

City Council Budget Adoption Meeting Transcript – 08/13/2020 (Continuation of recessed 08/12/2020 meeting)

Title: City of Austin

Channel: 6 - COAUS

Recorded On: 8/13/2020 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 8/13/2020

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

Please note that the following transcript is for reference purposes and does not constitute the official record of actions taken during the meeting. For the official record of actions of the meeting, please refer to the Approved Minutes.

[10:04:24 AM]

. >> Mayor Adler: This is a continuation of the meeting that we started yesterday. On August 12th. The adoption of the budgets and tax rate and election items. We came really close to finishing last night. It looks like people weren't feeling well, so we extended this over. We're still in item number 1. And where we're at is -- I think we have -- where we left, we had a budget rider in front of us and then three key related items. Let's go first to the budget writer item.

[10:05:26 AM]

Councilmember tovo, do you want to bring that rider 1? >> Tovo: Thank you. As we discussed yesterday, this would be a rider that would have no fiscal impact. It would simply ask for there to be a conversation around residency, in the years that I've been on council I've heard complaints from the public that not enough officers are from Austin, live in Austin. We've heard suggestions from various people, including with some of the community advocates who have written us over the last several weeks, asking us to transform public safety. Some of those e-mails have also asked us to address this issue, and to recruit more officers from Austin which I support, and look at ways of encouraging officers to live within the city of Austin. As I mentioned yesterday, this is a recommendation that aligns withment Obama's task force on

[10:06:27 AM]

21st century policing in part. And I still think there's research that needs to be done to look at areas that have different kinds of programs in place. There's certainly work that would need to be done to look at how and whether those are affected. (Indiscernible) Just asking our staff to report and have some conversations with officers who live within and outside of the city to get some initial feedback to help us move forward. It's my understanding, and just let me highlight that I mentioned the statistics yesterday, but 76% of our police officers live outside of the city. I think it would be a good thing for -- as we look at transforming public safety, to look at that issue as well. It's my understanding that one of my co-sponsors, councilmember harper-madison is no longer supportive of this. And based on the vote yesterday, I don't see a reason to bring it

[10:07:28 AM]

up unless somebody has changed their opinion. But it is unfortunate, I think, that it is something that the public has at various times expressed an interest in addressing, so what I will simply say is that at a time where we're looking at various ways and options and exploring various ideas about transforming public safety, I'm extremely disappointed that this measure, with no fiscal impact, and no commitment on the part of the city council to create a program to provide incentives, to do anything along those lines, just to simply along that conversation to get to this point. As I mentioned yesterday, police oversight in the conversation, with the officer police oversight about this. And so thank you for that work. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. That being the case, I think

[10:08:29 AM]

those are all the riders that we had in front of us. That gets us then to the fee related amendments. Councilmember harper-madison had one, councilmember Ellis had one, councilmember Ellis, do you want to lay out your -- or move your pass knowledge of 4? >> Ellis: Yes, and I covered this yesterday as well. Since it's not increasing the fee, hopefully the discussion would be moot at this point. But it is about the clean creeks crew, which would be funded through Austin resource recoveries, a community fee. The fee is not going up or down this year, it is just realigning the usage to be in line with the clean creeks resolution from last January. In conjunction with watershed protection department, there would be a crew going into creeks and doing litter abatement with budget rider/fee

[10:09:32 AM]

usage would be going toward. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any objection to including Ellis fee related amendment 4, related to clean creeks crew? Hearing none, that is included in the base budget.

Councilmember alter will address 1, your 1. Your number 1. >> Alter: Thank you. So I posted yesterday some updated language to the chief medical officer amendment, and hopefully that clarifies concerns that were raised regarding the intersection of the CML and the health authority. As previously noted in our amendment appointments, our health authority are (indiscernible) Subject to confirmation by council and the commissioner's court. We clarified any overlap is left as an option rather than a defined component of the office. I've also made some updates to

[10:10:32 AM]

language to allow for additional flexibility in navigating this process such as doing salary negotiations, et cetera. Because this is a somewhat new idea, I just want to take a moment, if I could, to lay out why I think this is necessary. This amendment transitions the office of the medical director to the office of the chief medical officer, and strengthens its clinical scope by adding several ftes to expand community access to physician services. This transition helps us to create strategic alignment of our clinical services, provided by the city of Austin, by developing clinical reporting relationships which will improve coordination of health care and mental health services across city departments. These changes will enhance our ability to bring the physician assistant services to Austin and the Travis county community. It adds several positions to what will now be the office of

[10:11:32 AM]

the chief medical officer. It adds a deputy medical director who will be -- support the cmo in urgent care and telehealth. It makes permanent a clinical manager who's currently right now a temporary employee who is working with vulnerable populations, including those in homelessness, and an event coordinator to coordinate data management. I see this as a first phase of a process that will continue in the coming months as we reimagine public safety. I really strongly believe that if we have this structure in place at the beginning of the pandemic, it would have been a boon to our covid-19 response because we would have had additional clinical support. I want to note this is funded by an additional charge for ambulance transports and will later phase in a fee for when AFD is present for a vehicle crash. And finally, I just want to add that when we talk about this

[10:12:34 AM]

proposal, I think it's really important that we understand that every one of the medics operates under the medical director's individual medical license. And we've been adding a lot of ftes, and those people all need to be credentialed, and that is overseen by the medical director's office. So the -- this proposal's going to bring efficiencies to that process, and it's also going to augment the capabilities of our paramedics to better care for our community and avoid unnecessary transfers. This is also a really

critical step for moving forward with the et3 initiative that was supported by councilmember Ellis' amendment which I was proud to co-sponsor. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you, councilmember alter. And as I asked yesterday, staff

[10:13:38 AM]

had raised some issues or concerns with an earlier draft. My understanding is that you've worked out through all those and staff is supportive of this as well, is that correct? >> Alter: Yes. And my understanding is staff is excited to see if there are other things that we might be able to move under this office as we go through public safety. >> Mayor Adler: Sounds good. Any objection to including alter 1 in the budget? >> Mayor, just one qui question. >> Mayor Adler: Yes? >> I'm glad to hear we have public health in the director's office feeling right about this. I haven't seen -- double-checked the latest version. Is there an estimate yet exactly on what fee level we're looking at as far as (indiscernible)? >> Alter: Sure. So my understanding is that it's about \$110 additional fee to the ambulance transport fee. They have not set the AFD fee. That's something they would set and would come back to council. But that fee then -- they've set

[10:14:39 AM]

a very low amount that has to come from that one for this year, as we grow the office, that's the fee that will be helping mostly for growing the office in the second phase. But they have to go through the process for setting the AFD fee. The transport fee is largely covered by insurance, and they have all of the systems in place that they currently have for helping folks who can't afford it. That's all set up into their processes. And this is calculated based on a very large percentage, not paying -- I don't remember the exact figures, but if you compared our ambulance fees to Houston, there was more than \$1,000 difference that we were below. I want to say it was more like 1,800, but I don't want to (indiscernible). Ems and the budget office thought these were reasonable changes to be made. An idea is that the medical

[10:15:39 AM]

director is providing the oversight for the medics, and that clinical stuff that has to happen, so it's a reasonable thing from a fee perspective to be funding out of that source. >> Understanding that public health is comfortable with the new language, and then understanding that the -- anything we do, we will make sure that people without health or auto insurance aren't impacted by this, and they understand obviously this is incremental add. But understanding that what we do here would address both of those. And I'm comfortable letting it go on the way it is. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any other comments on this?

Yes, councilmember kitchen, and then koub pool. >> Kitchen: Yeah. I just want to say thank you to councilmember alter for bringing this. And I appreciate the conversation that we've had around it.

[10:16:39 AM]

It offers a lot of opportunity related to better integrate our clinical functions, our preventive functions, and also relate to what we do around mental health. So I think it's very positive and I think the concerns that people have raised have been addressed, and certainly can be addressed as we continue to move forward with this. But I'm really very excited about it. I think it has a lot of potential. I appreciate councilmember alter for bringing it. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool? >> Pool: I just have a quick question for staff. This can come in the form of a memo later. It doesn't affect this, which amendment I support. I'm a co-sponsor. I think it's a good idea. I want to know if we can have participation in the cost of the medical officer from integral care. They also have a tax base in the community. And I'd like to know if somebody

[10:17:40 AM]

could check into that to see if we could have a contract report, and if they could contribute to the cost of the office of chief medical examiner >> Thank you, councilmember. We'll certainly look into that and follow up with you. >> Pool: Please send it to everybody >> Exactly. >> Pool: Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Any objection to including alter 1 in the base budget? Hearing none, that's included. That gets us to our very last item in budget consideration here is harper-madison 7, concerning golf course fees. Does anybody have an objection to this being included? And I don't want to stop you, councilmember harper-madison, from addressing it first if you wanted to. >> Harper-madison: Forgive me, I took my eyes off the screen. Did anybody express any objection? If not, I'd like to keep moving. >> Mayor Adler: Two people raised their hands to ask questions. >> Harper-madison: Let's let

[10:18:40 AM]

them ask their questions and then I'll respond. >> Mayor Adler: Sounds good. Councilmember tovo and then councilmember alter. >> Tovo: Going back and forth with the recreation staff, I don't know if they're on the line and available. I certainly support our commitment to early childcare and out-of-school programs and youth programs. I think that's next to homelessness, one of the main areas we should be investing in for the health of our community. But I do have some questions about the golf enterprise fund and have they -- do the staff support this and have they measured the impact of covid on our golf courses, which, of course, have been on and off closed. >> We do have our director of parks and recreation on the line and we can get answers to the impact on our golf courses.

[10:19:43 AM]

>> Tovo: And (indiscernible) Recommend this as a measure. >> Kimberly mcneily from the parks and recreation department. Specifically, in order to make up the entire million-dollar transfer would require approximately a 20% increase of all fees associated with golf. So golf has greens fees, they have annual membership fees, they have golf cart fees, driving range fees, those sorts of things. So there's a number of different fees. So we're looking at approximately a 20% increase. And so that would be something, in some cases, you know, 10 to 20 to \$25 increase to what is already in place. Which may be an increase that is not palatable for the market, which means we would be coming much closer to what private courses or public courses that

[10:20:43 AM]

have a particular level of care to their golf course, and folks may choose -- we don't know a hundred percent -- but they may choose not to come to our golf courses which would mean it would actually have the reverse effect in that we wouldn't make up the million dollars, we might make up some, but they may go to another golf course where they find it more affordable, and more in line with the care that is provided to the course. If we were to do a fee that was closer to 3% to 5%, we're looking at anywhere from about a 200 to a \$300,000 increase, and if those moneys were to be debited from the million dollars of the transfer and used on behalf of school programs, or out-of-school programs, you know, we're looking at maybe being able to serve 50 more children. I will say that we have been working on the Hancock golf

[10:21:43 AM]

course on a new business model. It's been stalled a bit because of covid, but that might give us an opportunity to -- we continue to lose approximately \$200,000, that's made up from the other golf courses, but that might be a new business model at that particular location, and may be an opportunity for us to reduce the million-dollar transfer. And also, and I know the city council is working very hard with regards to muni, but there's that \$500,000 lease with the muni golf course. And if that were to ever no longer exist, and by no means am I trying to put pressure on council, I'm just giving you the facts, that would be a total of \$700,000 that would no longer have to be transferred from the general fund. Councilmember tovo, does that give you some perspective? >> Tovo: It does.

[10:22:43 AM]

We've had conversations about the golf enterprise fund for years now. I just think there's a real question about whether it has ever functioned well as an enterprise fund. These are city facilities, and part of what you're paying for when you are a taxpayer in the city of Austin, are city facilities like parks and recreation facilities. So having golf courses with the requirement of paying for themselves has been a challenge that I'm not aware we've ever been able to really move, because of one thing or another. First it was the cost of using -- well, anyway, we don't need a history -- a walk-through history today. We have talked a lot about raising the rates for out-of-city users, which I 100% support, I think. And that's something that I have helped lead into place at our other parks facilities as well.

[10:23:43 AM]

Because when you are a taxpayer, you should get a benefit, you should get a lower rate if you're signing your children up for camp or swimming lessons or things of that sort. Can you remind me what it is like at our golf courses? I think there's a differential rate, but I'm not sure it's as different as some of us were arguing for in the past. >> Yeah. I'm looking up those rates right now, councilmember. They are -- there is a differentiation between resident and non-resident. I'm just trying to see what that is. You know, actually, I beg your pardon, I do not see a resident and non-resident rate, instead there is a regular round and evening round. So it's differentiated around the time in which you play the golf course. So I what I think I'm hearing you say, all of our other fees associated with our recreation programs outside of this enterprise fund do have a resident versus a non-resident

[10:24:44 AM]

rate. So what I think I'm hearing you say is it might be a consideration for this. If I may add, councilmembers, and mayor, the parks and recreation department, in kind of doing a really quick study after we found out that this was of interest, maybe somewhere between a 1 and 5% increase, we think might be something that our golfers would find to be appropriate. And again, that would be somewhere between 150 and 300,000. I just wanted to make sure I made that point for you. >> Tovo: So your recommendation is if we move forward with this amendment, that we keep it within the 1% to 5% range? That would still be competitive with private courses? >> That is what we believe may be appropriate. If we were to do something of that nature, it would not cause

[10:25:45 AM]

golfers to necessarily choose a different option. >> Tovo: Right. That's really helpful information. I know that -- and I can't remember the setting either, in audit or finance or one of our other committees, we did have a conversation about out-of-city golfers and had asked for some data on how many users at our golf courses are coming from -- are non-residents. Do you have any of that information available by any

chance? >> Yes. I'm getting that information right now. I do need to make (indiscernible) Councilmembers, and mayor, please know we do discount rates, it's not on the pay sheet that I was looking at. But between 1 and \$2 for residents versus non-residents. And the percentage of golfers that are from non-residents is lower. It looks like it's approximately in the 5 to 10% range of individuals who are non-residents that regularly play our golf courses. And we know this by zip codes,

[10:26:48 AM]

not by addresses, just simply by zip codes. >> Tovo: Do you know where they're coming from? What are the highest yielding zip codes outside of the city of Austin? >> I don't know. But I can find out for you. >> Tovo: Thanks. I'm just wondering, that might help us understand if they're immediately adjacent, so it's very convenient to them, or they have a group that they golf with, and they're willing to travel a little longer to get to the golf course. The latter group I would think would bear an increase more than the former group. And so just as we deliberate on this fee amendment, councilmember harper-madison, I would be interested in something -- in supporting something within the range that our director mentioned, between that 1% to 5% range. But I would like to see the assessment for non-residents higher than for our residents. I do think -- I don't know how

[10:27:49 AM]

this is going to play out this year, because, you know, the golf courses are closed, and I think we're going to have to do -- I think we're going to have to do a lot to pull people back in once they reopen. So that being said, again, I would support this if it were in the 1 to 5% range and if it has a higher fee for residents. So I don't know where your -- if you want to entertain suggestions or you have a sense of what you're going to propose here. >> Harper-madison: Sure, I'm happy to entertain suggestions. Something I'd like to say as we get the questions answered, and we're really digging into what people's questions and concerns may be, I think it would be appropriate to have the budget office also speak to their support of the item and why. If we're talking about the budget, if we're talking about substantive changes to make certain dollars available that

[10:28:49 AM]

currently aren't, I think their input on the conversation is as important as that of our parks department. Which, thank you, Kimberly, for laying that out. But I just wanted to make sure we tapped the budget office to be a part of this conversation as well. Because we certainly didn't arbitrarily make up numbers. We've been working with the folks who work the numbers to see what would work, what would be favorable for people who appreciate being able to play golf, what would be favorable to the city, as you recognized it's a system that hasn't worked. I certainly don't know the history and appreciate the

hesitation to take us back down, because we're looking forward, right? But you recognized that we need to move forward. I see Ed is on the line. I don't know when the appropriate time for me to tap you in is.

[10:29:50 AM]

I would -- I like the idea of the 10% and the numbers that we yield for the 10% increase. I would certainly entertain slightly lower >> >> Mayor Adler: As I read what's being proposed now, and we didn't ask for a motion as we should have, as I read it, you are suggesting increasing the fee by a minimum of 3% of up to 10%, but a minimum of 3%, but still maintain a competitive fee structure. So it's as written, it seems to correspond with what Kimberly just said. >> Harper-madison: I would say so. I would also say, I recognize what Kimberly's contribution to the dialogue is, we want to remain competitive, we want to make sure we're taking all the factors into consideration. In which case I appreciate the potential discount for residents, but if I understand correctly there already is one. Honestly I think for this to work, there's going to have to

[10:30:51 AM]

be an increase across the board. So I'm just sort of laying out where I'm coming from. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Flannigan? You're muted. >> Flannigan: Oh, no, I did it. I'm usually so good. >> Mayor Adler: Been waiting a long time to be able to do that. >> Flannigan: Twice in the pandemic. Kimberly, miss mcneily, are you still there? >> Yes, I'm still here. >> Flannigan: I want to confirm a few things to make sure I understand the situation. Currently right now there's a general fund transfer of \$1 million to help cover the gap between the golf enterprise fund and the operations, is that right? >> Yes. >> Flannigan: Okay. And then you said that a 20% increase could add \$20 to a fee,

[10:31:52 AM]

to the cost of playing golf. Did I hear you say that right? >> On certain fees, yes. On certain fees. Because of the -- so the fees, by way of example, the fees at Round Rock golf course are a different fee structure than the fees at Morris Williams. Depending on the particular fee, which there are many of them, it could add up to \$20 in some cases. Because in some cases, the fees to play a round of golf are almost \$100. >> Flannigan: Yeah, I was doing that kind of reverse math in my head, to say that, you know, currently playing golf at some courses is \$100. Which I don't see it's a particularly accessible fee for folks. A separate conversation that we don't have to have today about in-city versus out-of-city fees,

[10:32:53 AM]

I struggled with that one myself, but I think we're reaching a point where that conversation has gotten more complicated because of gentrification and displacement. And we've displaced a lot of low-income folks who are taxpayers in the city for a long time and are suddenly pushed out and we up the fees. We don't have to get into that now, but the idea that something that is already \$100, which is to me not an accessible fee, is worth \$1 million a year from the budget when yesterday we were talking about a \$1.5 million one-time cost that councilmember pool had proposed for childcare. And there's probably other examples, right? But I do think at some point we have to ask ourselves, is the thing we're spending money on more important than the thing we wish we were spending money on.

[10:33:54 AM]

So I support councilmember harper-madison's original budget rider, and mayor, to your point, it is modest, given what it would actually cost to recover \$1 million a year that could otherwise go to other supportive services. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Renteria? >> Renteria: Every year we go through this whole process, you know? It was half a million dollars a couple years ago, and we need to really take a really serious look at those courses that are not making any money. There are probably some that are making money, but there are some that are just draining our budget. And I've been asking for that for years, since I've been on the council, because every year we go through this whole process

[10:34:54 AM]

over and over again, where, you know, these golf courses are just draining our general funds that we could be investing in other more critical programs, especially in health. You know? And that's one of the things that is so frustrating about these golf courses. They do not make money. We have to subsidize them year after year after year. And we have a couple -- and I'm sure that you know which ones are losing money and draining us. So I'm going to be supporting (indiscernible). >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter? >> Alter: Thank you. So I think this is an important conversation, and I think especially the piece about the residential versus non-residential. I do think there are some room for some changes on that, in terms of the fees. I would like to understand,

[10:35:54 AM]

though, from a process perspective, when you have an amendment that says, like do it in this range, is this direction to the parks department to go figure out what would work? I mean, right now our golf courses are closed, and we're not -- you know, on the current path we're going to have challenges all across the board for park, with fees that were estimated based on covid resolving sooner. And so I am --

you know, I'm just concerned about what that means. I think one of the other questions is when you talk about the \$100, is that kind of when we talk about gray rock, which has a higher fee? Miss Mcneilly? >> Yes, ma'am. Gray rock is the highest fee. A round of golf at clay

[10:36:54 AM]

Kaiser -- I'm sorry, Roy Kaiser is approximately \$40 at its highest rate. At Lyons it's \$33. I'm just giving you the highest rates per round of golf. And so obviously gray rock is a different kind of a course, but the other courses are 40 and \$33. Yeah. >> Alter: So for me, I'm okay with increasing fees. My concern is if increasing fees actually ends up with more of a deficit, and we don't have any models or knowledge that have been put together to think that through, especially in light of the fact that the courses are currently closed, and there's a lot of folks who are advocating that they should be opened because they're safer than other recreation. I'm not trying to second-guess our authorities who have made that decision for right now, but it does factor into whether we could even count on any of that money to use, because overall,

[10:37:56 AM]

we're not operating them. And I don't want us to just result in a greater deficit without having put in the modeling and doing the other. But I just don't understand what it means if we're not putting a specific fee, does that mean it comes back to us shortly with some analysis and a proposal? >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember harper-madison? >> Harper-madison: Yeah, the intent -- the direction is to raise the fees at least 3%, and more if park can find -- or deems it, rather, appropriate, given all the considerations you just listed. So basically the -- the base recommendation is the -- the direction is raise at least 3%, and I think what we're offering is them to have the discretion

[10:38:57 AM]

if it goes up to 6%, which frankly I would prefer, or 10, also, I would prefer, then great. But if it's at least 3% than what we were hoping to accomplish, it gets accomplished. >> Alter: So again, we have to now vote on the fee schedule, and I just -- like are we -- it seems to me that what we're doing is providing direction to figure this out and we want to adjust the fee, but that doesn't -- I don't know how that happens today. >> Mayor Adler: Can you have a discretionary fee that moves based on the department's analysis? >> Mayor, we already have that. So if you look in the budget, in the fee schedule as proposed, the courses Kimberly was talking about, they have a range of \$3 [lapse in audio]. >> Mayor Adler: We've lost you, Ed.

