsor and supportive of this one. And that one is a larger opportunity, over 20 acres, but this one is so centrally located, you know, the apex of so many things, that it's also very exciting. So thanks for the work you've done with the community on it.

>> Pool: I appreciate your support.

>> Mayor Adler: Anything else on this item? Okay. Let's go on to the next item. Thank you. Jimmy, you pulled items 49 and 52.

>> Flannigan: Yeah, a couple of quick questions on those. Let me pull those out of my notes so I remember what I was thinking. On 49 the staff added additional use prohibitions, club or lodge, educational facilities, urban farm. I've seen certain groupings of uses come prohibited in a package like automotive uses or bail bond, whatever. Is this a new set of uses that are being grouped together that we should anticipate seeing prohibited in the future?

>> Greg Guernsey, planning and zoning. No. I'll follow up on that question. Actually, I thought it was going to be a slightly different question.

>> Flannigan: There may be another question.

>> I'll follow up on that part.

>> Flannigan: So yeah, so kind of any time -- my preference remains that the council be given professional recommendations from the staff and the requests from the community and the recommendations from planning commission and then let the council debate and decide what the compromise is. And I remain a little frustrated that we get staff recommendations that appear to be striking a compromise when I would prefer to see like what the policy that underlines the use -- especially -- generally on use restrictions is where it kind of triggers me.

[11:49:23 AM]

>> I am aware that the applicant and the neighborhood have reached an agreement regarding these conditions. I think there was only one concern that may be left that the neighborhood has expressed about removing an existing driveway. But I understand all the parties are in agreement and that this possibly could be offered for consent unless there's someone that I guess I'm not aware of from the neighborhood.

>> Flannigan: I'm not looking to have a big drawn out debate on Thursday, right? That's why I'm pulling them approximate for Tuesday so we can kind of -- I can kind of daylight my concerns. I also have concerns about groups coming together and negotiating deals with developers outside of the larger context of the policy decisions we have to make. That there's an -- an agreement is not evidence that it's good. It's evidence that the developer isn't going to do the thing that's being asked for. And that's why they are allowing the restrictions to be codified in perpetuity, but for a zoning change. And so I just think that the incentives are different in that negotiating room, which doesn't happen in public and it doesn't happen in an open meeting as opposed to us coming together as elected officials and having those

policy decisions. Then the second Williamson this is the one residential unit. There's a restriction on this as we did on a prior zoning case earlier this year, and I opposed the one residential unit restriction and I still don't understand why we would do a single unit restriction on a code getting significant investment, millions of dollars of investment both from the city and from campo what the one unit restriction accomplishes as a policy goal.

>> Kitchen: Could I speak to that? This is in my district. I understand your questions, I think, and Mr. Guernsey, you can please add if I'm misstating.

[11:51:24 AM]

The request, this zoning request, is for changing this to office. And the intention of the developer is to build office. So the reference to the -- the applicant proposes to develop the property with a medical office use. There is one -- what's on the property right now is a house that's not used. So my guess, and you can tell me if that's not correct, that they're retaining the ability to have that residential component on there, probably until such time as they get to the medical office building. So I think that's what that -- the reason behind that. I think the focus here is the intent and the reason for the change in zoning. And that's because the intent is to develop the property with a medical office use. So if you look in the backup you will see that's what the applicant is proposing to develop. There's a house sitting on it right now that's abandoned. So Mr. Guernsey, am I incorrect?

>> That's correct regarding the residence that was existing that was there, still there. And that they have the ability to continue to use that.

>> Flannigan: I think I feel a little whiplash so when we make zoning policy decisions because the developer says they're going to do a thing versus when we are setting policy broadly about zoning. Because I've been told multiple times it doesn't matter what the developer says they're going to do. We have to assume that they could sell it tomorrow. We've seen that happen before. And I think just roughly speaking my perspective is this is a road that's been identified as an activity corridor. It's got mobility plan dollars, it's got campo dollars. It just doesn't make sense why we wouldn't do the Lomu without the one residential restriction and without the -- these other weird uses.

[11:53:35 AM]

I understand that some of those are on the original request and we can't remove them because of the process that is still I think a little fuzzy to me about why that is. That's just where I'm at. It's just a policy question about do we own specifically for the thing a developer is intending to build or are we zoning for what we think is appropriate?

>> Kitchen: From my perspective this is appropriate for this location. What's being prohibited is a club, so I'm not sure that we need a club on slaughter at the intersection of Chisholm.

>> Flannigan: It's a club or lodge.

>> Kitchen: Also what's being restricted is a urban farm. Unless you have a problem with those I don't see any problem with those restrictions?

>> Flannigan: It's six of one, half dozen of the other. It's the challenge with the code generally that the groupings of uses and the process by which uses are allowed is a blunt oect. And hopefully we can get to a place next year as we entertain how this process should be better that we're not forcing this conversation to happen, much like we've talked more recently about convenient storage and other uses where it seems like the policy decisions about uses might be better appropriately decided separately from zoning. And my frustration just tends to be these often sound arbitrary because I could go into the Lomu list and probably find 10 more that the applicant would agree to restrict, but these -- why these? I'm not interested in having this debate again on Thursday. I'm just trying to daylight some of my concerns with how the code continues to put us in these weird situations. Both the residents and developers and the council, and I think at least in the short-term I want to avoid further imposing complicated zoning that will be later difficult to unpack into a better system that hopefully we will be developing in short order.

[11:55:42 AM]

That's the end of my questions on 49. And then on 52, mayor, let me just jump right to it.

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead. I'm sorry, Ms. Houston?

>> Houston: No, I just need to ask [inaudible - no mic].

>> Houston: When do we use the educational impact study?