[10:40:00 AM]

>> Am I back? >> Mayor Adler: You're back now, yes >> I'm going to leave my video off. I think I'm having a bad internet day. But the fees currently allow to be assessed in the range of 3 to \$55. I don't think any amendment to the fee schedule would be to happen, the golf director has the ability to charge more or less depending on weather conditions and other factors. I think this action simply would be to increase the projected revenue of the golf enterprise fund, to lower the general fund support. It's about a \$7 million revenue, so, you know, a 3% increase would maybe be \$210,000 of additional revenue. You don't need to change the fee schedule, it would just be the golf director in managing the fees he already has discretion to adjust. >> Alter: And do you think we can do that without -- I mean, I'm fine with raising fees for

[10:41:02 AM]

golf, and I think there's room to raise Lyons, which is the one I'm most familiar with, more than it is. But my concern is if our staff are saying it may reduce usage, and then we don't have that money, then what happens. I think it's a small enough amount that it ultimately can be captured by reserves at a later date and certain childcare is a good investment. I just want to make sure that I'm understanding the steps that we're going through here. >> And I think that's really a question for director mcneily. I think I heard her say the 3% increase would not impact the number of rounds. >> That is correct. In our -- in or back of the napkin analysis, somewhere between 3% and 5%, depending on what the fee is, we believe will likely not encourage people to go to another course, that we

[10:42:03 AM]

will be able to maintain our participation. And if I may give you a correction, mayor and council, I told you 5% to 10% were from out of town, it's actually 18%. I was reading the wrong -- a wrong piece of information. So approximately 18% of the players are from out of town. And those folks are from Hayes, Kyle and -- case county, meaning Kyle, buttea, and then Mainer and cedar park. >> Mayor Adler: As I look at this, does this make most sense then, if the fee schedule already allows for it in this range, is this -- does it make more sense as a direction or a rider that asks the parks department to take a look at the fees, see if there's an ability to be able to increase it while still maintaining the competitive fee structure with

[10:43:04 AM]

any additional revenue that's achieved, allocated to support recreational centers for childcare and virtual learning? I think -- if we're not going to change the fee structure, maybe it is that kind of direction. I would support that, because I think that that makes sense to have -- if the parks department thinks they can raise the fee, and increase revenue, to direct it that way. I have the same kind of concern generally that councilmember tovo raised. I don't know why this is an enterprise fund. There are a lot of things we do in the city that are not -- they don't pay for themselves, especially in the parks department. I don't know whether trails pay for themselves. There are a lot of things that we do. My recollection is, and you raised this, councilmember tovo,

[10:44:05 AM]

and I seem to recall in my first year or two on the council, we actually did a deeper dive on this, to see how many people used this particular park facility. There were a lot of people that used it in the community. But I would also support to put in this, to ask parks department also not only to look at a fee increase, but to look at whether or not they can maximize additional income by charging more for non-residents, even more. And I would still be okay with the across-the-board raise. But in addition to that, and separate from that, whether it was something to do with non-residents, also if that led to additional revenue allocating that revenue to recreational (indiscernible). Councilmember Flannigan? >> Flannigan: Thanks, mayor. I just wanted to remind us, we had a lot of great conversation

[10:45:06 AM]

yesterday, too, and some of us expressed some concerns about the complexities of the impact on the small childcare centers that are trying to make ends meet versus opening up. It's a good example of we need to make some choices where we're spending our parks money. Because to your point, mayor, maybe the trails are a better investment, or maybe the tennis courts are a better investment. I can imagine that it's a lot cheaper to have a swimsuit and go to a swimming pool than to own golf clubs. So I think these are just the choices that we're faced with, and I want to thank councilmember harper-madison for bringing this to our -- all of our attentions again. >> Harper-madison: I appreciate that. Something I'd like to throw in there as a point of consideration. You know, the community's contribution to this conversation time and time again, we talked about how important it is to listen to what the community is asking for, and when surveyed, this is the one they responded to most

[10:46:06 AM]

favorably, over 47% said if we had to raise fees somewhere, it would be golf. And I think a lot -- in a lot of ways, to councilmember Flannigan's point, it's about equity, and about us having to make really difficult decisions. I think everybody is acknowledging we're going to have to make tough choices, and

covid just compounded the difficulty of those choices. I keep coming back, if we're going to subsidize something, is it really helpful. So that's the question I would pose to my colleagues as we consider these difficult decisions we have to make. There's a lot more I'd like to say, and prepared to say, but I don't know if it needs to be said. But I want to make sure we answer everybody's questions before we move forward. I'm conscientious of the fact of the time.

[10:47:06 AM]

I'm conscientious of the time this morning. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter? >> Alter: I'm comfortable with some increases to golf. I'm just trying to understand -- still trying to understand the process that we're putting in motion. And I'm wondering if the mayor can repeat his suggestion. And I think the direction is to ask for our -- or to look at our fees and determine if any increases can be absorbed. But I'm not -- I'm just not sure. I'm also comfortable with the differential. I just want to be clear what we're asking staff to go and do. I understand from Ed's clarification that the fee structure is flexible, and provides options. But I just -- I would appreciate some further clarity.

[10:48:07 AM]

>> Is that for me? >> Mayor Adler: Ed, how do you think we should resolve this? >> I think you have two options, mayor. There's a \$1 million line item transfer from the general fund to the golf enterprise fund. You could direct the golf department to increase their fees on average by 3%, and we could lower that transfer by \$210,000 in the budget, and you could reallocate those funds. Or mayor, you suggested to provide direction to staff that pursuant to that fee increase, if there are additional revenues that come in, we can just administratively lower that transfer and free up the funds for park to use for childcare. So when we budgets the \$1 million transfer, that's the most we can transfer. We could transfer less than that with council direction and redirect the funds depending on how the golf course revenues pan out in fy '21.

[10:49:08 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: My concern is in setting it, and it's a balance. If you raise the fees too much, you end up with less revenue because you have fewer people that play. And so I would be comfortable asking Kimberly and the park department to maximize the additional revenue. And I wouldn't want to cap it -- I mean, if it turns out that you go to 5%, I wouldn't want to cap it at 3, if they could do that and still be competitive and still be able to raise additional revenue. If they could do it by increasing on top of that the non-resident fee, generate additional revenue, then I would want them to be able to do that. And I'm comfortable saying, you know, maximize the revenue that you get, and whatever increase you get, you know, give it to the rec program for children. So that would be my preference, I think.

[10:50:08 AM]

Councilmember harper-madison, do you want to speak to this? >> Harper-madison: Yeah, I would like that -- let me make sure I didn't pull a Jimmy. I'm not muted. I'd like to speak to that. For no other reason, I just want to be really clear, if we have to -- I know we haven't made a motion yet, but if we have to be firm in the amount, then the motion I would make would be 5%. Not to say, though, I -- I just want to make sure to be clear, that this amendment is proposing an increase of 3%. Part of how we got here, and it's been intentional, we didn't make up numbers, one thing we're looking at is the 2019 report prepared by the national golf foundation for the city of Austin, and it recommends adopting a program of a yearly increase of at least 1.5%, just to reflect inflation. And by the fy '21 budget, we will have -- we will be two years past that. So we'll still be using the same

[10:51:09 AM]

fee as 2019. So I would say that 3% is a minimum, just to catch us up from where we hadn't increased fees in the last two years. The last two budget cycles. So the motion I would make would be at least 5%. I think if we're thinking long-term, I think that fee should be considered, as well other recommendations outlined in the report. There are other recommendations to reduce general taxpayer dollars used to subsidize. Frankly, a support with lack of broad appeal. You look at the survey, you look at the information about who plays golf, they tend to be whiter and wealthier and older. I do really keep coming back to, you know, if we're talking about establishing a budget document that speaks to our morals and

[10:52:10 AM]

our values, I feel very strongly about our considerations here, even if they feel difficult, or less than palatable for some austinites. I could go on. I'd rather we go ahead and just move forward, if that means the pause there is for me to make a motion, or is the pause there for you to hear more from other folks? >> Mayor Adler: Why don't you go ahead and make a motion. >> Harper-madison: I'd like to make the motion that we at the very least increase fees at 5%, at the rate of 5%. >> And I'll second that. >> Mayor Adler: Seconded by councilmember pool. >> Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: I'd like to suggest the amendment that you outlined, so a line about staff should give particular consideration to differential rates for non-residents. You know, and director mcneily,

[10:53:12 AM]

you talked about rates as high as 100. As I look at Johnny Morris, and Hancock, and Roy Kaiser, the rates are far, far, far lower. And if we want it to be a sport that's accessible to young people, I think we have a responsibility to try to keep those rates pretty low for our youth. And there's some good examples of -- you know, I think our junior youth camp that takes place at some of our golf courses is an affordable one. I don't believe first tee is any longer at our municipal golf courses, but that's a good model of a youth program that is using golf to encourage physical activity, and other programmatic elements for young people across our community. So I would ask that you -- I would propose that hopefully as a friendly amendment, the one that you outlined, staff should give particular consideration for rates for non-residents, but

[10:54:14 AM]

the desire that we try to keep those rates for young people low. I was looking at, I think it's like \$10, \$11 at some of our courses for people under 18, and that's competitive with a movie. Those sunset rates at our golf courses at Johnny Morris and Hancock and others are also under \$20. And to me that is also competitive with a movie. So I think if we want our golf courses to continue to be places where we get broader cross-section of our community, I want to try to keep some of those budget rates at a budget price. So councilmember harper-madison, I would ask that you accept the non-resident as friendly, and if you're open to some language about trying to keep those rates for young people and those evening rates more affordable, I would come up with some language

[10:55:15 AM]

that helps do that. >>. >> Harper-madison: So I'd like time to think about that. I'll say why I say this. I appreciate the clarification that you made there. You said continue to be accessible. Then you switched it and said, be accessible. Because as it stands, they're not necessarily accessible to -- I mean, in that same 2019 golf report, all the consumer research points to the fact that continually, golf participation correlates strongly with higher incomes in ages. I don't think us subsidizing golf is going to change that fact. In which case I'm open to some different language. I need to see it. So I'm open. I just -- I'm not certain what the goal is there necessarily. >> Mayor Adler: Does it work if the instruction is to increase

[10:56:15 AM]

5%, the fees, but allow park not necessarily to do that just across the board in order to be able to get to that total number, so that if it wanted to increase at a greater amount, the resident -- the non-resident fee at peak times, it could give a greater percentage there. If it wanted to maintain the -- I don't know, what is it, \$2 or \$5 rate at some of our courses, at the nonpeak times that I think the younger folks play at, maybe you don't have to bump that rate at all. In order to keep that price point there. But to your

point, councilmember harper-madison, the goal is to get to the 5%, if the park had the discretion to be able to target those increases. >> Harper-madison: Sure, more or less. But I just want to point out at

[10:57:16 AM]

the 5% rate, we're talking about a \$2 increase for golfers. And for the junior golfers, it's less than \$1 increase. I just want to make certain that we're not -- yeah, just -- I'd just like to point out those facts. >> Of the junior rate, at Hancock, it would be about 2.20 increase, the senior rate would be just under \$3, Morris Williams would be about 2.60. This is the Monday through Thursday rates, for a junior. For a senior, that would be -- that would put it a little over \$20, from 17. So mayor, maybe the solution you offered is the best way, just to let those -- let the average come out to 5%. With an emphasis on -- I can try

[10:58:16 AM]

to come up with a sentence that helps keep those -- again, those kind of budget sunset rates and the youth rates on the lower end. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter?>> Alter: So again, I'm comfortable with some raises to the fees. I just wanted to bring in some other information here. So we've been talking about the enterprise fund and all that stuff. I was on the parks board. There was a period of time when we had some flooding APD we had some golf courses that were offline that kind of year over year contributes to the funding. In 2020 we were on pace to significantly close the gap and then the pandemic hit and then the golf courses were closed. So I don't know that the raises in the range that

[10:59:20 AM]

councilmember harper-madison is proposing, I don't know that the amount of money that we're transferring is going to be difficult to make up if we have a shortfall, but I think we should recognize that there has been a lot of work over time to try to close this gap and now that those renovations are over and we have both the golf courses working at full capacity once the pandemic is over, that gap should be shrinking. Covid is what affected things. So I think there is some background there that is important. This has been something that we've been focused on 2019. We did raise the fees. They were raised five dollars at gray rock and three dollars per player, which is about 10% of the other courses. So this is something we have been doing steadily over time. We did not do it I guess last budget, but we did do

[11:00:22 AM]

it -- just by way of further background. >> Are you okay with the concept, councilmember harper-madison, of having the five percent, but giving pard the discretion to be able to waive that for other accessibility goals? >> I think we're running a risk of doing that thing and really getting in the weeds here. I just did a little quick math and five percent increase of \$11 is 55 cents. So I don't know if my math is bad or councilmember tovo's math is bad, but I don't feel like the five percent unilateral increase is inappropriate. I would really like to keep it there. >> Tovo: You're right, it's my math that's bad, sorry. I should never do it on the dais. >> Mayor Adler: Harper-madison has made a motion. It's been seconded.

[11:01:23 AM]

Any further discussion? >> Tovo: Councilmember harper-madison, I had made a discussion that we add in a line about potentially adjusting it more than five percent for non-residents S that something that is considered friendly? >> Absolutely. >> Okay, thanks. And that line was staff should also give particular consideration to an increased rate for non-residents. >> Mayor Adler: Any objection to that going in? Hearings none, that's part of the amendment. Ed? >> I've heard from legal that we would like you to authorize the parks director to assess a higher non-resident fee as part of this motion so that the parks department has your authority to do that. >> Any objection to including that language? Hearing none, that language

[11:02:23 AM]

is included. Any discussion on this item as amended? Hearing none, any objection to this going in? Hearing none it goes in as amended and changed. Colleagues, I think those are all the pieces that we have with respect to the budget. Are we ready to move to a vote? Okay. Let's go ahead and do that. We are now ready -- we're not ready to take a vote. Ed, do you need anything else. >> No. We've kept track of everything. We are ready for your vote. >> We are now ready to take a vote on item 1 to approve an ordinance adopting the city's budget as amended. The law requires this to be a record vote. Will the clerk please read the roll so that each of us can state our vote. >> Mayor Adler? >> Yes. >> Mayor pro tem Garza? >> Yes.

[11:03:24 AM]

>> Councilmember alter? >> Yes. Councilmember Casar? >> Yes. >> Councilmember Ellis? >> Yes. Councilmember Flannigan? >> Yes. >> Councilmember harper-madison? >> Yes. >> Councilmember kitchen? >> Yes. >> Councilmember pool? >> Yes. >> Councilmember Renteria? >> Yes. >> Councilmember tovo. >> Yes. >> Mayor, it passes. >> Mayor Adler: It passes unanimously. We'll now take up item number 2. There is an ordinance on fees, fines and other charges to be set by the city for fiscal year 20-2021. We'll start with the presentation. Ed or manager?

[11:04:25 AM]

>> I'm ready with the presentation. Sorry, I need to share my screen. I think I'm getting that now. >>
Mayor Adler: We can see it. >> All right.

[11:05:27 AM]

So this is item number 2. Is staff just has a small number of fee amendments to offer for your consideration. The first is small adjustments to the transportation user fee. That was part of our budget presentation. It was part of the notifications we made to the community about fee increases. They did not end up in the fee schedule, though. We've included the revenues and transportation department, so these would be the increases that should have been included in the transportation user fee to be consistent with the city manager's proposed budget. The next item are some changes that were left out to watershed protection fees. I won't read them all. You can see what they are. It's largely language changes. The third item is to amend Austin energy's fee schedule as shown in the city of Austin's fiscal year 2021 electric tariff, Chavez part of the package that we sent

[11:06:28 AM]

you yesterday. So you can take a look at the tariff. And finally just an item to say we would amend the fee schedule to align with council actions taken during the adoption of the fy2021 operating budget. So that would be in particular the guidance that you just provided. Those are the only amendments we have to the fee schedules. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Can you return me the screen? Councilmember alter, is your hand raised? >> Alter: Yes. I just wanted to clarify that there are changes to the fee schedule that follow from my -- of the chief medical officer as well as the -- I don't know if there's any change for the clean creek one, but there is also the ambulance fee change. >> Yes, thank you for that reminder. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Is there a motion to approve

[11:07:33 AM]

the fee, fine and other charges as recommended with the amendments shown? Councilmember pool makes that motion. Is there a second? Councilmember Flannigan seconds that. It's been moved and seconded. Is there any discussion on the fees and fines? Okay. Law requires this approval to be a record vote as well. Will the clerk please read the roll so each of us can state our votes? >> Mayor Adler? >> Yes. >> Mayor pro tem Garza? >> Yes. >> Councilmember alter? >> Yes. >> Councilmember Casar? >>

Yes. >> Councilmember Ellis? >> Yes. >> Councilmember Flannigan? >> Yes. >> Councilmember harper-madison? >> Yes.

[11:08:34 AM]

>> Councilmember kitchen? >> Yes. >> Councilmember pool. >> Yes. >> Councilmember Renteria? >> Yes. Did you get me? Yes. >> Councilmember tovo? >> Yes. >> Mayor, it passes 11-0. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, the measure passes unanimously 11-0. Colleagues, agenda items 3 to 5 can be taken on consent if no councilmember has pulled them for discussion. Three are the fire department, police department, ems classifications and positions. Is there a motion to approve items 3, 4 and 5? Councilmember Casar makes the motion. Is there a second to the motion? Councilmember harper-madison

[11:09:35 AM]

seconds the motion. Any discussion on this motion? Councilmember Casar and then councilmember alter. >> Casar: Mayor, this has been updated to reflect what we have done in the earlier items, is that right? >> That is correct, councilmember. >> Casar: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter? >> Alter: I didn't see the revised version. That was my question as well. For ems and police in particular, can you share what those changes are. >> I can. I think they've been posted to the agenda system, but if not we'll make sure they get added. In the police department there was a reduction of 80 officers from what the original classification ordinance was. There was no changes for the fire department. And then for the emergency medical services department, there were several changes. I'll read them to you. For the field division, the

[11:10:35 AM]

position of commander, we increased the count by five, from 34 to 39. For the position of captain, we increased the count from 72 to 75. For clinical specialists, the count was increased from 251 to 269. For the position of medic, the count was increased from 175 to 193. In the communications division, the position of clinical specialist was increased from 25 to 29. And those were all the changes. >> Alter: Thank you. So the base motion already had -- you just told us the changes. The original version also had additions vis-a-vis [indiscernible], is that correct? >> That's correct. >> Alter: So as follow-up could we just get those totals relative to what

[11:11:38 AM]

changed from last year in some kind of summary format? I think I've got a pretty good idea, but for EMS I would like to be able to state how many positions we increased, including what was proposed as new positions in the manager's budget. >> For police there was an additional 70 officers reduced, so that would be a net reduction of 150. And then in EMS we did add 19 positions and I wouldn't want to guess at the exact classifications, but we can get that information for you. Those are all included in the original ordinance that we posted. >> Alter: Great, thank you. I think it's really important that we added those additional positions in EMS, but I do want to also acknowledge that the manager's proposal had several additions as well for doing that. Thank you.

[11:12:41 AM]

>> Councilmember Flannigan, did you still want to speak? >> Flannigan: Yeah, for the public that's watching, like with many of the changes we're making there would be continued oversight and monitoring of these. And like with the budget it can be amended, maybe like the classifications can be amended. As we go through the work of reimagining we can continue to refine these numbers. The only thing we're doing today that can't be changed later is the tax rate. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. We have a motion and a second to approve items three through five. You ready to take a vote. Those in favor of this motion to approve three through five please raise your hand? Those opposed? All of the hands raised in favor, it passes unanimously. That gets us then to agenda item number 6, the vote to ratify the tax increase

[11:13:41 AM]

that's in the budget. This vote, in addition to and separate from the vote to adopt the budget and the vote to set the tax rate. This vote is in addition to and separate from those other ones. Item six requires us to ratify the property tax increase reflected in the budget. This vote is required by state law. Council must make this vote separately to make sure clear that we know it will take more property taxes than the city raised last year to pay for the budget that we approved for this year. This is not a vote on the tax rate. We'll take a separate vote on the tax rate after the budget is adopted. Is there a motion to ratify the property tax increase proposed in the fiscal year 2021 budget adopted by the council today? Councilmember Flannigan makes the motion. Councilmember Casar seconds

[11:14:43 AM]

that. Any discussion? Councilmember Flannigan. >> Flannigan: I want to reiterate this particular vote is important and will likely be misreported because the portion of this tax rate that compares to previous tax rate is 3.5%. And that is the lowest increase that council has adopted in over 15 years and I'm really proud of the work that my colleagues have done getting us to this point, and in no short -- in no small

way the reimagining and reform work has been a big reason why that was possible. I truly believe that the work we're doing is possibly the most fiscally reform work in municipal history, maybe in this country. I'm really proud of this vote. The remainder of the tax rate will go to the voters and the remainder will go on later. I'm very proud of the work that you and us have done on the council and the

[11:15:43 AM]

community that have led us to this point. >> Mayor Adler: Any Kurth discussion on this -- any further discussion on this item? Councilmember pool. >> Pool: I wanted to say what I said a few weeks ago at my town hall when we were looking at the tax cap over the past year it was a concern for me thinking that we -- how would we get there. And yet here we are. In the middle of a pandemic and additional national upheaval and local upheaval. I again tip my hat to the city manager, his amazing staff, Mr. Van eenoo and all of the budget and finance officers who put everything on the line to bring us the budgets every year, and especially this year. So I am impressed at the 3.5% tax rate, and thank you so much for being able to bring that to us so well. >> Mayor Adler: Further

[11:16:44 AM]

discussion on the item number 6? Let's take a vote. All in favor of item number 6 please raise your hand? Those opposed? I see everyone's hands being raised. It passes unanimously. Now we're going to take a vote on adopting a property tax rate. We're going to take up item number 7, approve an ordinance adopting and leveeing a property and ad valorem tax rate for the city of Austin for fiscal year 2020-2021. There will be a short statement by law with regard to the exhibits to the ordinance, and then we're going to take a motion that uses the language that is required by state law. Ann, do you want to take this -- >> I think Lela is on the line. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's hear from the city attorney's office. >> She's disappeared.

[11:17:45 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: That's okay. We'll give her aecond. We won't move forward without her. I see her on my screen. You might need to unmute. >> Thank you, mayor. Sorry it took a little time to get me unmuted. >> Mayor Adler: That's okay. >> I just need to make sure that you know that the attachments to the property tax ordinance include the historic tax exemptions and that those consist of national and state registered landmarks as well as properties that are in need of tax relief to encourage preservation. And so as you are approving the tax rate and the various

[11:18:45 AM]

exemptions that you're approving, you're also approving those. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. So this motion to adopt a property tax rate has to be made using the words required by the Texas property tax code. The tax code also requires that the vote be on a motion by a record vote. And when we say that we're voting to, quote, increase the tax rate, close quotes, the statute defines increase as, quote, the percentage by which the proposed tax rate exceeds the effective rate. End of the quote. I'll now entertain a motion that the property tax rate be increased by the adoption of a tax rate of .5335 cents per 100-dollar valuation, which is effectively 54.5% increase in -- 24.5%

[11:19:45 AM]

increase in the tax rate. Is there a motion? Councilmember Casar makes the motion. Is there a second to the motion? Councilmember Renteria seconds. Is there any discussion? Okay. It has been moved that the property tax rate be increased by the adoption of a tax rate of .5335 cents per 100-dollar valuation, which is effectively a 24.5% increase in the tax rate. Will the clerk please call the roll so that each of us can state our votes. >> Mayor Adler? >> Yes. >> Mayor pro tem Garza? >> Yes. >> Councilmember alter? >> Yes. >> Councilmember Casar? >> Yes. >> Councilmember Ellis. >> Yes. >> Councilmember Flannigan? >> Yes. >> Councilmember harper-madison? >> Yes. >> Councilmember kitchen?

[11:20:47 AM]

>> Yes. >> Councilmember pool? >> Yes. >> Councilmember Renteria? >> Yes. >> Councilmember tovo? >> Yes. >> Mayor, it passes 11-0. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. So unanimously that passes. >> Casar: Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember Casar. >> Casar: I think it's just an important moment on several fronts that I want to -- folks have watched us go through all these procedural votes and I think it's important to mark it. I think that this is without a doubt the most significant change in Austin's public safety priorities in generations. This was only possible because we're in the midst of a local and national civil rights movement. And it was only possible because city leaders listened, we took democracy really seriously and

[11:21:47 AM]

listened and unanimously this dais has done something I think that we should all feel really proud of. I think we've shown that we are shifting away from overpolicing our community's challenges and instead funding community solutions. Today we voted to open a new family violence center, house the homeless, expand substance abuse care, hire mental health first responders, help with covid-19 and so much more. We're moving tens of millions of dollars immediately into those solutions. We know there's

so much more work to do in the coming year. And we have to be clear eyed about what's ahead. There's so much more that we know our community is asking for if we want to truly he reimagine public safety. And we know that we should be clear eyed that there will be well funded efforts to fear monger about this

[11:22:48 AM]

vote and about the false notion this that this council isn't caring about safety. But this is what this council has been working unanimously towards is justice and safety for everyone. Just like we know there will be people who talk about how the mass transit that we're putting on the ballot costs too much when in fact the real cost is the status quo. Where in fact what makes us less safe is the status quo. So we -- our community knows better, our community knows that the status quo isn't working. They've commanded change and I'm really proud to be part of Austin today and a part of this dais today because this has not been easy for anyone. And this moment is something that's been borne out of a lot of hurt in the community and today I hope that the community feels hope that when the -- when they organize and when they ask for change that we can respond. So thank you, mayor and to

[11:23:48 AM]

the dais, and to everyone in the community organizations that have worked so hard to get us here. We know we have a really long way to go. I want to give a special shout-out to everybody on my staff, especially to Stephanie for her spreadsheets. That really helped us get through this is well. So thank you, mayor and thank you, council, for indulging me for a few moments. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you for that. Colleagues, I think that now gets us to item number 8. Item number 8 is an item for the Mueller local government corporation. It's a resolution appointing councilmembers Natasha harper-madison and Paige Ellis to the board of directors of the Mueller local government corporation. Is there a motion for those appointments? Councilmember Flannigan makes the motion. Is there a second to that? I need a second.

[11:24:48 AM]

I'll go ahead and second. Is there any discussion on this item? Councilmember pool. >> Pool: Really quick, that's a board that's made up of the entire dais, is that right? >> That's correct. >> Pool: And the rest of us, did we not need to have our membership on that reaffirmed? >> I believe you're already on it and you're going to take an action as a board in a minute. >> Pool: Right. I just wasn't sure why we were having to do it, but great. >> Mayor Adler: I think these are our two newest arrivals. >> Pool: Okay. Their names are listed on the board on the city website, but I guess it hadn't been ratified by us, is that

correct? Okay, thanks. >> Mayor Adler: It's been moved and seconded. Let's take a vote. Those in favor please raise your hand? Those opposed, it's unanimous on the dais. Welcome aboard.

[11:25:49 AM]

That gets us to item number 9. This is to approve an ordinance ordering a general municipal election, including the tax rate election for project connect transit system. Is there a motion to put this item on the ballot? Councilmember harper-madison makes the motion. Councilmember Elli seconds the motion. Any discussion? Councilmember alter and then councilmember kitchen. And then councilmember harper-madison. >> Alter: Mayor, just so people know what we're voting on with this item since we've had so many different things, this is an ordinance that calls for the election of -- for councilmembers in the five districts that these terms

[11:26:49 AM]

are up and then it is calling -- it is placing the tax rate election for project connect on the ballot. And I don't know if there's any value of reading out the proposition as amended or not. I don't know if that's something you want to do, mayor. I just think we've had so many things we're voting on with respect to project connect and this is an important moment to be putting that language on the ballot and asking the voters to voice on. So I would ask, mayor, if you would give us the language for those who are watching. >> I would be happy to. With respect to city of Austin proposition a, question before the voters will be to approve the ad valorem tax rate of .5335

[11:27:50 AM]

per 100-dollar valuation of the city of Austin for the current year, a rate that is .0875 higher per 100-dollar valuation than the voter approval rate of the city of Austin. For the purpose of providing funds for a citywide traffic easing rapid transit system known as project connect. To address traffic congestion, expand service for essential workers, reduce climate change emissions, decrease traffic fatalities, create jobs and provide access to schools, health care, jobs and the airport. To include neighborhood support of affordable investments along transit corridors at a fixed rail and bus rapid transit system, including associated road, sidewalk, bike and street lighting improvements, park and ride hubs, on demand neighborhood circulator shuttles, and

[11:28:51 AM]

improved access for seniors and persons with disabilities. To be operated by a capital metropolitan transportation authority, spending its funds to built, operate and maintain the fixed rail bus rapid transit system. The an independent board will oversee the acquisition, construction, request equipping and operation and maintenance of the rapid re-housing, by providing funds for loans and grants, to develop or expand transportation within the city and to provide the transit supportive anti-displacement strategies related to project connect. Last year the ad valorem tax rate in the city of Austin was .4431 cents per 100-dollar valuation. >> Alter: Thank you, mayor. Appreciate you reading that as we mark this that puts

[11:29:54 AM]

the choice before the voters. I did want to take a second to acknowledge the in-depth engagement process, the work of the council and the cap metro board together that I believe dots all its I's and crosses its T's and lays out a plan forward on how to build out the system and to finance it. This has been a process that has listed years and umpteen meetings and engagement. And I think the quality of what we're putting before the voters reflects that. I want to particularly thank our staff and acm's team and the cap metro staff and our colleagues who got to work on this both as councilmembers and as cap

[11:30:54 AM]

metro board members. This was a lot of work and it was an effort that I think showed the best of capturing what happens when we do engagement deeply and extensively and rereally listen and hear people's concerns about the project. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: Yes, I would like to echo those words, councilmember alter, and thank you for mentioning that. I'm excited about this project and as we have talked about before, there's a lot of work done over the last few years and a lot of consensus building and working with the community and I think we have an excellent product to offer to the voters. So we have taken all of our other votes on project connect by acclamation, we've also moved them by acclamation. So I think that's appropriate here.

[11:31:54 AM]

I think all of us would like to be part of the motion to put this on the ballot. So if we could do this the way that we've done the previous ones, I think that would be great because it's just another way to give voice to the unity that we have on our council dais on putting this on the ballot. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember harper-madison. >> Mayor Adler: You're muted. >> Harper-madison: I don't know why it does that. I'm really proud to be part of this process. It's right in alignment with the transformational change that we've been talking about nonstop for the last month or so. So that was about all. >> Mayor Adler: Okay.

[11:32:59 AM]

Councilmember Flannigan. >> Flannigan: Thank you, mayor. A lot has been said about this item in many joint meetings between the city and cap metro over the last couple of years. A process that, mayor, you have accurately described as a new way of doing business and a better way of doing business, and I hope that that becomes a sign for our partners at the county and other jurisdictions to engage more as partners. The plan itself as councilmembers have said, is amazing and it ticks all the boxes for how the smartest cities account for growth, but I want to talk specifically about the tax rate component because to me this is the most exciting portion of this proposal is that we are not talking about a future obligation we won't be able to fund. We are not setting ourselves up for failure like other cities and other transit agencies have done across the country. This is a long-term,

[11:34:00 AM]

sustainable funding source that ensures how is designed that the money that we're collecting will not just pay to build it, to operate it, but he will ensure its continued operation into the future over many generations. It is a tool that is rarely used in Texas. It will be the first time I'm aware of it being used for transit in the state of Texas and it is an amazing and most fiscally responsible way to expand infrastructure in this community. And by taking this item to the voters we have an opportunity for the community to invest, invest in a sustainable way that I am extraordinarily proud to support that will allow not just projects in one part of town, but projects all across the city, including in my district and almost every corner in a way that will ensure its continued supportive operation for the future. I am extraordinarily proud of our finance staff, at

[11:35:02 AM]

Greg canally and the teams at cap metro for pulling this tool together, and building a future of transportation in the most financially responsible and sustainable method maybe in the history of the state of Texas. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any further discussion on this item? It's been -- yes, councilmember Renteria. >> Renteria: Yeah, I really want to thank everyone that has worked on this project. This is one of the most exciting projects that I've worked on and I'm a big transit supporter. And when I started using transit and a little its amazing how my blood pressure had dropped, the frustration of driving in this city and finding parking, it just really -- it's just really frustrating.

[11:36:02 AM]

And my wife used to claim that I had road rage, which I probably did, but when I started using public transit and my own electric bike, I've saved so much money. I didn't have to buy another car, I still have my old truck there. I think I put about 20 miles a month on it. And I fill my truck up once over three months. So I just -- I just want to let the public know that it saves you a lot of money, and by maintaining my old vehicle, all I need is just regular liability, no comprehensive or anything like that. So I really want to encourage everyone to support this project because it's really going to save you some money. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem?

[11:37:02 AM]

>> Garza: I just want to add, we've talked about this a lot. This is about mode change and culture change for our city and I think it's great and symbolic that we're doing so much of this. I also as an aside I don't want to go too far from the budget without asking about something. It's just a really exciting time about changing the way we do things in a variety of ways, including how we get to work, how we get to school, but also understanding and working with each other in a knot everybody can get on a cut or even be able to walk to the bus because of sidewalks or other issues. So as a community we're working together, some people won't be able to take a bus to childcare and then work, but those of us that can, we're going to lean on each other during this time and that's what the beautiful thing is about being part of the community is shifting the way we do things, getting out of our comfort zone to make things better for someone else.

[11:38:02 AM]

And in Pio's case it made it better for his own health. So it's really exciting and I look forward to shepherding this to the finish line. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's go ahead and take a vote on item number 9. >> Kitchen: Mayor, I had made a request that we make this motion by all of us by acclamation? >> Mayor Adler: Sounds good to me. Any objection to that? The record will reflect we're all putting this on the ballot together. Those in favor of all putting it on the ballot together raise your hands. It's unanimous. Now let's go out and talk to the community and get it passed. Mayor pro tem? >> Garza: Yeah, I wasn't sure if we were doing closing comments at the end. Councilmember Casar made some comments and on --

[11:39:03 AM]

good. You're saying yes. We talked about golf fees for 45 minutes and I thought it was weird nobody was saying anything about the budget. So I will reserve my comments until the end. >> Mayor Adler: It's my intend to do this. We passed number nine. We're going to hold off on 10 and 11 because we need to discuss them in executive session. 11. I'm going to go to the Austin housing finance corporation meeting

and the Mueller meeting. And then we will break for lunch. We will do the executive session, we will come out, vote on the last two items, 10 and 11, and then we will have closing statements for the two days. Does that work? Okay. So let's skip now 10 and 11. And let's go to the Austin housing finance corporation meeting. I'm going to recess the city council meeting here at

[11:40:03 AM]

11:39 and I am going to convene here at 11:39, today is our continued meeting from yesterday, set for August 12th. Continued over to today. And this meeting is being handled virtually. Staff, can we handle these items on consent? >> Yes, we have two items today related to the Austin housing finance corporation's budget beginning October 1st and ending September 30th, 2021, and both of them are available for consent. >> Mayor Adler: Is there a motion to approve these items on consent, board? Councilmember harper-madison makes the motion. Councilmember Ellis second. Those in favor of approving the consent agenda please raise your hand. Those opposed? With all of the directors

[11:41:03 AM]

voting aye, they both pass. Is that all we need to do at meeting today? >> That's all we needed to do. Thank you, mayor. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you for being with us. With that we are adjourning the -- >> No, mayor. You have Mueller. >> Mayor Adler: Don't I have to. >> Yes, you have to adjourn -- [overlapping speakers]. >> Mayor Adler: So we are going to adjourning the Austin housing finance corporation meeting here at 11:41. I am now going to convene the Mueller local government corporation here on -- it's a continued meeting from yesterday. It's posted for August 12th, 2020. We just carried it over to today. Some councilmembers weren't feeling well yesterday. We've carried it over. It's being held virtually.

[11:42:06 AM]

Ms. Rabb, do you want to take us through this? Is this a consent agenda we can handle. >> Yes, you can handle the three items. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Do you want to tell us what the three items are? >> Yes. Minutes from September 10th, 2019. Appointment of the vice-chair, and approval of the operating budget for 2021. >> Mayor Adler: Is there a motion to approve the consent agenda? Councilmember Ellis makes the motion. Seconded by councilmember alter. Any discussion? Those in favor of the consent agenda please raise your hand? Those opposed? It is unanimous on the dais. >> Renteria: Mayor, I just had one really quick question. How long do we have on the existing tif before it expires? >> The last of the bonds will be paid off in 2032. >> Renteria: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Having handled all the business of the Mueller

[11:43:07 AM]

district here at 11:42, this meeting is adjourned. Now I am reconvening the city of Austin council meeting here at 11:43. And what I would do at this point -- >> Kitchen: I have a question -- my question simply was you had mentioned going into executive session on 10 and 11. I have not requested that and I'm not seeing a need for it. Are there others that are requesting executive session? >> Mayor Adler: The attorney has requested it, wants to just touch base with us. >> Kitchen: Which attorney has requested that? >> That's correct. I think we would like to go

[11:44:08 AM]

into executive session and have a discussion about a few items. There's been some editing last minute. I just want to make sure that we're all on the same place and we have our bond council here that's available. >> Kitchen: Can I speak to that. >> Mayor Adler: It may be a short executive session. So it may be we can go into executive session and come right back out and pass these items or consider these items. >> Kitchen: Okay. I thought that I had -- city attorney, I had worked out -- if you're speaking about the reference that I'm going to -- language I'm going to be proposing, I had worked that out already and had suggested that there was no need for us to go into executive session. We certainly didn't need to talk to bond counsel, not about the items I'm asking about. If there are other items, sure, fine. >> Mayor Adler: So our counsel has asked us to go into executive session so we're going to do that. >> Kitchen: Okay. I just didn't want it to be because of me. >> Mayor Adler: Don't know. We'll find out in executive session. The city council will now go

[11:45:10 AM]

into closed congestion S egg to take up two -- closed session to take up two items pursuant to 551 of the government code we will discuss items related to item 10, approving an ordinance for a special election. Item 11, approving a contract with the voters concerning transportation general election bonds. Without objection, here at 11:45 we will go straight into executive session. If it looks like that doesn't take very long, then maybe we'll come right back out to the meeting and take care of the rest of the business and then break for lunch. If it looks like it's going to be longer then we'll grab some lunch and then come back. But let's all go over to executive session now. See you guys there. Paragraph

[11:58:11 AM]

[. . .

[1:14:34 PM]

[Executive session]

[1:58:47 PM]

[.

[2:53:32 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: We're out of closed session. We discussed legal matters related to items 10 and 11. We're back in our meeting. It's the intent now to give councilmembers the opportunity to address the earlier work we've done with respect to the budget. Pretty historic day. Legal is taking a look at some questions for us. When we're done speaking to the budget issues, we'll take another recess, so that we can finish up the executive session on the remaining two items. And then we'll hopefully come out and decide that. We're going to give everybody a chance to be able to speak and address what happened today. Does anyone want to go first? Mayor pro tem.

[2:54:34 PM]

>> Garza: My staff has helped actually post on social media my remarks, so I'll try to keep them as short as possible. Any tears, or tears of joy, and a little bit of joy, and a little emotional because this is my last budget. Today we take a historic vote, one that would have been extremely unlikely a year ago. And it's not the first time that a different political landscape has made huge reform possible. Before we move to 10-1, councilmember Mike Martinez worked hard under the old council system to increase our budget for social services and help equity contracts. So we could be funding those at least as much of other cities in the same size and same amount of need. The structure that the council in the status quo that made it possible to simply right size our social services spending. It took years and resolutions

[2:55:35 PM]

and reports and stakeholder groups and more reports, and we were only able to achieve that kind of real investment in our community after we moved to a system that better represented austinites after we moved to 10-1. In fact, the old council I believe was on track to spend even more of our budget on policing, and less on programs that directly addressed the root causes of injustice and inequity. The point of that story is that investing in our community to address inequity head-on is not some radical idea that we've never heard of before, it's just that we may not have been -- it just may not have been possible until now. The conversation about reimagining public safety is one more part of that same conversation about equity and injustice. I want to thank my colleagues and their staff, city staff for all their hard work. Above all, I want to thank the community. You saw injustice and you did something about it. You showed up in the streets,

[2:56:36 PM]

and you showed up at our council meetings. You called our offices and e-mailed us in volumes that we've never seen before. I'm trying to not read this all. This vote could not have happened without that work and honestly without other hard-fought moments that came before it. In last year's budget deliberation there were only two of us saying we could find better investments to adding to new positions to the police department that still it not filled its vacancies. Less than a year later we pretty much agreed on that issue. With the vote on this budget we're saying we're listening to our community and we're working on these solutions. I also wanted to thank councilmember Casar and his staff for a lot of the heavy lifting. There's been so many conversations behind the scenes, but I want to recognize that. I want to recognize my staff,

[2:57:37 PM]

Cynthia is our main budget person, but all my staff, Katherine and rose were a big part of this. Lastly, there's so much more I can say, but I'll just end with one of the things I've been able to do every budget is use the balance of my leftover office budget. In the past I've financed literacy programs and workforce development. This year, primarily because of probably being in the office less, and other office expenses, I have over 100,000 in excess money available and we're going to put that in a bucket for the childcare facilities that are facing incredibly tough times during this pandemic. So thank you to all my colleagues. I know this -- these were incredibly difficult discussions. Thank you to staff. I know these were incredibly difficult discussions for you and I look forward to all your

[2:58:37 PM]

comments. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Who wants to speak next? No one? Councilmember harper-madison. >> Harper-madison: If you insist! >> Mayor Adler: You're muted. >> Harper-madison: I said if you insist.