>> That's usually at a time when you're proposing some sort of multi-family or residential and then you're looking at certain number of units. So it wouldn't involve this.

>> Houston: So it wouldn't be applicable here. But because it's not multi-family.

>> Because they're not proposing several units and it's not overwhelming any schools.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Next person. Jimmy?

>> Flannigan: Then on 52 it's almost the reverse question of that, which it wasn't clear to me what the future of dessau road is. It's designated in imagine Austin, it's not designated in project connect. I don't know if it's going to be in asmp what the future of that road is. And then generally is adding a co that says you can only do what is it, 18 units I think is the co, if I'm reading that correctly?

>> That's correct.

>> Flannigan: Less than one might be able to build under a maximum scenario and I think the max -- the scenario is maybe -- roughly 28 if you were able to find a way to build out every inch of entitlement?



>> It might be closer to getting a maximum of 24. If they were just to develop it under its existing zoning, it may come out to be about 18 duplex units, if you set aside about 20% of land?

>> Flannigan: I would prefer to do the sf 6 alone and not bake in in perpetuity the number of units on the site.

[11:57:45 AM]

And you know, again, the developer is only saying they're going to build 18, but again, I find that sometimes we take that as evidence to do a thing and sometimes we take that as evidence not to do a thing. But also is this a part of town where we want that level of density? And maybe it's not. Maybe it's not because dessau as a corridor is maybe not likely to get a lot of public transportation in the future or whatever that is. And that's again why I think these decisions need to be debated and negotiated by us because when I think about housing and homelessness being at the top of the list, my instinct is I'll put housing everywhere I can put housing, but if the choice is not as much in the train station, but pushes more housing to dessau, that's not the right choice, but that's what the neighborhoods are going to negotiate. So I need more housing at the train station because it doesn't make sense to put more housing on dessau. I think that's why it's so important that we be making these choices but for most of my colleagues having left. I tried.

[Laughter].

>> Houston: They're listening to you. Let me kind of speak to dessau is a major corridor and should be identified as such. There is no transportation. I think the concern for the community is dessau is such a major thoroughfare that to exit on to dessau is a death threat and so apple gaitgate and the little interior streets you have to go back on and on so they can turn safely either left or right on to dessau road. So I think if there was some way to mitigate the traffic impact on dessau -- dessau is a secondary road to I-35. So people are going 60, 70 miles per hour. And Applegate is a substandard street. I don't know if that's what you all call it, Mr. Guernsey, but it's a very narrow lane, Applegate lane.

[11:59:48 AM]

So that would put more traffic on the road on Applegate trying to get into downtown because there's no other way to get there except by car. And there's no indication that capital metro is looking at dessau road for mass transit.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else on this? Let's talk timing and scheduling on Thursday. I'm trying to look to see if there's anything that looks like it might work into the evening. You want to talk about 55, which is --

>> Alter: Yeah. With respect to camel back, item 55, parts I've heard, mediation was not successful this weekend between the owner and neighbors across the lake. My office has twice contacted the

mediator, selected by the neighborhood, but unfortunately we have not heard from him, in order to learn from his perspective what happened in the sessions. With that in mind, I'm going to request a time certain for 7:00 P.M. For this Thursday. The nine neighborhoods on the northern side of the track have agreed to limit their testimony to a handful of speakers but I'm not sure how many neighbors from the southern side of the river will want to speak and we may need, you know, time to deliberate. My office is working on a series of amendments with the applicant, which he has agreed to. I don't want to go into detail since we're still looking at those items. Amplified sound, size of the house, and restrictions and a few other minor things. We're also continuing conversations on conversation on steep slopes but I don't yet know if we will have agreement on an amendment related to that issue. I had hoped that we would be able to address this before dinner, but I think since last time we limited testimony really to before dinner, and this is second and third reading with a pretty hard constraint with respect to the timing for the champions, I'm going to ask that we have a time certain at 7:00.

[12:01:51 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: That's been our practice here recently not to set a time certain the way we have in the past so an item can't come up before a certain time, so if people are available in the afternoon and we have the time and they can speak in the evening, that we allow them to speak earlier, but we have been saying that -- instead, what we've been saying, in those instances, we won't make a decision in the afternoon and come back after dinner and take testimony if someone is there to speak to it. Does that work here too?

>> Alter: I'm fine with that. The main thing is that I want people to have the opportunity to come after dinner to be able to speak after us. A lot of people were not able to come last time because it was during the day, and because of how folks had organized, I felt comfortable with that. But given that it's -- we need to push through second and third reading, I want to give people the opportunity to speak to us on either side who want to -- certainly I'm open to saying if they come before 7:00, that they will have an opportunity to speak or that we can begin talking about some things so that we can move quicker to a resolution moving forward, but that folks will have an opportunity to speak at 7:00, but that my colleagues understand that we will need a full dais, you know, after dinner to discuss this issue.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any comments on the timing request from Alison? It's okay, we have so few people here, you might want to post something on the message board that says that we obviously can't vote to do that till Thursday, but if you post that and give people kind of a head's-up what your recommending, and no one on the dais here, all five of us, no one raised -- all six of us, no one raised an objection to it.

>> Alter: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: All right that being said, I think that's all the things we need to take care of here. We're going to go into closed session and take up three items. Pursuant to 551.071 and 551.072 of government code, we're going to discuss legal and administrative measures e2, the golf course, item 58, negotiation and execution of an amendment to the Brackenridge development agreement, and city

council will discuss legal matters related to item e4, which is the Reagan national advertising versus city of Austin matter.

[12:04:17 PM]

E1 and e3 has been withdrawn. Without objection here at 12:04, we will recess and go into executive session. We have no further business after executive session, so we will not be coming back out here except for me to close the meeting. Let's go into executive session.

[Executive session]