And I also said unlike my colleague I'm not going to keep it brief. I'm going to be pretty long-winded and take up some space. I think we all earned it and I'm excited and I'd just like to say, mayor pro tem Garza, I almost climbed right through this computer screen and said covid be damned and give you a big old hug because everything that you do you do with your whole heart and it's admirable and I appreciate it and I'm very glad that I had this opportunity to go through this last budget cycle with you because

[2:59:37 PM]

you've inspired me professionally and personally, and I look forward to carrying that torch these next couple of years and budget cycles. So thank you. All right. So I'll start with the thank yous. Obviously there's a ton of them. There's the thank yous to staff, to our staff. They worked so hard, tirelessly, and sometimes thanklessly. I think we get wrapped up in this process and I know I wasn't as nice as I would like to be some days and it was just because I was really just wholly committed to getting this right. So thank you to my staff. And thank you to all of the staff members, for every councilmember and the mayor. I know you all work hard. Thank you to the staff and every department, but obviously five gold stars to Ed van eenoo and the folks in the finance office. I can't imagine what it looks like for you this last couple of months. I don't want to imagine. And thank you, thank you all

[3:00:38 PM]

for entertaining all of our questions and concerns and helping us come up with solutions that I think work best for our community. I'm so glad that this is over, honestly. I really think that we're moving in the direction of having a city that works better for more people. And I appreciate that. I know that the first day of fall is still officially more than a month away, but it already feels like the summer of 2020 broke all the records for being the longest summer ever. It's been a long summer. As a council, as a community we've all been going full speed for months to do the necessary -- to do what's necessary to answer the undeniable outcry for overdue justice, and in that I realize that I forgot a massive thank you to the community for showing up. To the advocacy community for working so hard tirelessly. I think some people assume

[3:01:38 PM]

that they just come to us with complaints, but they come to us with substantive arguments and data and that doesn't fall out of thin air. People, humans have to compile that data and those arguments, and those solutions. So thank you to all of those folks as well. I recognize that this work is vital and it's historical. This budget is part of our history. It is not at all the independent of the work. Some of the folks that testified day before -- yeah, some of the folks that testified about the budget I kept wanting to pipe in and say it doesn't stop here. I know I heard this sense of urgency in some people's voices. Let me

just say to the general public patching this doesn't stop here, this keeps going. Keep getting involved and reaching out to us and making your voice heard because there was nothing signed in stone when we took those votes today. This process is fluid and flexible and continues to move. And we have other options for work through our

[3:02:40 PM]

concerns so please don't stop getting involved. As a nation, as a state, as a municipality we have a long, long, long legacy of white supremacy to -- legacy of white supremacy to unravel. It won't be one summer. We've been making progress for generations. Black people are no longer slaves by law, no longer dealing with separate and unequal facilities by law. No longer explicitly denied the right to vote by law. The laws that mandated those circumstances are gone, yet the circumstances still remain. This is what we call institutional racism. Undoing it, resolving it will take time, it will take effort and it will create discomfort. Some more -- more so for some than others. We are in a moment in our history where more white Americans than ever are willing to make sacrifices. Watching my colleagues do it

[3:03:40 PM]

makes me so proud. We shouldn't squander this moment. This budget is a big step this long journey, the biggest we've taken yet. It's not as big a step as some would like and I recognize that, but that's because our shoe strings are still tied together by status quo. And we're talking about that's been happening for generations. So it's steeped so deep in that we really will have to fight our way out. As I said this is a long process and we must all remain committed to it. This budget moves us closer to our goals of reimagining public safety and addressing racism as a public health crisis. It gives us the opportunity to reshape our budget process as well, which is so important, especially as we all recognize so many folks participated in this budget that have never interacted with their municipal government before. We need to make sure that the process is accessible and that more folks can participate. It's about, you know, democracy works only if

[3:04:40 PM]

people participate. So while we allocated more resources to the public health department, the equity office and innovation office to pursue their [indiscernible], we made a lot of other decisions. I grew up in east Austin. I speak with firsthand knowledge to reimagine the policing in our city. You cannot take the things like the Tatum report, the shooting of David Joseph, the violent arrest of Breion King, the piles and piles of data and lived experiences and data and testimony of thousands of people and tell us that our police department does not consistently deliver disparate and deadly outcomes for Black Austinites. You cannot look at that body of evidence and say that this is a system that just needs a few tweaks. We

are determined to do a full overhaul in the name of equity and in the name of justice. Pi still believe we need

[3:05:41 PM]

well paid and well trained officers to keep us safe. I also believe we can pay them and train them to do other things than discriminate and inflict violence against black and brown austinians. And those existing in the margins, low income austinians. I also want to recognize that right now at this moment, the city of Austin is on the brink of historic change and it is not because of the will of this council. It's because of the will of the people. For maybe the first time ever we have a true people's budget, a budget that seeks to right the wrongs of racism, police misconduct and historic underinvestment. Real politics is constant action. So I look forward to our ongoing work ahead, and if I didn't do so before when I gave my thank yous, thank you to all of you, all of my colleagues for us all committing to the process and being gentle and

[3:06:42 PM]

respectful with one another and our constituents. I appreciate all of y'all's effort as well. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Anyone else want to speak? Councilmember Flannigan. >> Flannigan: There should probably be a rule never to follow councilmember harper-madison. You know, I think mostly ditto. Thank you, councilmember harper-madison, for your leadership through this work and your passion and your courage in leading the effort and leading amongst national leaders to have you and -- national leaders to have you and councilmember Casar and mayor pro tem Garza to be among the folks in this country who are going this work. It has meant a lot to have your support and the council's support in being the chair of the public safety committee pulling this work together since the first votes we took in June and leading an incredibly

[3:07:43 PM]

transparent and open and collaborative process. Some of the best I think -- the best work we've done as a council, it was out in the public, it was on the message board board, on atxn, it was engaged in the public, we had experts at the table, community at the table, staff at the table. We were looking at data collected over many years, analysis done by poc led organizations who when they started that work were listened to by no one and now had a seat at the table here at the end leading to the first of many folks we will take. So I'm thankful for that and I'm thankful to be in a position to continue leading the committee and I hope the whole council continues to participate to the extent that you can make it work in an ongoing series of work. We're going to meet on Monday. We aren't even taking a break. We

will be meeting on Monday to talk about mental health first response work that councilmember kitchen has done a lot of -- put a lot of effort into. We're doing to dig 62 the

[3:08:44 PM]

details on that. The headlines the public will read will often be inden DI arrestry and they will add up to elements that don't add up to the decisions that we make today and the decisions that are made in front of us. We also have folks in this community who are insistent on doubling down on that misinformation. And that fight continues to escalate in threats of violence against us personally, against members of the public, and it is completely inappropriate. And unconscionable that that continues. And I am committed to making change not just in the budget. Part of this budget adoption was the change to the police department headquarters that I'm glad everyone supported.

[3:09:45 PM]

A building that we already moved the municipal court from because it was falling apart and now a site that in the future will be a benefit to this community to benefit economic success for the black community, be a gateway to east Austin, so much great opportunity to be had on a site that has not been providing that opportunity so far. What we didn't finish today, as councilmember harper-madison so eloquently said, there is a lot more work to do and a lot of the votes we took are the intention to do more work. And we will do that work and it will be data driven and it will be community led and it will be transparent and it will be in the public as all of the work has been so far. As will my belief that there continues to be a need for leadership change. I have not given up on seeing leadership change in

[3:10:46 PM]

our city when it comes to public safety. We cannot do this work if we are fighting department heads. And we cannot be fighting department heads without the consent of the manager so that work is going to have to continue as well and I am as equally committed to seeing that work through as I am to seeing the general reform works that we have begun this week. Thank you to all of my colleagues for us being unanimous in this work together. >> Mayor Adler: Anyone else comments? Councilmember alter. >> Alter: Thank you. I would like to join my colleagues for thanking my staff and colleagues for the work they have done in this difficult year. I'm proud to be on a council that shares a broad vision for a safe, sustainable, equitable Austin. I want to thank city staff for their hard work and for

[3:11:48 PM]

the community for sharing and calling with their ideas with us. We've been on a learning journey today. This year we're advancing many of the priorities of this council that aim to make our city more resilient. We're increasing funding for early childhood development, money for rec centers and our trails. Workforce development, access to physician services and ems and much more. I believe also that with the amendments and direction we've added into this budget we're setting a path to create the type of change that our community is seeking in our public safety system. My hope is that ultimately we reach transformational systemic change. And I believe that some, not all of the intense pain and anger we are hearing across our city from all parts of our community is a symptom of a flaw in how we do public safety today. Right now we have many members of Austin, particularly within

[3:12:49 PM]

communities of color, who do not feel like they are valued by our city or by our police. Relying extensively or even predominantly on police or on punitive measures for public safety needs comes with staggering cost, both fiscally and morally. We also know that we have overly relied on police officers to perform too many functions in our city that could be better handled by others. So I want so say that I'm absolutely in favor of many forms we are making and I co-sponsored many of them. I do think that as we end this step in the process that we need to acknowledge that the way we did the budget this year was challenging to say the least. We had very little time to dig into the details of the proposals, especially when combined with the time and energy we are simultaneously spending on a multi-billion dollar transit bond and as we tried to respond effectively to a pandemic.

[3:13:52 PM]

I raise some of my concerns with different aspects of the budget as we were deliberating and I want to reiterate my commitment to making sure that we get it. We put forward a lot of good ideas and many of those will be further examination. I look forward to revisiting these concepts to either building them out, to adjust or revise them or to set them aside and explore new options. We all know this pandemic has presented a variety of new challenges and I'm very very proud of the steps this budget takes token vest in our community to meet those challenges. I'm especially proud of the creation of the office of violence prevention and office of the chief medical officer that would help us actively respond to critical needs during this pandemic and beyond. I'm also heartened to see investments in public safety and in our ems department. These are two departments that have been underfunded

[3:14:52 PM]

with years and I believe they are critical pieces of reimagining public safety. As we explore ways to transform our public safety system, I look forward to seeing how we can creatively shift responsibilities off of the shoulders of officers such as through the mobility officers pilot. Our work is not done today. We set into motion many ideas and possibilities and we still have a lot of work out there. I look forward to joining with all of us to continue these efforts to work together to make sure we end up in the best place for our city. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: So councilmember Flannigan, I would say that you said about everyone. It's hard to go after everyone. I really want to say thank you for the words that all of you have spoken from the heart. You're all speaking from the

[3:15:52 PM]

heart. I know that this is who you are and this is what you believe in and this is what you're taking action on. So I too am very proud to be part of this council to-- in a unified way we have come forward, in the leadership I've seen from all of you and thank you especially, councilmember Flannigan, for taking on the committee. Councilmember Casar for pulling together all of our work. And I spend thanks to every single one of you because every single one of you brought forward very innovative and transformative ideas, and we all voted for it. So to my mind I think about this in a couple of ways. First we have to -- what's immediately in front of us is something that councilmember harper-madison said better than I could ever say and that is the

[3:16:53 PM]

legacy of racism in our history, in the violence that we have seen is never acceptable and we must renew our efforts to -- we must renew our efforts to uproot that. At the same time as she mentioned also, it is engrained in our systems. Our institutions are engrained in racism, our institutions are engrained in economic unfairness. And it's taking a lot of -- it will take a lot of work, a lot of continued community work to uproot all of that and to make fundamental systemic changes. I think that we have taken steps in the past, but as others have said, they have not been as much of a leap

[3:17:54 PM]

forward as we wanted. We are in an unprecedented time right now when we can take those leaps forward and we must. So I think what we did today is I think we took immediate action, we did very immediate things like funding additional mental health services is. We added to our civil right office, the equity office, all of the things people mentioned. We did those immediately today, but we did way more than that. We also immediately today as a matter of policy identify those parts of our current policing system that has been evident to us for awhile and is evident to us now that we can -- that we need to

decouple, reallocate, whatever word we need to use, we need to separate from our policing system, and we identified what those are. We also set a path for

[3:18:58 PM]

additional areas that we need to have further conversation with the community on and we have a path through the work that our deputy city manager is pursuing for continued conversation with the community. I think all of those things together are significant action and it's on us and on the community and on the city manager and our staff to make sure that we carry out those actions. I would also like to say that I want to thank our community and I want to encourage our community. Many of you who are new to -- new to talking with us, new to talking to your government, new to thinking about how you make change, and stay with us. We need your conversations. We need you to talk to your neighbors. We need you to talk to us. We need conversation because

[3:20:02 PM]

as councilmember harper-madison indicated, this work is not done. This is hard work. It's ongoing work and it requires us listening and talking to each other and understanding how we can all together get to the result that we're trying to get to. As others have said, and I have said for awhile, I have seen for many years my background is in social services and psychology, as well as in law as an advocate for health care. And our system in this United States and also in this city, and we're no -- we're not immune to that, is we have piled on to the criminal justice system just the result of all failings as a society and expected our police officers to deal with it when they are not equipped nor trained. And because -- when we have failed. When we have failed to address individuals who are

[3:21:03 PM]

experiencing homelessness, when we have failed to address our people experiencing mental health crisis and a whole host of economic and racial injustices. And so I'm proud of the work we did today to start down the path of making those changes. So again, I would just echo what my colleagues -- I would just echo what my colleagues have said and say that I'm excited about this work. I want to continue doing this work with my colleagues and with the community. And I encourage everyone to listen and talk to each other. At its fundamental level I know we all are interested and support and believe in public safety and a safe and justice community for us in Austin.

[3:22:08 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Renteria. And colleagues, I apologize for the disruption.

Councilmember Renteria. >> Renteria: Thank you, mayor. I really want to thank my colleagues. This is one of the most-- even though we were restricted to a 3.5 tax increase, we have done more for our citizens, especially the ones that are not as fortunate as some of the others that live here in this city. We have created so much affordable housing, and it's just amazing. I really need to thank Greg Casar on his leadership. When I got on the city council five years ago my whole goal and dream was to build as much affordable units in east Austin. And especially in downtown east Austin where we were getting gentrified left and right.

[3:23:08 PM]

You know, we got through Greg's leadership we were able to get the -- the homestead preservation act. We are building all sorts of affordable units there in the Cesar Chavez and neighborhood and Guadalupe. We're reinvesting that money leveraging out, building as many houses that we can to keep our citizens here in Austin. And then with the 250-million-dollar housing bond, I just really want to thank the citizens of Austin. We really are in desperate need of those kinds of funds. I know there's a lot of pressure that are on us when we're trying to buy hotels for our homeless population. We got a lot of push back, but I'm so grateful that this council stayed so strong and was able to support me on getting some of these hotels bought and so we could have the transitional housing. And even with the shortfall that we had here, because of

[3:24:09 PM]

what the city had done where they had done -- I mean, they looked out after our tax money and we were able to put immediately, when we had the coronavirus, we were able to help our community by putting \$15 million immediately on the rainy day fund. And that was able to help the ones that didn't qualify for the cares program that the federal government -- he we still got a lot more to do. We haven't beaten this virus, but we invested all the money that we could into starting out these programs so that when we received the care funding that we were able to be out there in front and helping our citizens and we contribute -- put a lot of money in the food bank and to feed our citizens because we knew they were going to be laid off and we knew the money wasn't going to be

[3:25:10 PM]

there to support them. So we were going to provide enough money in there so we could feed our citizens and that we could provide rent for most of the low income, the people that were earning less

than 80% and help them out on their rents so they couldn't get displaced. When it comes to the police, I started out with community policing, and you know, I just feel so bad that we have a lot of -- a few bad apples in the police department. And our police chief wouldn't go out there and fire them and they got reinstated by the state. We have a real problem here at the state level when we cannot fire police officers because of their misconduct. And we need to really focus, and all of y'all need to really focus on this election coming up and let your leaders know that you want some changes. It could be at a point now

[3:26:11 PM]

where we could have community policing, we could have all kinds of activities, but we cannot get rid of these bad police officers. And I want to let the police department know that both are bringing you down. Those few are bringing you down. And you're causing so much disruption and distrust in this community, that you see what's happened -- what's going on now. So I really want to thank our city staff for being so responsible with -- being able to keep track of all the money that we spend and letting us save enough so that we did not go under the 12% that we keep in reserve to keep our credit rating high. And I really want to thank our city departments for doing an excellent job there. It's going to let us be

[3:27:11 PM]

upfront when we get this covid-19 behind us and we're going to be able to really move on and make this city really prosperous. The 10-1 has consequences, you know. When it was at large we had a group of people concentrated right there around downtown and west Austin that controlled everything. And 10-1 gave the community a voice. And that's what's the beauty about 10-1. And we got -- thank god this last election we got some really Progressive people elected, and I am so proud of my colleagues that have been here for four years and two years because they are making a difference here in this city. I grew up here, I'm a native austinite and I worked hard to try to change this system, and it was just -- it's just like throwing rocks, you know.

[3:28:12 PM]

And you're a mile away. You weren't going to hit anything. But that's the way -- I did not give up and I'm so proud of y'all guys. And Delia, you're just fantastic. I hope you the biggest success in your career and I really want to thank all of y'all for doing what y'all do for this city. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: Thank you, mayor. Like those of you before, I would like to just really extend some thanks. First I want to thank my colleagues. The last few months have been a period of really intense focus on multiple fronts, but especially on public safety and I really appreciate the

collective work and the attention and thank you to all of you who brought forward such innovative proposals for this budget cycle in particular. They really rise to meet the needs of our community and

[3:29:13 PM]

at a pivotal time. Like my colleagues who have preceded me today I want to recognize many of the community members who participated in this process. Over the last two months, many of them for the first time, we've heard your lived experiences, your fears, your passion for co-creating a more just, equitable and safe future for all of us. Thank you for your participation. True change requires community collaboration and your voice matters so thank you. We need structural change in public safety, not just in Austin, but in departments across the nation and I'm committed with working with my colleagues for that change. There's no doubt that some officers have caused great harm. I hope the city and community task force will explore how to strengthen APD's early warning intervention system so we can better identify the early warning signs of high risk officers.

[3:30:13 PM]

I expect chief Manley and leadership to address those indicators and I'm counting on our city manager to hold APD leadership accountable for doing so. I value the service our officers provide to this community. While also believing that some responsibilities have fallen on police that other professionals are better trained to handle. As we shift some of those functions to social workers and mental health professionals, my hope is that we will be allowing space for our officers to do more focused work as they won't be rushing from call to call. And that will ideally contribute to better outcomes and greater community wellness. I'm excited about the process of reimagining public safety. I hope this transformation national work will allow us to learn from officers that are doing their jobs well about how they could do their job even more effectively. While also continuing to learn from the community as we implement the sustainable, lasting changes and the significant reforms that our community deserves. I want so say a few things about the community investments that we've made in this budget cycle.

[3:31:14 PM]

We have had voices in our community for a long time calling for increased investments in social services and in homelessness. Shortly before the change to 10-1, councilmember Laura Morrison championed increasing social services on our public health budget. Talked about metrics and other ways in which we could and should be investing more in those important programs. And that really helped lay the groundwork for what I've seen and experienced on our 10-1 council as we've been able to increase our investments in most of our budget cycles in the areas of public health and social services, but perhaps

no year as successfully as this year. As I mentioned, we've also had voices in our community calling for increased investments in the area of homelessness. It was just a few budget cycles ago that several of us supported a budget amendment to add an additional three million dollars for homelessness. That failed.

[3:32:16 PM]

1.5 million failed. We finally came to a consensus around an additional one million dollars. I want to say how heartened I am by the progress we've made in the council conversations related to that critical need to fund housing and services and innovative programs such as host for our neighbors who are experiencing homelessness. These are necessary investments and the path we have before us with the consultants investing for work is going to guide our staff in making sure that the investments we make are the most effective ones in moving us along the path to ending homelessness in this community. This budget includes other important increases for new investments. For the sobering center, for childcare, workforce development, ems, food assistance, mental health responders, for an office of a chief medical officer and officer of violence prevention for family violence services and more. Thank you to my colleagues who brought forward those really important initiatives. As I mentioned we've had voices in our community calling for increased investments in social services and in homelessness for a long time, but this

[3:33:17 PM]

budget cycle they've been joined by a chorus of additional voices. And for that I'm really encouraged. We need our community at large to be supporting the efforts and for digital access to families in all parts of the city to getting resources to the growing number of families and individuals in this community who are experiencing food insecurity. Before March the needs in our community were great and these needs have been amplified and multiplied by this pandemic. We've had an opportunity over the last couple of days to talk about some important needs that unfortunately we weren't able to fund at the level that they really need to be funded. And I am committed to working alongside my colleagues who were -- who brought those forward to really see what additional funding we might be able to identify and those include the additional support for childcare, including councilmember pool's part childcare initiative. To expanding digital access, especially for families in our community who students will be attending school

[3:34:18 PM]

from home and may not have access to the internet that they need for those students to participate consistently and successfully. And as I mentioned yesterday, the food policy recommendations that we weren't able to fund today, including to develop a regional food system collaboration and equity

framework. And to continue to respond to the urgent food needs. But I want to be really clear in my message to the community. Our city budget cannot and will never be able to meet all of the pressing critical needs that we have before us. We have to be able to work together as a community to expand partnerships among our public entities, but also to expand our partnerships with the private sector to make sure we're responding to this pandemic and to the economic crisis in ways that don't just sustain our neighbors through this time, but really help them to thrive in the future. And that the work we do and the investments we make now enable Austin to emerge a stronger and resilient city. So that's my hope and my

[3:35:19 PM]

intent and my commitment to the public. And lastly, I just want to -- as other colleagues have done, really just stop and thank our staff. Thank you to all of the city hall staff and every office who have worked tremendously hard not just on the budget, but over the course of the pandemic, explore -- responding to and really communicating with individuals in their district, but also in other districts. Thank you to the staff in our all departments, our finance department and other departments for all of their critical work during this pandemic, but also during the budget. And lastly, I just want to extend a real sincere and huge thank you to the staff in my district 9 office. So Ashley who led our budget work, to Nicole, Shannon and Nikki, all of my staff have worked tremendously hard during these last months. They always work hard. It is a tough job working for the city and it's a tough job working in a city council office. But this has really been a

[3:36:22 PM]

time of extraordinary productivity, but it's been very intense and I so appreciate the work that they do on behalf of austinites each and everyday. We're really fortunate to have such dedicated people who are willing to do that on behalf of the community. So thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember Ellis? >> As we've entered into this budget process and wrapped is up is my thoughts about this being a moral document and we've had conversations over the last few weeks, a public safety committee that kept working through the entire summer to look at what reimagining policing in our community is about and that shows the true dedication of not only councilmembers, but our staffs and our community members and our advocates who have come to those

[3:37:23 PM]

meetings to help us understand how we can make this city the best that it can be. And as we started looking through this amazing document that I'm sure Stephanie compiled in councilmember Casar's office because she's such a whiz at it, I'm just so amazed at how many things we were able to do with

this money, and it's just really, really amazing and heart inc. To see the commitments of this council. We're helping ems have more staffing and trucks. We're having mental health response increase, community health paramedics, violence prevention with family shelters and an office of violence prevention. We're helping our parks and trails, helping people with food access, abortion access, early childhood and workforce training. We're doing litter abatement in creeks. We're retraining our park rangers. There are so many things that amaze me at the level of creativity and commitment that this council has shown and it's really been eye

[3:38:24 PM]

opening to see the dedication that people have had and people have been working so long for so many weeks. And I also appreciate city staff's work on it because we had so many questions and they were able to get us answers for every single nickel and dime and that is really impressive in a budget this large. I look forward to the ongoing conversations around reimagining policing and decoupling some of the services that may be best provided by non-sworn officials. And I really think that we've done a good job with this budget and it has heart, it has soul, and it has commitment in it. And it's an amazing, amazing document that I hope people are really proud to see and I hope that the community members who have come to us time and time again and told us what they want to see are finally seeing that action take place. And this is a very proud moment to be a part of. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Anyone else want to speak?

[3:39:26 PM]

Is everybody done? Councilmember Casar? I'm going to speak last. >> Casar: I generally already said my part about the budget. I appreciate everything everyone here has said. I want to urge the manager and the staff now to quickly put to work all of the investments that we laid out here because this is about making our community better and more safe and so it should be all of our expectation that we have that family violence shelter up and running quickly and the permanent supportive housing up and running and taking care of people quickly and the ambulances on the streets and all of the things that we need to address covid-19 and the other forms of harm and violence in the community, the council has done this part and will be there making sure and doing whatever we can to make sure that that -- that help gets into the community because we're not doing this just to vote on a budget. We're doing it to save lives. And now the step is to actually go and do what it says in the budget and to do

[3:40:26 PM]

it. So please do keep us all posted about anything else that we have to do to make the real change in people's lives that we've dedicated ourselves to. I also just in hearing all this and hearing the mayor pro

tem's talk, have to reflect on the fact that in February it's no secret that I almost decided to go run for something and leave. And I am -- after 10 years of advocating on issues of social and racial justice at city hall, almost stepped out. And I'm just so proud to still be here a part of this group for what we're doing for mass transit and our own green new deal for Austin, for our response to save lives in covid-19 and then this to to be leading in this country about on issues of how we take care of people, how we treat people like people and how we save

[3:41:28 PM]

lives. I take it and I know we all take it so seriously. We all have people we know in our lives who have died because we do not solve public safety issues with mass incarceration. We do not solve with overpolicing. We do not solve those. We haven't done it right in this country and the community has risen up and said that they're asking us to change and I think today that we've made a statement that we are headed in that direction. So I'm thankful to be a part of this city and a part of this group. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool. >> Pool: I'll bring up the end before you, mayor, and just amplify everything that everybody has said. Thank you all so much for the hard work on the dais, for the inspiration and the hard work of bringing it all together. To my staff, I've got a fabulous staff.

[3:42:28 PM]

I'll name them [listing off names]. You guys are awesome. Thank you to the city manager and to your strong leadership team. Our favorite budget officer, Ed van eenoo, thank you. And to Maria, welcome to Austin. This is quite a baptism for you this budget and this year. To all of the staff who made all of this work, took all the raw materials that we put on the table and helped shape it. And certainly to the community, especially to the community, to all the folks who called and spoke and really let us know what we're looking for. And you do that everyday. So thank you so much to folks in there that we met along the way and this particular journey.

[3:43:32 PM]

Thanks. We still have tons of work to do, but thank you for helping us get to this point of closure, this inflection point. As we take a little bit after breather and then recommit to the hard work that continues and that's ahead of us. >> Thank you. Councilmember Renteria? >> Renteria: Yes. I forgot to thank my staff. Got a little bit too emotional. Especially to my chief of staff [listing names]. They're a great team and I'm so happy now that I got a full team as you might know that I had my ex-chief of staff, he's running for city council now, but he left at the beginning of the year, so I'm just really so grateful that my staff picked up all the slack and kept on running and I'm just grateful for that.

[3:44:33 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem? >> Garza: I want to quickly say I was trying my hardest to listen to everybody and I'm sorry I had to step off but my phone blew up with people talking about your kind words, Pio. Just when you work the hardest, you have a pandemic and a five-year-old. It's been challenging. If I'm off it's because I'm trying to give her the next task. So just thank you for those kind words. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. So I would just conclude by saying that I think this is the most forward looking budget in memory. This is really the budget where we launch our future. It's -- our future as a fairer, more just, equitable, more universally acceptable city. This budget is full of opportunity and hope. That includes regional rapid

[3:45:34 PM]

transit, the food deserts, regions underground and the airport, are remans transportation in so many new ways. It puts investments into putting people without homes and providing people with new places to be safe. Significant, unprecedented investments in workforce development, it's going to be real important because we have a lot of people in our city without jobs to return to after this virus. Significant new investments in public health and all that with the lowest general fund supported tax rate in almost 20 years. I will say as we go through the debate and the conversation it's been so encouraging and wonderful to see so many people now involved in this process both speaking to us, speaking to the city, speaking to the world. The engagement on the issues that we have seen has been dramatic and powerful.

[3:46:34 PM]

And I hope that it bodes well for having so many people vote this coming November. I also want to say that as I watch this process as go through it and read that I don't understand why all police seem to be indicted by the conduct of only some. You know, we don't abide that with other places and people and other professions. I want to be clear that this budget is not punitive, it is not intended to punish police. We're going to improve public safety in Austin together. We need and I welcome the knowledge, the expertise and the good will that our first responders are going to bring to this process. And one thing I know is that if we do this together, when we do this together we're going to reach a much better place. You know, it is often said that are priorities are reflected in what we give and the directions we give.

[3:47:35 PM]

This is especially true with this budget and I am really, really proud to vote for it. This budget is the work of residents, of advocates, of stakeholders, people in their homes, people in the streets, non-profits, partner governments, area leaders, certainly the city staff and in an inexhaustible way. The city manager, you and your executive team have been looking exceptional in this process and then we'll meet up. My colleagues on the council, your staff's special thanks to my staff, Michael McGill and Leslie [listing names]. Who have been working on this budget in particular. Special thanks to Stephanie who some people think works for Greg, but I think that

[3:48:38 PM]

on our staff, certainly mine as well. This budget reflects all of Austin. Together we've put lights now on the path, but the work and the journey are just beginning. We often name our ordinances and our resolutions. For me this is the justice budget. Colleagues, with that I think we're going to take a break, go back to executive session. City attorney, I don't know if you've been able to send to us materials. If we should go straight to executive session or if there's stuff for us to review and we should be in executive session in 15 or 20 minutes after we've had a chance to look at it. >> I'm hoping that we've sent some things to you all, but it may take just a few more minutes. I suggest just a 15-20 minute break for people to look at language and then go

[3:49:39 PM]

into executive session if that works. So pursuant to 551.071 of the city government code the council will go into executive session to look at items 10 and 11. Colleagues, it is 10 until 4:00 now. How about if we gather to 10 after 4:00 in executive session. Councilmember harper-madison. >> Harper-madison: Are we coming back out here after executive session? Because if you recall, there were a few other items we needed to clear up. >> Mayor Adler: We have to come back after executive session to be able to vote on items 10 and 11. Do you want to address the liability issue before we go or when we come back? >> Harper-madison: I'd be happy to. I know I'm not the only person who had something to bring to the dais before we conclude for the day. Certainly you can take the temperature of the remainder of the dais, but I would rather get those things

[3:50:39 PM]

taken care of than take a break. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. I didn't know there were more things. Let's go ahead and do that now because we have that 20 minutes while legal staff is working. So let me -- we're not going to go to executive session right away. Councilmember harper-madison, I'm going to give you the floor. >> Harper-madison: Thank you, I appreciate it. As you all know I was bringing forward an amendment around the liability fund. And we glossed over that one in our process. But I don't want to

tip the apple cart, so to speak. I'll leave it be. I think what I'll do instead is bring it back at a later date and have some opportunities to get more people on board with the overall intention and get some more folks to contribute to the process. I do have to be honest, I was a little surprised at how much push-back it got. I understand it. It just caught me off guard. Our efforts and our conversations here have really been framed around the dollar amount we want to

[3:51:40 PM]

remove from APD's budget, but beneath it all really fundamentally what we're talking about is saving lives, right? And we absolutely cannot lose sight of that, that's our guiding star. That's what brought us here. That's really what we're all fighting for mutually. Maybe -- I know there was hesitation because the proposal was clear-cut, it didn't pull any punches. It was one of our brilliant community members said, this may do more to incentivize police management, to actually enforce their own policies than anything we've ever done before. And I appreciate that because that was certainly my intention. I appreciate the notion, the concept, the practice of holding our peers accountable. When I reimagine our approach to policing I see a department that's accountable for their actions. Accountable for the actions of their officers and that pays for their misconduct and their mistakes. Again, we have paid for more than two million dollars

[3:52:40 PM]

each year for the past five years to cover APD's litigation costs. This is money from taxpayers like me and like you and like our constituents, like our neighbors. APD is removed from the accountability loop that we all end up paying for. Whether it's two million dollars every year or \$20 million every year, I don't see how these payouts discourage police misconduct unless we put the burden on our police department. We can cut APD's budget, we can shift responsibilities to other departments, but that won't address misconduct. It won't address violence against black and brown and other marginalized residents, not to mention peaceful protesters. We need to put the onus on APD to take direct accountability for officer misconduct. If the department decides it doesn't want to pay its own bill, the choice is simple, improve your hiring, improve your training, improve your

[3:53:43 PM]

oversight, improve your culture and hold officers accountable to their oath to protect our residents, rather than committing violence against them. I'm just asking to apply the same standard to our police department that applies to the rest of it. You break it, you buy it. Without this clear and present tool for direct accountability, our broken system will remain broken and misconduct that disproportionately harms black and brown lives will inevitably happen again. So I look forward to working on this some

more and bringing it forward as a resolution for everybody's consideration. Thank you,, >> Mayor Adler:. -- Thank you, mayor Adler. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Anybody else was the floor before we break. Yes, councilmember Ellis? >> Ellis: I'm not sure if you have room in your subquorum, councilmember harper-madison, but I would love to work with you on this. I have heard some things

[3:54:44 PM]

nationally and would love that conversation with you if you have room for it. >> Harper-madison: That would be great, thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Anybody else would like the floor? Then let's go ahead, let's go into executive session. We'll go into executive session pursuant to 551.071 of the government code to discuss legal matters related to items 10 and 11. How about if we meet out at 4:15 in ? >> Tovo: Mayor? I don't believe we have the -- I'm eager to have that conversation, but I don't believe we have the documents yet. So I thought the break was about affording us the opportunity to review the documents and so I'm not sure that the times are going to line out here? >> Mayor Adler: Let's do this. We're going to take this break and when the documents come from legal, we'll meet 20 minutes after the documents are sent out. All right.

[3:55:45 PM]

Does that work, Ann? >> Let's plan on you meeting at 4:30 and I'll get the documents out to you shortly. >> Mayor Adler: Sounds good. We'll meet in executive session at 4:30. It is 3:55 now. See you guys then. ...

[4:58:09 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: All right, colleagues. I see a quorum. It is 4:57. We are now out of closed session. In closed session, we discussed legal matters related to items 10 and 11. We're now back out. We have two items left to consider, items 10 and 11. Council member Ellis, you want to make a motion? >> Ellis: I would, and I believe there's additional language I would need to read with it, so give me just a moment. >> Kitchen: While she's doing that, may I ask a question? >> Ellis: I got it. >> Kitchen: I assume we're starting with item number 11. Right? >> Ellis: I think for discussion purposes, it

[4:59:11 PM]

might make sense to go with 11 first, then go into 10. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. We'll start with 11 first. You want to make that motion? >> Ellis: Yes. I would love to move passage of item 11, and I can unveil it if there's a second. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Is there a second to this motion? Council member Casar seconds. Council member harper-madison seconds. Discussion? >> Ellis: I'm happy to go ahead and lay it out if that helps beginning our conversations. This is a really exciting moment for mobility and for green mobility, in particular. This particular bond is a compilation of programs that the city has been trying to implement that includes [indiscernible] To school, urban trails, bicycle lanes and things of that nature to help with our mobility. A lot of my constituents and a lot of activists have spent some hard time putting all of this together, a lot of dedication and a lot of hard work.

[5:00:12 PM]

And I think this is a really interesting moment for a city that is looking at advancing project connect as a TRE and to look at building out some additional measures for better mobility to our city. And I think this is a great opportunity to be bringing forward a bond like this. And I'm proud of the work that's gone into this contract with the voters that I'm proposing. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. It's been moved and seconded. Discussion? Council member kitchen? >> Kitchen: I would like to make an amendment and then lay out my amendment. It's version 4 that you all have in backup, and I'll lay it out, then I'll explain it. It's the same version as you all have seen before. It's just got the language that the attorney suggested. So let me just say this. I'm bringing this amendment because I agree

[5:01:13 PM]

with council member Ellis, that this is an important time for us to look at the opportunities to -- to build out additional infrastructure around mobility and green mobility and to use that to complement and work with the transportation system that we're developing for project connect. I am concerned and not in support of the 450 million. And that's why I am proposing [indiscernible] A million. I'll run through the reasons for that. First, I think that there remains significant uncertainties and concerns around affordability in our city. And I want to be mindful about overburdening people and adding to the affordability challenges we have as a city. So this is not about whether these items are important or good for our city, it's a balance. It's how much are we

[5:02:14 PM]

talking about. And I think 450 is not the right balance at this point in time, considering where we sit in our community and considering the concerns around affordability in our city. The second thing is that the city has significant active transportation funds that have yet to be spent. Over a hundred million. And we're not going to be ready for the next infusion for a couple of years. A less costly amount now at

3million still allows for significant work prior to the next bond cycle of 2022 or 2024. There's just absolutely no need to put that big a bond on at this point in time. And that's another reason that I think the 450 right now is out of touch with the concerns for affordability in our city, and it's not something that has to be done that high right now. I would also say that this proposal did not go

[5:03:15 PM]

through our city's usual public input processes, which allows the community to weigh in on priorities. It was actually posted with particular items after people had the ability to sign on and speak to it. So we just have not had public input process. And what that normally does for us in our bond process is it allows us to weigh and the public to weigh just how much do we put into -- into transportation and active -- excuse me -- active transportation right now versus other priorities like parks or housing or things like that. So I'm particularly important -- I'm particularly concerned that at 450 million, the amount proposed, eclipses our largest housing bond, and in fact it is higher than the 300 million we just recognized we needed

[5:04:16 PM]

to protect housing as part of our TRE. It is \$150 million more than we just put into affordable housing, at a time when we had concerns in our community and without a public -- without a public input process. I appreciate -- I really, really appreciate all the work of the advocates, and I hate being in the position to say to them that I think this amount is not appropriate because I've always been someone who's been a strong -- in strong support of active transportation. And I still support active transportation. But, to me, it's a matter of fairness. I really have to ask the question about how is it appropriate to earmark this much for transportation at this point in time? Particularly since we can make -- we can make significant progress at a lower amount towards reaching our goals. We can balance that with the concerns that we have

[5:05:17 PM]

around housing, and we can hear the concerns from our community. This is going to be -- at 450, it's two cents on the dollar. And that is just not necessary right now. And so that is why I urge my colleagues to think about this. When we were talking about project connect, we weighed -- you know, we weighed the dollar amount we were going for, and we chose a less costly amount you because we knew what we were trying to achievement we can do the same thing here. We can choose a less costly amount. We can achieve what we need to achieve in terms of building out more multimodal stuff that will give us, you know, more support, more equity, more ability for people to get to the transit system. But we can do it at a much more reasonable level and a level that feels right. I just -- I just have to

[5:06:19 PM]

tell you, like I said, I don't like being in this position because I care about active transportation. I care about sidewalks and trails and bikes. But this just doesn't feel right. It doesn't feel right at all. And particularly since we're now in the position where we're -- we haven't even had a chance to talk to our communities about what they would prefer in terms of the roads we're naming and stuff like that. So, anyway, I just -- I felt like it was important to offer an option for folks and just ask folks to consider, just like we did with our recent considerations around project connect, to consider the possibility of a very significant level. 300 million is a very, very significant level. But in my mind, let's try to do something -- from my perspective, I know that everybody has a

[5:07:20 PM]

different perspective, but the bottom line for me is, when I look at the 300 million that we put in for displacement and for protecting housing in areas, I look at the \$250 million bond we did previously for housing, and now I look that we're saying that we're going to put 450 without public process -- it just doesn't feel right. So anyway, I'll be quiet. I wanted to offer another option for people to consider. I do really, really appreciate and thank the work of our advocates. They worked very hard and tirelessly, and I have no disagreement with them in terms of the importance of these items. It's just not necessary to do it now. >> Mayor Adler: I meant to ask for a second before council member kitchen started through her amendment. I failed to do that. Is there a second to council member kitchen's amendment? Council member harper-madison seconds the kitchen amendment.

[5:08:22 PM]

Further discussion? Council member harper-madison. >> Harper-madison: I know you're the chair and you get to pick who goes, I will go, but I'll just say I think mayor pro tem's hand was up first. There's a lot here, including -- I appreciate this process, I appreciate council member Ellis for bringing it forward and the hard work that her office has been doing to bring this forward, the advocates for bringing this forward. I even appreciate that council member kitchen is making an attempt to make a compromise, based on what she feels is right. But I do want to point out -- and this is absolutely no criticism, but I do want to point out, you specifically said it doesn't feel right, and then you said it's not appropriate timing, and then you said it's not reasonable. And I just want to make sure that we're clear that those are all subjective.

[5:09:23 PM]

Right? And so I just want to point that out. But some of what I'm thinking about this as a whole, especially when I was, you know, give the opportunity to think between the two, the two numbers and the impact, correct me if I'm wrong, but my math made it about a dollar more a month, if we go 450. And if that's the case -- you know, I'm certainly willing to be corrected if that's not the case, but if that's the case, then I think -- I think that the general public will appreciate having the opportunity to spend a dollar more a month to invest in our community in this way. So we're talking about -- if we were to go the \$300 million route, it literally halves the money for the 450 -- in comparison to the \$450 million plan for sidewalks. And I know that we are missing sidewalks all over the city, but I've got to tell you, district 1 is really, really,

[5:10:25 PM]

really -- and that was three "Reallies" intentionally, we are struggling. We have -- all over the city, we have sidewalks with craters. We have urban trails that have collapsed. We have pedestrian bridges that are washed out. If these were pieces of infrastructure used by cars, there's really no doubt that we'd spend hefty resources to fix them asap and not let them go unaddressed for years on end. Historically, we prioritize spending on car transportation beyond anything else. And then we wonder why everyone is stuck in bad traffic. For so many reasons, we need this change. We need to change it fast. Our residents want say, healthier, cleaner, more affordable mobility options. We've been promising them that for a really long time, probably longer than I've been around. Without this proposal, though, we'll surely fall short of the goals we've set for ourselves as a

[5:11:26 PM]

city. Not to mention -- oh, gosh, do we make these promises if we know we're not going to keep them? You know, this -- this plan helps us to really maintain our credibility while also -- most important -- delivering comprehensive investments. That's how I see this plan, as an investment to all parts of our city. In district 1, it could mean badly needed sidewalks, from copperfield to colony park. The residents of pecan park mobile home would no longer be trapped on an aisled serviced by a tiny two-lane road with no safe way to walk to the elementary school just down the street. When it comes to equity, we know about traffic violence and how that attributes dispersion proportionately to black and brown people more. That's the fact. A lot of people live in districts where this bond program would build sidewalks, address those

[5:12:28 PM]

trails, would build bike lanes and safer intersections. But we all know black and brown people, they disproportionately ride the bus. And this bond program increases by more than a factor of six the money we've already committed to projects that make transit faster and more reliable. So folks with disabilities in our community, how much longer do we need to tell them to hold on before we actually get around to filling in the many, many gaps in our sidewalk network. My daughter asked me on a walk the other day, how would a person in a wheelchair get over that? And they couldn't, was the answer. And I felt bad having to tell her that. When it comes to concerns about affordability, I don't know that we as a city can afford to not consider these critical investments. Aside from the jobs they'll create, they'll also give more residency option to shed the burden of costly car ownership, as so eloquently pointed out by our colleague, council member Renteria earlier. We're also not planning to adding to our existing debt service here.

[5:13:29 PM]

Instead, we're authorizing staff to use these bonds as we spend off money. By the end of this six-year program, it's my understanding we're talking about a monthly impact of \$5 for the median homeowner. I'd also say this doesn't get enough public input. Mobility is a great challenge. This funds sidewalks, bicycle, urban trail master plans, vision zero plan, our Austin strategic mobility plan, not to mention -- and this is one that we'd be remiss to not mention -- we're talking about really feeling the pain of covid-19, but one of the things that's going to be, you know, important for us to recognize moving forward is climate reality. We have to talk about the impact of this kind of plan on our climate reality goals and hopes. Ultimately, there's no public input process more definitive than an election. I'm very eager to put this proposal before our voters, and that will be

[5:14:30 PM]

hire opportunity to weigh in on whether or not this is the appropriate way to move forward. This year is a single year. We know that people are thirsty for a change, and they'll be turning out like never before. And I'm confident that our residents will see this package as a perfect complement to project connect and an exciting opportunity to make big strides toward that affordable, equitable, healthy, clean, just, and safe transportation system that we keep promising them. And that's all I had for my commentary. I did, however -- mayor Adler, I think I jumped the gun and I may have seconded council member kitchen's amendment, in which case I would like to offer the opportunity to you to call for a different second. I was raising my hand to speak, not to second. >> Mayor Adler: And I apologize for misgetting that. >> Harper-madison: That's okay. I was trying to get in fast. >> Mayor Adler: You did. You got there real fast. Is there a second to council member kitchen's amendment?

[5:15:32 PM]

Council member tovo seconds it. All right. Continuing on in the discussion. Mayor pro tem Garza. >> Garza: I just wanted to -- council member harper-madison asked it, but could staff explain to us what the difference is in the 3\$00 million bond versus the 450 -- possibly 460? >> Yes, mayor pro tem. We're just bringing over Greg canally, achieve financial officer who will be able to walk through those scenarios. >> Mayor Adler: So that I can understand, there's a be it resolved clause in the kitchen amendment that's in front of us that speaks to funding for Barton springs road improvements. Is that in the base motion, or no?

[5:16:33 PM]

>> Yes. I had updated some language that incorporated in my newest version the language that council member kitchen had proposed for that particular stretch of Barton springs road. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. So it's in front of us by this amendment, by the changes to the whereas clause at the top of this motion sheet, revised before from council member kitchen, so two whereas clauses, and then it's the changes on pages pages 2 and 3. Mr. Canally, did you want to answer the question from mayor pro tem Garza? >> Yes. Sorry. I was getting moved over. If I could just hear the question again about what version of the potential bond you'd like to know [indiscernible] -- >> Garza: The difference between a \$300 million bond and a 450 for the average homeowner. >> Well, looking at that,

[5:17:33 PM]

projecting that out, [indiscernible] Again, each of them would require additional tax rate above our current rate. The \$300 million bond proposal would be about \$48 a year impact on the typical homeowner. A \$450 million would be approximately \$77 a year. >> Garza: Okay. You're going to make me do the math. But I have a calculator. So 48 -- >> That's \$29. >> Garza: Okay. So -- okay. So about \$2.42 a month difference is what my calculator says. Okay. Thank you. Is there any way for you to calculate what an additional -- what 460 would be? >> Mayor pro tem, we --

[5:18:36 PM]

our model is a very large -- looks like very large dollars in quarter-cent increments. Obviously it's going to be a little bit higher if you go up an additional 10 million above whatever number it would be. I would put that in the range of 2 -- it would be in the range of \$3. I'd have to look at that real quickly again. >> Garza: Two to three dollars a year. >> Yes. Again, every quarter-cent, depending on where we are, is maybe nine -- maybe about ten dollars a year. >> Garza: Okay. It looks like about a 20-cent effect on the

240 we just -- okay. And then I had a question, council member kitchen, about the substandard rates part of

[5:19:39 PM]

your amendment. Do you know -- do you know how much of that is for Ross road? It doesn't have -- >> Kitchen: No. I was working off of the -- the staff's proposal. I was working off of two proposals, the staff proposals and the -- and council member Ellis's. So this amount that's in here under substandard road is about -- it's about 4.6 million more than is in council member Ellis's, and it's also -- let's see, I believe it's more than what's in the [indiscernible]. I didn't -- I don't know how the staff had it broke down, so I can't

[5:20:41 PM]

answer your question. I was just using -- if the staff would cover it with the dollars they had and if council member Ellis could cover it with the dollars she had, I was trying to do the same thing and add an additional 4.6 million. >> Garza: Okay. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Further discussion on the kitchen amendment? Council member pool? >> Pool: [Indiscernible] Didn't do them individually because there were some concerns about the amount that we -- >> Mayor Adler: Council member kitchen, would you please move, please? Would you please -- go ahead, council member pool. I'm sorry. >> Pool: Anyway, when we get to voting, I'd like to divide the question with regard the whereas

[5:21:42 PM]

clauses that are in -- anyway, we'll see which way this goes. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Further comment on the kitchen amendment? Council member Ellis. >> Ellis: I've got a question because you and I haven't had a chance to discuss this, council member kitchen, but the added whereas language about the corridor program office and the corridors, is that in a programmatic bucket? And I'm sorry if you explained that and I was just thinking of something else. >> Kitchen: No, I didn't explain it. What I was trying to do was -- I was trying -- what I did is just adopt the language that legal gave me. First, let me just back up to explain what that program is in case folks are not familiar with it. You may be, council member Ellis, I'm not sure. But this is -- the corridor program office has identified about 50 projects that are

[5:22:42 PM]

associated with these corridors, and these are the corridors that we passed as part of a previous bond. So they're all over the city. They include slaughter and north Lamar and south Lamar and Guadalupe, mlk, burnet, and Riverside. So they're pedestrian infrastructure and associated infrastructure, and some people might call them place-making. And so those are -- that's what this refers to. And the whereas is language which is the way that the corridor program office talks about it. The last be it resolved is the way that legal suggested we put it in there. So I did not attach it to a particular bucket because legal didn't have it that way, and I wasn't sure which bucket it should be attached to. So that's why it's in there the way it is. I can tell you that it's

[5:23:43 PM]

estimated that for the corridor office estimates about \$500,000 for each project, so their preference, of course, would be around five million, but this doesn't commit to any particular number of projects or to any particular dollars. It's just intended to make it -- to authorize dollars that could be spent on one or more of those particular projects. >> Ellis: I can appreciate that and certainly want people to have as much as possible. Do you know if this overlaps with what would be in project connect with some of the proposed light rail lines or metro buses or anything that might be built off the TRE? >> Kitchen: Yeah, they do. And they're associated with them, so I think -- I'm not familiar with all of them, but if you just look at the roads, for example, so south Lamar,

[5:24:44 PM]

for example, and north Lamar, north Lamar is Orange line so some of this is along that. South Lamar is the brt area. I don't -- I can't -- I'm sorry, I can't speak to the specific ones. I can ask my staff to try to send that out if you'd like to see the specific programs, but they're ones that have been identified by the corridor office. >> Ellis: I was just curious. I appreciate that, thinking about project connect every time just to make sure I'm looking at everything correctly, but it struck me as that might be in some plan that we just approved or with other corridor programs [indiscernible] With previous plans. So I just kind of wanted to understand those layers a bit better. >> Kitchen: Yeah. These are the kinds of projects that are not funded in other bond programs, but they're complementary to the -- to project connect because they're all along these corridors, and all

[5:25:45 PM]

of these corridors in various ways have either bus rapid transit, I think, or they have -- well, some of them have some rail on them. So -- but -- >> Ellis: And are any of them -- >> Kitchen: I'll ask my staff to send it to you. >> Ellis: Yeah. It will help me understand if any of them could be funded with project connect's plan. >> Kitchen: No, they can't. They're not -- I'm sorry, they're not counted in. The estimates

that we have for project connect do not include these. So... >> Ellis: That's helpful. I appreciate the clarity. >> Mayor Adler: Further discussion of the kitchen amendment? All right. Let's take a vote on the kitchen. Council member alter? >> Alter: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Council member kitchen, would you mute, please? >> Alter: So I came into this discussion with a goal and intention of listening to my colleagues, and I

[5:26:45 PM]

listened to a number of advocates working on this proposal, who I respect and esteem. I think it's clear that these investments are good and should be made. However, I have very real concerns and questions about taking these steps, given the extremely limited amount of time and public engagement process on these proposals. I think we do our best work when we engage the public, as we did on project connect, and while these priorities reflect a lot of public input over various years, the package itself has seen significant change in the last few hours and days. I think for me, it has various financial implications that perhaps with more time I could be comfortable with, but given economic and financial dynamics we have at play and the ways they impact one another, and given the lateness of this proposal and the short timeline for discussion engagement, I'm not confident I'll get to a place this week where I'm comfortable with such a large expenditure. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Further discussion on the kitchen amendment? ?Council member Flannigan.

[5:27:49 PM]

>> Flannigan: I'm also struggling with many of the things that I'm hearing. I'm likely to support council member kitchen's amendment, although less in the substantive new allocations between buckets, mostly that it's just smaller, and I have more questions on the details once we get past council member kitchen's amendment. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Further discussion on the amendment? Mayor pro tem Garza. >> Garza: This -- I agree that -- well, speaking for myself, I have not been able to be as engaged in this conversation because of all the other things going on. And I do have concerns about how quickly the process was. But that all being said,

[5:28:52 PM]

you know, I remember when I created the regional affordability committee, it was because of these affordability concerns and how this jurisdiction by jurisdiction, right, so there's the city asking for bond money and the county and the school district and how, you know, one -- looking at one per -- looking at them one-off, it doesn't seem like a lot. And so it seems -- it's easy to say, well, this is only going to be \$2 a month more, or something like that for the average homeowner, but when you stack those on top of each other, it becomes a lot. And I know that our community is getting uncomfortable and, you know,

especially in a district where families are moving further away from grocery stores and health centers, it's a big concern. But the reality is, we have to invest, and it is -- when I look at my tax bill, the city's portion is one of the

[5:29:52 PM]

smallest. And so I worry when we -- when we get into conversations about burdening our taxpayers because the real burden on our taxpayers is the way our state taxes us and the way over 50% of my -- of what I pay in taxes goes to the school district, and they don't even get all of that, that half of that goes to who -- to not education. And so I -- I would prefer to stay lower, but I also -- but I also know it's important to invest in our community. And there are so many parts of our community that have not seen that investment and have been waiting, and having to explain that to your constituents and saying, but we don't have the funding for that, well, we don't have the funding

[5:30:52 PM]

for that. And I agree there's a risk, there's always a risk that we take, but I -- I'm a little uncomfortable going higher, but I think it's the right thing to do, and I think we they'd to we need to get away from these conversations that it is the city. We can't feed into that it's the city that's creating -- because look at your tax bill. I encourage anybody watching this later, look at your tax bill. Look where your money goes to. Look what you -- what I pay the city feels like a bargain when you do the math. And everything my family gets in pools and libraries and roads and sidewalks and investment, it feels like -- just looking at that portion. Yes, together, it's a lot. So council member kitchen, I really understand where you're coming from, and I appreciate you -- your

[5:31:53 PM]

efforts, but I'm going to -- I'm going to really -- I'm going to go with the higher number that invests in -- I believe invest you have invests in more projects that help many in our community. Lastly, I'll just say we're doing things during this pandemic that we'd never been able to do before. Go on a nightly bike ride, I would never have been able to do that. I was thinking how amazing it would be for us to have a bike lane to be able to do that. Not every part of the city can do that. My neighborhood doesn't have that we stay in our neighborhood because we don't want to go on the main roads because I don't feel safe. And so I really hope that all parts of our community can participate in a multimodal network, and I feel that a larger investment helps us get there. >> Mayor Adler: Council member Casar. >> Casar: I know that

[5:32:53 PM]

we're all trying to get to the best place here, and we all care about sidewalks and vision zero and trails. I honestly feel differently, though, about the process than some other folks might because my -- the process that I feel has just been constantly people so often emailing and calling about how I can't believe there isn't a sidewalk here, and I can't believe there's kids that walk in the gutter over here, in the drainage ditch to get to school, and us doing everything we can to scrape together some pennies, but we can just never get it done. And so while I actually -- I totally understand and could see a path for the smaller amount, being able to get 80 million in sidewalks, as opposed to the 40 million, and the extra money for vision zero, for such -- for just

[5:33:54 PM]

about two dollars more a month six years from now, and frankly an even smaller difference in the first few years, that's why I think I would -- well, that's why I would prefer the larger proposal. I think we're all trying to get to the same place, but I think for that small incremental bit more, we can do so much and we can save future councils and future communities the strain of having to keep asking, why don't we have just some of these basic amenities in our neighborhoods. Actually, back in 2016, a few of us made a push to try to get some more of this sidewalk and vision zero money in. We were trying to strike a balance then, but we couldn't get it all in. And I think we've just been actually in a community process since then, I've been feeling since then, a bit of a hole that hasn't been filled to actually address the vision zero and sidewalk and safe bike lane and safe rides to school needs that I

[5:34:56 PM]

wanted in 2016, and I think this really helps get there. So that's why -- but -- that's why I would go this way. But I think we're really united on the dais in wanting to get this done, and I just don't see that big of a difference between the two. >> Mayor Adler: Council member tovo. >> Tovo: Thank you. Thank you, council member Ellis, for coming forward with this vision and bond language. You know, when I first was contacted by some of the advocates, I was a little surprised, as some of my colleagues have said, we typically talk about bonds for a longer period of time before we ask voters to make decisions about them, we have a process and we have considerations that are raised in the course of that. And it was surprising to me because we know that many in our community right now are struggling financially. They've lost jobs. They've had wages cut.

[5:35:56 PM]

And we're asking them to think of the future and invest in the future. And early this morning we put a measure on the ballot for project connect, and so this -- it just was a surprise to me that we would, at the same time, be asking for bond support for these projects. That is not to say that these aren't critically important projects, as all of my other colleagues have said. Sidewalks in our city are necessary. Urban trails, these are all important and necessary things to fund. So I am -- I am preparing to support putting this on the ballot for voters to decide, even though it was -- again kind of took me by surprise that we would do it at the same time we were asking the voters to make a decision about project connect in the midst of an pandemic crisis for many families in our community. But I think the lower amount that council

[5:36:56 PM]

member kitchen suggested really takes into account these really significant financial circumstances that many find themselves in right now and represents a more middle position, while still, I believe, moving -- asking the voters to weigh in on -- and hopefully support the investment in these important projects. So I'm going to be supporting the amendment. Again, I think it's -- I think it's an important middle ground and one more likely to be supported by the voters. So that's why I'm supporting this amendment. >> Mayor Adler: Council member kitchen. >> Kitchen: Yes, I just want to say -- just want to say that there's no question that these investments are important. And I appreciate everyone's thinking. I just want to make it clear that I recognize the importance of these investments. But we didn't have a conversation about should

[5:37:58 PM]

we be making these investments now? Should we put more investments into housing, for example? We have put so much into transportation in recent years. Every time we put more into transportation, I stop and think, why aren't we putting more into housing? So I just want to tell you where I'm coming from so -- and also respond that I agree with everything that everybody is saying, that these investments are really, really important. But I just feel like we didn't -- we made it real clear, I thought, to the rest of the community that we weren't even going to consider anything else at this time. And so that's why the process bothers me. And the process that -- the level that we're at bothers me because the decision now for 450, if that's what the group is going to do, that impacts what we do in two years or four years. It impacts what's available in the future. So I respect everyone has to make their own

[5:38:58 PM]

decision in this, and that's fine. So I just want -- I wanted to offer an alternative, I feel pretty strongly about it, but I understand that everybody has to make their own decision. So I just -- for me, to me,

going higher now means that I have less opportunity for other things in the future, it didn't allow for a conversation with the community about other important, critical needs, and it is an impact because, you know, we just put -- I think it's 8.75 for project connect, and now we're going to put 2-plus for this, and - anyway. So I feel pretty strongly about it, but everyone -- but I respect everyone's opinion, and so I appreciate considering this amendment. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's take a vote. Those in favor of the kitchen amendment, please raise your hand.

[5:40:02 PM]

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I'm juster we were going to -- mayor, I'm sorry. We were going to separate I. Divide the question. >> Mayor Adler: Divide the question? How would Yo want to divide it? >> Kitchen: Let me explain. I would like to consider the items for the -- the whereases at the front and the amount at the end that relates to the project corridor projects separately, so let's start with the vote on the 300 million, which is the -- that will be the further resolved that says 300 million, then gives you the allocation. I'd like to start with that. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. First we'll consider the 300 million and the change to the allocations, which is what's on page 2, going to the very top of page 3. Those in favor of the

[5:41:06 PM]

amendments, please raise your -- did you want to say something, council member Ellis? >> Ellis: I just wanted to clarify the be it resolved that mentions Barton springs road is also in mine, so if anybody feels they want that section in there, it's in my language. >> Mayor Adler: In fact, I've taken that out because it's already in your motion, so the amendment only asks of the whereas clause at the beginning of page 1, the \$300 million change, and the allocation changes on page 2 and 3, and the be it resolved at the end of page 3. >> Ellis: Okay. Thank you for that clarification. >> Mayor Adler: What is before us now is the 300 million and the change to the allocations. Those in favor, please raise your hand. It is kitchen, pool, Flannigan, and tovo. Those opposed? It's the balance of the dais. >> Alter: I'm abstaining, mayor. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Council member alter abstains. Should we take a vote on the balance of the kitchen amendment? >> Tovo: So, mayor, does that make it six-five?

[5:42:08 PM]

Or six-four -- >> Mayor Adler: Six-four- one. >> Kitchen: -Four-one okay. The second part is allowing for dollars to be spent on these corridor projects. >> Mayor Adler: So what we're now on, the whereas clauses and be it resolved, at the very beginning and the very end. That's the amendment, those in favor of the kitchen amendment, please raise your hand. Kitchen, pool, Flannigan, and tovo. Anyone abstaining? >> Alter: I'm abstaining. [Audio is cutting out.] >> Mayor Adler: Council member alter

abstains. Those opposed, please raise your hand. It's the balance of the dais. Same vote. >> Kitchen: Okay. So can I ask a question? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Kitchen: So these are

[5:43:08 PM]

the 50 projects that are in many of your areas, and they're for five million dollars, at max, or some of them will be \$500,000. So I understand that the vote was against including them in the motion. Is that correct? >> Mayor Adler: That's correct. Does anybody have any further debate or discussion? We're back to the base motion from council member Ellis. Any discussion or amendments? Council member Casar. >> Casar: [Indiscernible] I would add in from the law department the language that relates to the two properties on I-35. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Casar: Just wondering if that's been added or not. I would want to add that, and I imagine that that's friendly and not objectionable to anyone that we have -- but I don't know if that got added to the base after executive session or not. >> We will add it.

[5:44:09 PM]

I don't know if Lela has had the opportunity to steak the language in there yet. I hope she's coming over, but if not, we can certainly just clarify what it was and pretend that it is in there. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Council member Casar, you want to describe what the amendment does? It says that none of this money will be used on the project that is the redevelopment of the home Depot site. >> Casar: That's right. We already have passed -- passed a resolution that outlines four or five different funding mechanisms for that site, so I'm not including it in this because I actually think that it is better, more certainty for the project for it not to be a part of this. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Is there any objection to that amendment being added? Hearing none, that amendment is added. Any further discussion on the Ellis motion? Mayor pro tem Garza.

[5:45:12 PM]

>> Garza: I'd like to offer an amendment, and it was sent by catie powers, I believe. You might have to search for it because we have -- we get a lot of thank yous in our inbox. I can look to see what time it was sent if that's helpful. >> Mayor Adler: 5:01 P.M. , Mayor, I've got pulled up. >> Garza: 5:01 P.M. So this changes the -- of course if council member Ellis would consider it friendly -- changes the 450 million to 460 million and the -- and the reason -- the reason for that is, there in council member Ellis's base motion, there was 43 million allocated to substandard streets, and then it listed prioritization of certain

[5:46:16 PM]

streets [indiscernible] To this, asking questions, it appears that -- so we were able to pay for the interim study of Ross road with some previous bond money, but we've still been trying to find a way to finish it out. The difficulty with Ross road, it's a mixture of jurisdictions, city and county. It didn't spell out what would be committed to Ross, understanding that, of course, we always are trying to find other revenue, other ways to fund this. As many of you recall, many residents of del valle reached out -- I'm sorry, I should have just made the amendment, mayor. >> Mayor Adler: Is there a second to the Garza amendment? Is there any objection to the Garza amendment going in? There's no objection -- [indiscernible] >> Garza: The build-out

[5:47:16 PM]

of Ross road, it's my understanding, is about 50 million. There were many people in del valle that called us during our budget hearing to ask that we include that in the budget. I had meetings with those constituents to explain that these are not -- these giant projects, unfortunately, are not ones that we can usually add to -- to just our general fund. We have to have these big bond programs. And so that's why I'm specifically asking for that amount because the county is going to have to help us, and obviously those other opportunities to be able -- and it allows money for those -- because just Ross plus Johnny Morris would exceed the 43 million. So that's my reasoning behind that amendment. And as Mr. Canally said, it would add, I think, two or three dollars per year, or approximately,

[5:48:19 PM]

for the average homeowner. And so del valle has often felt very neglected, and I think this is an opportunity to invest in that -- growing very quickly and exploding in growth. Many of our puds, new puds are out there, and so I would appreciate the support to get Ross road fully funded. >> Mayor Adler: And I think I called for a second, but I don't know if I called out a name. Council member harper-madison was the second on that. Continuing the discussion on the Garza amendment, council member Flannigan. >> Flannigan: Thanks, mayor. Mayor pro tem, when I pull up the preliminary engineering report [indiscernible] It shows Johnny Morris as 8.3 million. And like you said, Ross was 50. Are you seeing the same numbers that I'm seeing? >> Garza: Yes. >> Flannigan: Okay. You mentioned the mixed

[5:49:21 PM]

jurisdiction on Ross. Has there been -- like how -- what are we -- what are you suggesting in your amendment for the part that is in the etj? >> Garza: The county's portion of the road? >> Flannigan: That's right. >> Garza: I would -- I'm hoping that the county will put in money as well to be able to finish

-- to get us to the 50 million. >> Flannigan: The 50 million appears to be both the north and south sections of Ross, but your amendment is just the north section of Ross. So the 30-something million seems like a lot for half of the project. >> Garza: I guess I'd have to ask staff that it was my understanding from [indiscernible] To pierce was 50 million. Are you saying that's not the case? >> Flannigan: Yeah. When I look at the cost estimate in the preliminary engineering report, it says the Ross road project is 50.6, that's both north of

[5:50:22 PM]

Pearce and south of Pearce. >> Garza: Okay. Is staff available? >> Yes, council member. This is [indiscernible] City manager, Rob Spillar, director of ATB is in a meeting, and I will ask him to speak to this. >> Hi. This is Robert Spillar. So in our proposal to council that we sent forward to staff, we included 50.6 million in needs on Ross road. What I don't know is -- is if -- that would not include -- let me state that, it would not include the county's piece. So the county would be in addition to the 50.6. And so we would have covered the entire Ross road within the city limits, if there's two pieces north and south in the city, that would have been in that investment proposal.

[5:51:22 PM]

>> Garza: So the 50 million does cover from 71 to Pearce? I'm confused. >> Yeah -- hold on a second. >> Garza: Because we were told by staff that it included everything, including Travis county's portion. >> I'll have to take a look at that real quick. We're not allowed to spend outside our city limits without some kind of partnership with the county so I'll have to find that out for you. If you'll give me a few minutes, I will. >> Garza: I'm not asking to spend outside our city limits, I'm just wanting to understand if the 50 includes the county's portion. That's why I'm not asking for the 50, I was asking for 35. And it didn't delineate, of the 50, to my understanding, of the 50, what was the city's -- what was the city's amount and what was the county's amount. >> Mayor Adler: Council

[5:52:23 PM]

member Casar? >> Casar: [Indiscernible] The mayor pro tem's motion, I'm not saying in favor or disagreement with anybody on the dais, but just observing, some more change, continued change at the county and at the county commissioners court, I hope that we can start getting to a place where we recognize that the city of Austin is largely within Travis county, and I would -- I think that as we talk about this, we should continue to remind folks that it doesn't make good sense for Austin, Travis county taxpayers to not get as much in county transportation money. And it shouldn't matter whether Ross road -- how much of Ross road is in or out of the city of Austin, Travis county coming and participating

makes sense because all of it is in Travis county. So I hope that if we pass this and there's a gap, that the county makes it up, whether it's in the city or not, because we are in Travis county, largely.

[5:53:24 PM]

Of course there's also the Williamson county component of the city, as council member Flannigan does a good job of reminding us. It doesn't make sense to me, and I hope that message gets to the county, for them not to participate in the inside the city stuff. >> Flannigan: Council member Casar, somebody has got to remind everybody. It's entirely up to me to do that. >> Casar: I have no problem with the reminder. >> Flannigan: Since you brought it up, since you brought it up, there are road projects in the city of Austin, in Williamson county where Williamson county paid the bill. That can be done and it should be done. >> Casar: And that's -- >> Flannigan: Yeah. So to clarify my question, mayor pro tem, is the 35 million, then you say 71 to Pearce, it says a minimum of 35, so we might have accidentally -- what might have been written is money we can't even expect. >> Garza: I understand

[5:54:24 PM]

it's a question Mr. Spillar can help us. >> I just verified. It is 71 to Pearce and Pearce to Tom valley, so it's the two parts. It includes both that inside the city and the county, so we would form a partnership with the county to complete that work. And if it does require the full \$50.6 million, council member. >> Garza: Okay. So then what -- I think the language that needs to be fixed is that it would say -- it would be the engineering study of both the north and south portions of Ross road. >> Yes. >> Garza: So I would -- that's what I would change my amendment to. >> Mayor Adler: You said the amendment -- what's the change again? >> Garza: Instead of saying from state 71 to Pearce, it would be part of the April 15th, 2019

[5:55:25 PM]

study -- both the north and south portions of Ross road. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any objection to that change to the amendment? Hearing none, that change is made. Any further discussion on the Garza amendment? Council member kitchen. >> Kitchen: I just want to get and. So is this going into the section on substandard streets? Is that right? >> Garza: Yes. >> Kitchen: Okay. And so the amount in substandard streets is 43 million? Is that right? >> Garza: I am -- [multiple speakers] >> Garza: I amended it to 53. That's what the amendment does. >> Kitchen: Okay. Oh, because you're adding, you're not taking away from the other, you're adding. >> Garza: Yes. >> Kitchen: So I just want to understand what we're seeing here. So out of the 53 million, it's Ross road

[5:56:25 PM]

[indiscernible] Cooper lane, sss road and [indiscernible] Crossing road; right? Is that right? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Kitchen: Is the thinking that the 50 million will get to all of these? 53 million, I'm sorry. >> No, I don't think the 47 got to it nor the 43. >> Kitchen: Okay. Is the language where it says -- okay, I think we answered this earlier, where it says including, so there are other substandard streets that could be considered? Is that right? Am I understanding correctly? >> Garza: Yes. I think it prioritizes the ones that are listed, but it doesn't preclude other substandard roads from being funded in that bucket, is my understanding. >> Kitchen: Okay. Well, then my question for staff is -- and I just don't know the answer to this, do we have a priority of substandard roads? And are all of these on

[5:57:26 PM]

the priority list? >> Council member, we completed a series of turns for substandard streets. Council has indicated that there are several that we wanted to look at in terms of the eastern crescent, and those are the ones that we provided in our original proposal. As others have common, we will obviously work with council to prioritize those to meet the needs as best as possible, focusing on the pedestrian and bicycle pieces of it first. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any further discussion on the Garza amendment? Let's take a vote. Those in favor of the Garza amendment, please raise your hand. >> Kitchen: I'm still asking questions. >> Mayor Adler: I thought you were done. >> Kitchen: No. So -- okay. So I just -- I wanted to make sure I'm sorry, I wasn't quite clear.

[5:58:28 PM]

All of these are priority substandard roads, is that what you said? >> Yes, ma'am, I believe so. There's one that may still need a P.E.R., but clearly it would fit the category of sub standards. >> Kitchen: Which is the one that still needs a P.E.R.? >> I don't have that list in front of me. But I believe (indiscernible). >> Kitchen: Well, I'm just asking that, because I'm wanting to make sure that we're looking at priorities. There are a lot of substandard roads. And I'm familiar with Ross, so I know that's a priority. I'm not as familiar with the other ones. And so -- >> Councilmember, it's knuckles road that we don't have a P.E.R. Yet on. >> Kitchen: Okay. So this would be the funding to do a P.E.R., is that right? >> We would need to do a P.E.R.

[5:59:28 PM]

Before we could even define what knuckles crossing would be. >> Kitchen: Okay. Okay. The only reason I'm asking that question is I'm wanting to make sure that we are -- you know, we have a lot of roads in

the city that are substandard, including Bradshaw lane which is another one in district 5, which is in southeast Austin, and it's not listed here. And so I'd like to make an amendment to add it. I don't know if people would entertain that. But I just want to make sure that we're following our priorities as a city, and Ross road, as I said before, I just wasn't as familiar with the other ones. So I'm wondering what would happen if -- maybe this is -- for this set of dollars, if there was a road that was a higher priority, then this other

[6:00:30 PM]

list, does this mean that all of these other roads have to be addressed before we can address any other road? Let me just give you an example. >> Is that question to me? I'm sorry. >> Yes. >> Oh. >> Kitchen: Yeah. >> I'm working without the benefit of actually seeing the amendment. >> Kitchen: Okay -- >> -- With the list of roads, I believe we would be obliged to follow those and do those first. >> Kitchen: That answered my question. >> Okay. >> Mayor Adler: Okay? Any further discussion on the Garza amendment? Take a vote. Those in favor of the Garza amendment, raise your hand. Those opposed. Flannigan voting no. Any abstentions? Kitchen and alter abstaining

[6:01:32 PM]

from voting. The amendment passes. Now back to the main item (indiscernible). Councilmember Flannigan? >> Flannigan: Councilmember kitchen, if you would mute -- there's a key stroke we're all hitting and muting and unmuting us by accident. I didn't talk about this during mayor pro tem's amendment because it wasn't substantive to her amendment to that point, but all but knuckles is -- was a 2016 project, in the bond in 2016. Knuckles was not. Cooper is interesting, it's the line between districts 5 and 2. And if I'm not mistaken we just did a couple of zoning on cooper. We were talking about the level of density on that road, that we

[6:02:32 PM]

might want to contemplate bond funding the road's improvement and then refunding the bond with the transportation fees that come out of those redevelopments. I think I'm remembering this right, that it was on cooper, and there was some sf 6 that was being zoned on that street, two or three lots in a row. So in that event, rob, can you help me understand how the impact fees, and hopefully soon street impact fees, but in the future, how those -- what is the current process or policy about using funds collected to refund bonds that were spent improving a road prior to a project's construction? >> So I can only speak with regards to the street impact fees, once they're passed, we can pay back bonds if moneys are

[6:03:35 PM]

in -- if we build something, a roadway improvement, a roadway capacity improvement within, I believe it's a five-year period of that construction, we can collect moneys to pay ourselves back for those debts. On that specific project. In a sense, it's like borrowing money to go ahead and build it in advance so we can benefit from the benefit, so that improvement or that investment, and then pay ourselves back as new development starts to help pay that cost. And so that can be part of our payback concept. >> Is that only applicable under future contemplated street impact fees? Does it apply to the process used now to collect impact fees from developments? >> I don't know. I would ask that -- if that's an answer you'll need right now, I

[6:04:35 PM]

need to go asking. >> Flannigan: I don't need the answer right now, I'm just posing the question. For that reason, colleagues, I can get behind some of these components, because I think there's probably some good explanation, or some good basis -- rob, will you mute? >> Yes. >> Flannigan: Thank you. I think the same might apply to storm water infrastructure, or other things, where we need to build a better system, and then as development occurs, they can refund the bonds and then everybody kind of gets ahead. There are parts of it that make sense to me. What doesn't make sense to me is the particular projects that were included in this list. You know, I have a substandard street from district 6 that was in the 2016 bond, Rutledge spur, that primarily serves affordable housing. I have one current and one planned foundation communities project on Rutledge spur, and they've been asking for improvements to that road

[6:05:36 PM]

because it's having a pretty deleterious impact to their housing development. As you can imagine in my district, it's not that easy to find affordable housing. The preliminary engineering report for Rutledge spur says 3.7 million. Not that long of a street but it provides a vital connection off of a highway for both pedestrians and cyclists, that is not that far from the lake line station, which under project connect under TRE is going to have better red line service. So I'm not going to make an amendment because I think it's clear I'm not going to support what we're doing here, but I just want to make the point that without having a bond process like we normally have, where every councilmember is appointing somebody to it, and conversations get to be had, big parts of the city are left out of the conversation. And I'm really uncomfortable with it, because, you know, this is being described as an active transportation bond. But there are tens of millions

[6:06:37 PM]

of dollars for road projects in this bond as well, which may help. Some people may vote for it. But that's not what I heard from the advocates. What I heard is we want you to build sidewalks and bike lanes. There's money for sidewalks and bike lanes here, but there's also money for other stuff. But it wasn't a robust conversation. I'm pretty uncomfortable with it. Furthermore, for me, it shines a light on how great project connect is. The two years of work, the broad city-wide effort, the multiple town halls in every district, the fact that we're using a tax rate election which is, like I've said, the most fiscally responsible way to build major infrastructure, because it doesn't just build it, it ensures its long-term maintenance. Bonds don't do that. Bonds let you build it and then you've got to hope that you've got money later to maintain it. We had an opportunity to include at least some of this in project connect, and there wasn't the

[6:07:37 PM]

will to do that. That's fine. I don't -- I mean, I feel like we often get ourselves -- and I say this a lot -- where we all agree saying, that thing is great, we all like sidewalks, and improve substandard roads. Then the devil's in the details. And I just can't with these details. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem Garza. >> Garza: Is Mr. Spiller still there? >> Yes, ma'am. >> Garza: Hi. I just wanted to -- you said something about prioritizing sidewalks and bike lanes. I just wanted to make sure that the intent was clear, and that's why it's specifically referencing that engineering study, that the intent was clear it's not just sidewalks, it's the whole improvements as directed by that engineering study. I just wanted to make sure my intent was there >> Thank you for correcting me.

[6:08:37 PM]

>> Garza: Okay. I didn't mean to correct you, I just wanted to -- >> Yeah, I know. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: You know, I appreciate what councilmember Flannigan said, and that's part of where my unease is with this. So I am going to make an amendment. And I don't know if -- you know, if it will pass or not. But I'm very uncomfortable with the way we're picking and choosing the names that go in here. So I'm going to make an amendment that we include in the bucket substandard streets, Rutledge and Bradshaw, also have a substandard street in my district. And I would ask anyone else who has a substandard street to add that street also. Because I think these need to be considered, since we didn't have a bond process to do it, I think

[6:09:38 PM]

they need to be considered by our staff. And so I don't want it to just say, including improvements and not allowing our staff to have some discretion. So, you know, I just feel like I need to make the amendment. So I move that we add Rutledge and Bradshaw to the substandard streets. >> Mayor Adler: Adding Rutledge and Bradshaw. Is there a second to that? Councilmember tovo seconds it. Councilmember Flannigan? >> Flannigan: Councilmember kitchen, has there been a preliminary report on Bradshaw? I'm unfamiliar with that project. >> Kitchen: Well, that's a good question, and I should ask Mr. Spiller, I know there needs to be one. So it might be like knuckles crossing in the sense that it needs one. I know it's substandard. But I don't know if they've done

[6:10:40 PM]

the actual preliminary. Can you comment on that, Mr. Spiller? >> I would suggest that maybe using the list of substandard streets from the 2016 bond might be the better approach. There's plenty of those streets in your district, councilmember. Almost all of them. But that list is Brody circle, 1626, Johnny Morris, Ross, and Rutledge. And those have all gone for bond process and done the preliminary report. So it would make more sense to move on with construction. >> Kitchen: That would be fine. Could Mr. -- Mr. Spiller, could you explain what the status of Bradshaw is? I remember it being in the 2016, but I might be misremembering it. So can you just speak to that? >> Yes, councilmember. My staff said that a P.E.R. Has not been completed on Bradshaw, and it is also a street that blends over into the county in places. It's about \$500,000 to do a

[6:11:43 PM]

P.E.R. Typically on any street that needs one. >> Kitchen: Okay. So maybe I would change my amendment to include all the 2016 listed substandard streets, and also to allow the P.E.R.S that are needed for knuckles crossing and for Bradshaw. >> Mayor Adler: I'll come back in a second for you to make that amendment. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember harper-madison? >> Harper-madison: Thank you. I think it might be appropriate -- well, I'll go ahead and say my piece. What I was going to say was, I wasn't on the council at the time, but certainly I heard the fallout and some of the subsequent conversations around kind of those similar concerns about a lack of public inclusion in the process in 2016. So I would be curious to go back and see how my colleagues fared in that bond election. The one thing that I'm really

[6:12:45 PM]

just very concerned about as this conversation has taken this turn, you know, a lot of the conversations we've been having as of late (indiscernible). And I know that in 2016 that council splid that sidewalk funding evenly among districts despite the fact that some of our districts have, you know, the highest

and super high priority sidewalk needs. I know that these substandard roads -- [background noise]. >> Mayor Adler: You need to mute. >> Harper-madison: I am very worried about losing sight of the fact that to some degree, I know we will have to prioritize part of the city that have historically underinvested in. I think that's going to be a part of these processes. And that's how I see this. And so I just want us to be very

[6:13:46 PM]

careful not to lose sight of some of the things that we've committed to in the last several weeks of deliberation, and consideration, about right sizing things, and about reconciling historic disinvestment. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen, do you want to withdraw your (indiscernible). >> Kitchen: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you, mayor. >> Mayor Adler: Do you want to withdraw your amendment so we can make a different one? >> Kitchen: I just want to replace it. Can't I just do that? >> Mayor Adler: Does anybody have any objection to councilmember kitchen withdrawing her amendments? Hearing none, it's withdrawn. Councilmember kitchen, can you make another amendment? >> Kitchen: Yes, I want to amend adding to the substandard street bucket the 2016 list of substandard streets, but keeping

[6:14:48 PM]

the knuckles crossing road which needs the P.E.R., and adding Bradshaw for a P.E.R. And then I wanted to speak to -- the only reason -- >> Mayor Adler: Hold on a second. Let's see if there's a second to the amendment first. Is there a second to the amendment? Councilmember pool seconds the amendment. Councilmember kitchen? >> Kitchen: I just want to explain my thinking. Because this is a -- I want to give the flexibility to staff to consider all of those, understanding that it needs to be done in priority order. And we know that Ross road, for example, is probably the top priority. I think staff has already mentioned that. But if we don't list them all here, then we're not giving the staff the flexibility to do it in priority order. And councilmember harper-madison, I hear what you're saying. That's why we have established -- that's why we have established prioritization

[6:15:49 PM]

methods. So for example, under sidewalks, we have high priority sidewalk segments and things like that. And I think our staff has some mechanism for determining priority for substandard streets. And I think equity needs to be a component of that prioritization. If it's not, it should be. But I think our staff does include it. So regardless, I just think that we should add the names of the rest of these streets, just to allow the flexibility that they can be addressed should there be sufficient dollars. Or should there be a way to leverage the dollars. >> Mayor Adler: Kitchen's made an amendment. Is there any further

discussion? Let's take a vote. Those in favor of the kitchen amendment, please raise your hand. Kitchen, pool and tovo. Those opposed? Mr. Flannigan. Those opposed, raise your hand? The balance of the dais.

[6:16:50 PM]

>> (Indiscernible) I'm abstaining because I'm uncomfortable with the whole process. >> Mayor Adler: The amendment does not pass. Next item. >> Councilmember kitchen, please mute. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. We're now back again to the item number 11 as moved by councilmember Ellis. Councilmember pool. >> Pool: Thanks, mayor. So the original resolution that you brought, councilmember Ellis, was for 750 million, is that right? >> Ellis: I believe it's a return with options. The advocate did want 750 million. >> Pool: I wanted to know, because we've heard about Ross road, and we've heard about substandard streets in other parts of town and the lack of equity in the spending, which is a huge concern to all of us. I want to know if somebody could help us with what projects we're on that \$750 million

[6:17:53 PM]

proposition, which ones are not on the 450 million that you got, councilmember Ellis. >> Ellis: Since staff has not worked that up, I'm not sure there is a particular list for what the advocates had wanted, unless one of them has sent it around. >> Pool: So we don't -- usually we have a list of what the projects are. That's how we come up with the dollar figure. I mean, do we have a list of projects that gave us the 750 million, and then it was culled and shortened, and then the buckets were rearranged for different amounts in different buckets. What was left? >> Ellis: There was more off of the city plans and estimates. Because we have estimates of high priority. (Indiscernible) School, urban trails is in 1 and 2, those are the plans that the estimates were built off of. So in Gina's original memo back,

[6:18:57 PM]

it did not include the 750 million with the options, or list of the very specific sidewalks, compartmentalized into each one of those plans. >> Pool: You didn't have a list of projects that were then cut? It was -- is that correct? >> Ellis: Right. We didn't work from 750 million to begin with. On the policy and paperwork side. >> Pool: That's -- okay. So again, here's where we're falling short of not having our standard process to go through. We don't know where we started. We have a number, we don't know what was in the number. So we don't know what isn't going to be included if we get to 450. Now, we had some additions to 450, so now we're up to 460 because of Ross road. And councilmember kitchen has some concerns about streets in

[6:19:59 PM]

her district. And I hear those concerns, and am not sure why we would deny those her projects, too. So this is all a little bit too confusing, and I'm thinking at this point I'm going to have to abstain on this whole proposition. I will put it on a ballot, but I'm -- you know, I will vote to put it on a ballot, but I'm going to have to abstain on the dollar figure, because it doesn't seem to have any firm foundation. It still feels like we are pulling numbers out of the air. We don't have projects to back it up. So mayor, just as an advance notice, I'll be abstaining on the amount. Only agree to put it on the ballot so the community can have their say which I think is appropriate. >> Mayor Adler: Let's go ahead then and take the vote. All in favor of item number 11, please raise your hand. Those opposed. Flannigan voting no. Those abstaining.

[6:20:59 PM]

It's pool, alter, and kitchen. So with a vote of 7-1-3, it passes. That gets us to item -- item number 11 passes. That gets us to item number 10. Councilmember Ellis, do you want to move passage of item number 10? I guess at this point it needs to change to reflect the \$460 million. >> Ellis: So we are at 460. Okay. In addition to passage of this amendment, I move that council authorize the city manager and law department to make necessary changes to the ordinance calling the bond election, to reflect this amendment to include the dollar amount adopted by council for this bond proposition, and to fill in the financial information necessary to comply with the bond law requirements for this ordinance. And the amount that would be put into the ballot language would be \$460 million.

[6:22:01 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Is there a second to this motion? Councilmember Renteria seconds the motion. Any discussion? Councilmember kifen? >> Kitchen: I'm going to go ahead and bring my amendment. And my amendment is to replace the dollar amount with the 300 million. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen moves to replace (indiscernible). Is there a second to the motion? Councilmember tovo seconds that. Further discussion? Those in favor of that amendment, raise your hand. Pool, kitchen and tovo. Those opposed, please raise your hand. Councilmember Flannigan, how do you vote? >> Flannigan: I'm abstaining. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Three nos, one abstention -- >> I'm abstaining. >> Mayor Adler: Two abstentions, Flannigan and alter. It does not pass. Okay?

[6:23:02 PM]

I guess that's to Ellis item 10. Let's take a vote. Yes, councilmember alter? >> Alter: I just wanted to say something before we voted, if I could. >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Alter: So I'm going to abstain on putting this on the ballot, and I want to make it clear that I wholeheartedly support making progress on these priorities and I want these investments to be made. Many, many people who I respect and admire have worked on this, and I want to thank them for this work. This is a lot of a list of projects. For me because the proposal has only been released in the last two weeks, and significant changes were made in the last hours and days, there is no way to consider this seriously with my constituents and staff. I haven't taken the time to really engage with my constituents, get their concerns and take those perspectives into

[6:24:02 PM]

my vote and potential changes I might suggest. I don't mean this to disparage the hard work done on the item, which I know reflects years of hard work, but this specific package is one where the details have only really just been surfaced in recent days and hours and I cannot vote to advance it today, given that an insufficient amount of time was available for me to speak with my constituents, for them to speak to us as a council and for us to understand the fiscal implications. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Go ahead -- councilmember Flannigan? >> Flannigan: Thank you. And I share a lot of that sentiment. I want to add one thing for my part. I'm excited to see project connect be on the ballot, and I'm going to spend time educating my district about the merits, and the details of that proposal. This proposal, I have issues with, for the reasons I've outlined. But I do want to make a

[6:25:03 PM]

commitment to my colleagues that are urging this proposal, that I will, as I have always been, be a focused and passionate advocate for equity in the implementation of these dollars, if they are voter approved. There are elements of the contract that I worry are not strong enough to ensure that, and so for as long as I sit on this dais, I will ensure that every dollar spent is done through the strongest equity lens that we have. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember pool? >> Pool: Yeah, I don't think this is ready to go today. And so while I do want to see this on the ballot and I think we have two more votes on this, I'm going to abstain on this first reading of this resolution. And I want -- as councilmember Flannigan just said, I'm looking -- and also my other colleagues, I think everybody is saying, we want to ensure the equity on this and I also want to make sure that the right projects are on this list and we actually know what projects are

[6:26:07 PM]

included. So that will be abstention for me on this first read. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar? >> Casar: I have a question, because if there's seven votes and it passes on all three readings, my question

for anyone on the dais is, would we take this vote differently if it was in all three readings? >> Mayor Adler: This could be the last shot. Vote. >> Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: Yeah, I am now at the point where having watched -- now we're -- several of us expressed concern about the size. There was an attempt two, now both failed, to go with a lower amount as a middle position, those failed. There was a successful effort to put an additional road in, for an additional amount. Councilmember kitchen came forward with another substandard

[6:27:08 PM]

road, which was voted down. I am now at the point where I'm not ready to support this today. And I am also going to abstain, and so we will need to come back. I think that we as a council need to learn to work together on these issues, and that's going to mean taking some -- working a little harder to get to a place where we can get more support on some of these issues. I was prepared to support this, I preferred the lower amount, I was willing to move forward and put this on the ballot. At this point now I'm really going to need to reflect on this. So I am also abstaining on this final vote. I hope to be able to support it on a second vote -- on a second or third reading. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: I, too, I'm -- I agree with my colleagues. It does pain me to be in this

[6:28:10 PM]

position. I'm going to have to abstain now. I don't feel heard. The fact that I could make a couple of amendments that don't impact this at all, in terms of others' ability to get the roads that they want in their districts, and to have that turned down, just makes this process that much more troubling. I'm very, very troubled by this process. We need to work together. We have -- we've done such a great job, wonderful job working together on the budget earlier, and on project connect and I don't see why we can't do that this time. Instead, we are not listening to each other. And so I'm going to have to abstain. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember harper-madison.

[6:29:11 PM]

>> Harper-madison: I just want to respond to the last couple of comments. I have a great deal of respect for both councilmember tovo and councilmember kitchen. I just want to say I don't feel like we're not making the attempt to work together. I feel like sometimes we're just not going to agree. I feel like sometimes our goals are just going to be different. And that means, you know, I'm going to fight for what I believe is the appropriate path forward, and so are you. That doesn't necessarily imply any lack of willingness to fight. I was hesitant to say it earlier, because, I mean, I didn't want to run the risk of being subversive. But, you know, there was something that was said earlier about affordability, and I just --

especially in housing. I just keep thinking, well, we can use other tools to pursue our affordability goals. You know, such as reforming our

[6:30:12 PM]

land development code to allow more market rate housing in all parts of town. But I didn't want it to appear as though I was attempting to be, you know, adversarial. That's certainly not my intention. So I just want to make sure that nobody feels like I'm not listening to what they said, or not interested in working collaboratively. I just don't agree with the path forward that you see as appropriate. And I hope that that's okay. I hope that we're allowed to just not agree sometimes. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem Garza. >> Garza: Thank you for that, councilmember harper-madison. I wanted to say something similar, in that to me this isn't that-we're not working together, this is just disagreements on the path forward. And to be fair, councilmember kitchen, your additions on the substandard roads weren't even

[6:31:12 PM]

in your amendment. So it's -- I think it's disingenuous to say you don't feel heard when they weren't even included in yours. So I also -- I have a question. And so if there are six votes, that creates a situation where we're coming back tomorrow, and then Friday, is that correct? To get another six and another six? >> Mayor Adler: Tomorrow is Friday. >> Garza: Oh, that's right. >> Mayor Adler: Yeah, I know, some weeks are like that. But we would post the meeting tomorrow for Monday. In case we didn't have a seventh vote tomorrow. We would have the option to go Monday. I don't know that with this we would need to do that, but I think we would set it up that way. We'll get advice from counsel. >> Garza: So if the votes were -- it would be 6-6-6, or

[6:32:16 PM]

6-6-7, would get us to whatever we need. So -- >> Mayor Adler: (Indiscernible) >> Mayor pro tem, if I might. I will vote yes to move this along. There's no reason to force everybody to come back multiple times. >> Garza: I was going to say, there was a zoning case where I was against it, but I didn't want the homeowners to have to come back simply because -- to make this principled stance that I was against it. And I changed my vote so that we could move on from that. So I would just -- I know people are upset. I want to make clear, this is purely a disagreement on a path forward. I think we all want the same things. We all want affordability. We all want transparency. We all want all that. But I would plead with my colleagues to let us be done with this vote today.

[6:33:18 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you, councilmember Flannigan. Councilmember kitchen? >> Kitchen: I just want to say one thing. You know, I apologize if my words were not more carefully spoken. What I was trying to say is, I just don't understand, and perhaps we just need opportunity for more conversation. I just don't understand why the amendments that I put forward, and yes, mayor pro tem, I know they weren't in the original, but you have to try to get what you can, if you can't get what you want in the original. And so I just don't understand why amendments that took nothing away from the projects that are in here. And did not reduce the dollars for any of the projects that are in here. I don't understand why those were not passed.

[6:34:25 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Ellis, there was a version 2 of the language that you had posted for this ballot. Is that the language that you were moving? >> Ellis: Let me double-check. Yes. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Ellis: Yes, that's correct. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. It's been moved and seconded. Any further discussion? Yes, mayor pro tem? >> Garza: One last attempt. Councilmember kitchen, if your substandard roads were included, I'm curious if that would change your opinion on the final package? >> Kitchen: Well, I think we're past that now. I feel like I have to abstain. I appreciate you asking that. But you don't need my vote anyway, you're going to go forward. But I appreciate you asking.

[6:35:25 PM]

But I don't want to draw this out further. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar? >> Casar: It's been a really hard set of months for all of us, and a really long week, I think. And I think we all hope that we can get the sidewalks and bike lanes built, and I know that it's just been hard to figure out the path. I also want to recognize the work of all the councilmembers on this, including you councilmember kitchen, and then councilmember Ellis. And I know your staff have been working on this really hard. So I just want to recognize that work for the city, from all of us, and (indiscernible). >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: Mayor pro tem, thank you for the offer to include the substandard roads. I would like to make the

[6:36:28 PM]

amendment koub kitchen did earlier. If you can remind me of your language. And then I am prepared to vote for it today. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember kitchen, what was your amendment? >> Kitchen: The wording was to include in that bucket the substandard roads that were included in the 2016 bond. And also to -- but then also to do the P.E.R. For knuckles crossing road and for Bradshaw >>

Mayor, I think that would require a reconsideration of the prior items. That was in the contract, not the ballot language. >> Mayor Adler: It's going to require us to go back and do that. >> Kitchen: You're right. Sorry. >> Mayor Adler: I'll commit to vote for that change. Councilmember tovo.

[6:37:32 PM]

Councilmember Renteria? >> Renteria: Yeah, mayor, I wanted to support that. You know, I, too, didn't find out about it until just two weeks ago. And I immediately went with a really alarmed feeling -- you know, I had the feeling that it might kind of interfere with the project connect. You know, I was very concerned about that. But I went and talked to other people, and I finally was able to get assurance that it was going to work, it's going to pass for project connect. That there is a good possibility that it will pass. So, you know, I didn't put in an amendment and all that, and I'm willing to accept the 460. You know, when we had the path bond election and we had the sidewalk, we were trying to put

[6:38:37 PM]

the most of the sidewalk in a safe path to school in district 1. Unfortunately, we have nothing. But she wanted to divide that equally. And I knew that some of the inner city area, (indiscernible) The sidewalks that we needed to concentrate more on the region, and it just didn't happen. We need to correct that mistake that we did, that happened back then. And that's why I'm going to vote in support of all of these projects. >> Mayor Adler: Let's do that. Let's vote on this item and then go back and reconsider 11. Let's first take a vote on 10. >> Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool? >> Pool: I think we need to make sure we've got 11 locked down before we vote on 10. I don't see how we can do that.

[6:39:39 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. On the dais, are there -- when we move -- who on the dais is going to be willing to reconsider the vote on 11, and to add that amendment? Would you raise your hands so that we can see that? I'm raising my hand. As is Natasha Harper, Garza, Casar, Paige. I think that would include Kathy, and that would include Ann. And it includes Jimmy. So is it sufficient for us to vote on 10 while we're here? Thank you, councilmember tovo. Yes? >> Kitchen: I have a question. >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Kitchen: I would also like to reconsider when weapon get to it the project connect items, which are really small dollar and they're all over the city. So I would like to give people an opportunity to vote on that.

[6:40:39 PM]

Not project connect, I'm sorry, the corridor program items. >> I think we need to do 11. Let's table this. (Indiscernible) Properly. >> Mayor Adler: We're going to reconsider that, Ann, and we'll open it up for discussion. When it's open to reconsider, anybody can make any amendment that they want to. Let's take a vote on number 10. Those in favor of number 10, please raise your hand. >> Kitchen: Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Kitchen: Some of us might like to be able to vote on this, but can't at the moment >> I think there was a motion to table this item for a moment. And to go back and reconsider the other items. >> Just tabling, taking up 11, and do it in the proper order so we know what we're voting on. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Ellis? >> Ellis: I feel like there was

[6:41:40 PM]

consensus around the 460. Since the items that we were talking about may be adjusting weren't going to be changing dollar amounts, I think it would be okay to proceed. I certainly don't want to make anyone uncomfortable. But it seems like people were okay with that amount. >> Mayor Adler: We have councilmembers Flannigan and tovo that said they would vote for this item. With that one change made to item number 11. That would, I think, add two more positive votes to the deal, which I think actually gives it eight votes. So with the representation from councilmember Flannigan and councilmember tovo, I think there are eight votes to pass this. When 11 gets reconsidered, people can bring up other amendments, too, if they want to. Second vote on number 10. Those in favor of number 10,

[6:42:40 PM]

please raise your hand. It's Casar, Renteria, Flannigan, harper-madison, tovo, mayor pro tem -- I'm sorry, raise your hands again, please. It's Ellis, Renteria, harper-madison, Flannigan, Casar, mayor pro tem, Kathy tovo, and me. Those opposed? Those abstaining? Those abstaining are pool, kitchen and alter. All the rest voted aye. It passes 8-3. >> Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Let's go back to 11 >> I'm abstaining because I don't agree with the process. My vote is not on the substance, I don't like how we are handling this. It would have been just as simple to table this item, take up 11, get that squared away, come back to 10 and have a clean

[6:43:41 PM]

vote, where we know everything that's going to be in it. And I protest this process. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. We're now on item number 11. Is there a motion to reconsider item number 11? Councilmember harper-madison makes that motion to reconsider. Is there a second? Councilmember Ellis seconds that. Any discussion? Those in favor of reconsidering, please raise your hand. Everybody on the dais. Okay.

Item number 11 is now before us. Councilmember tovo moves the amendment that was articulated by councilmember kitchen. You all have that, clerk? Or you have that, Ann, what the amendment was? >> I don't have it written down in front of me, no. >> Mayor Adler: Ann, would you please do that, councilmember kitchen?

[6:44:41 PM]

>> Kitchen: This is the substandard streets. We want to add all the substandard roads that were listed as substandard in the 2016 bond [background noise] For a P.E.R. We want to keep knuckles in there for P.E.R. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Is there a second to that amendment? Councilmember -- mayor pro tem seconds that. Is there any objection to that amendment being included? Hearing none, that amendment is included. Any further discussion on this item? Councilmember kitchen? >> Kitchen: I just want to make this amendment one more time. I realize that I didn't do a good job of explaining it to everyone. So I just want to just try again to do a better job of that. So this is the language about

[6:45:42 PM]

the project -- I'm sorry, I'm tired. The corridor program office. The corridor program office has identified about 50 projects along all these major corridors. And they're projects that in some ways you can talk about them as place-making. But they include things that support bikeways and sidewalks, and basically taking the spaces along these corridors and doing things like trees, you know, like working with the trees, and other kinds of things that make the space a truly usable space for a multimodal perspective. And they've identified these projects along all of these major roads, you know, slaughter, north Lamar, south Lamar, Guadalupe, mlk, Burnett and Riverside. And they don't have the funding

[6:46:44 PM]

to do that. And they're low dollar kinds of things. When I talked to the project -- and I'm not even asking to specify the dollar amount here. I'm just trying to say that this would be something that they could be spend on, and councilmember Ellis, you had asked me which bucket to put them under. I don't know, I'm not as familiar with the proposal that you're bringing forward. I originally had thought in terms of perhaps putting it under the major capital improvements bucket. So I'm happy to suggest that it be put there, unless you think it's not appropriate there. If there's even any interest in pursuing it. These are the kinds of projects that really work well in enhancing our transit system. >> Ellis: A quick question. You may have said this, and I'm sorry, there's a lot of tabs I have open.

[6:47:44 PM]

Is there an estimated dollar amount that you notice might fit into, how much we're talking about that might take from a different program in a similar bucket? >> Kitchen: Well, the estimate from the corridor office is about 500,000 or so per project. So the total for them is -- they'd be thinking in terms of 5 million, but I'm not even asking that you specify that. I'm just wanting to make it a possibility to use for that. So it makes the most sense to me under the bucket that you have the 102 million for, and if it was to be used under that, and if it could be \$500,000 one-time project or it could be a couple of projects for a couple of million, I would leave that all to the discretion of the staff. >> Ellis: I might be more comfortable if we either set a project with it, or some sort of cap on those particular projects. That might work. I think it might work well with

[6:48:48 PM]

the major capital improvement. >> Kitchen: Do you have a suggestion? I'm totally open to if you want to put a cap on it. >> Ellis: Let's see. Do you have nine? It's hard to say without having numbers. That's not at you, that is something we would all say. What if we cap it at 5 million? >> Kitchen: Yes, that would be fine. >> Ellis: Would that be acceptable? Is that acceptable to other -- it looks like it's okay. I'm not seeing anyone say no. Okay. Well, then we may just need to beef it up a little bit that puts it in the major capital improvements. And at the very end of that segment, to say something along

[6:49:48 PM]

the lines of (indiscernible) Look at these particular projects, at an amount not to exceed 5 million for all projects listed. And then insert your language that lists the actual streets and roads. >> Kitchen: Yeah. It could be -- yeah. So you could say the funding in this program can be used -- or the funding up to a maximum of 5 million in this program can be used to build, and then go on from there, and then put that paragraph not as a separate be it resolved, but put it under your last bullet, which is the major capital improvements. >> Ellis: Yeah, just tack it on to the end of the -- >> Kitchen: Yeah. Does that work? >> Ellis: I'm okay with that. I think that gets us to a good place. >> Kitchen: Okay. So that's my motion. >> Mayor Adler: Okay.

[6:50:48 PM]

So the motion is to add some other additional elements to the \$102 million for major capital improvements. (Indiscernible) At the bottom of page 3 in her original amendment. With a cap of \$5 million for those expenditures. No greater than 5 million for those expenditures. Is there a second to that? Councilmember tovo seconds that. Is there any objection to that amendment going in? Hearing

none, that amendment goes in. >> Mayor -- >> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry? >> Mayor Adler, this is Lila. To be clearly, councilmember Kitchen, that's the version of the language that you had provided very recently as backup that you edited, is that correct? Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Lila, are there

[6:51:49 PM]

any other changes we need to be making to this to conform to what it needs to be legally? >> Yes. I think we need to make sure that we have language relating to the reimbursement resolutions that council previously has approved, and so I would say to add in that council has taken formal action to approve the expenditures of funds to construct streets relating to the quarter (indiscernible) Program to issue certificates of obligation to finance street improvements. And council contracts with the voters that the proceeds of the bonds will not be used to fund those streets for which council has previously issued the reimbursement resolutions. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. When you just read that, you said to construct streets. Do you want to say construct certain streets, or no? >> Certain streets would be fine.

[6:52:49 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any objection to that being added? Hearing none, that is also added to this resolution number 11. Councilmember Casar. >> Casar: Mayor, I have to double-check, but the 35 properties are in, right? >> Mayor Adler: Yes, it was the Home Depot -- >> Casar: I wanted to double-check. Okay, got it. >> Mayor Adler: Those things are still in. Any further discussion on this item? Let's take a vote on this item 11. Those in favor, please raise your hand. Those opposed? Mr. Flannigan is voting no, abstaining. Councilmember Alter is abstaining. It passes 9-1-1. While we're together, councilmember Pool, does anyone want to change their vote on item number 10? >> I was going to ask if we would retake the vote on item number 10.

[6:53:50 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. Does anybody object to reconsidering retaking the vote on item number 10? Hearing none, we're going to revote. Item number 10, those in favor of item number 10, please raise your hands. Those opposed. Flannigan votes no. Those abstaining. Alter. Item number 10 passes 9-1-1. Councilmember Kitchen? >> Kitchen: I want to say that I still am very uneasy about the 450 million, but I do appreciate the opportunity to bring forward an alternative and to have this discussion. And councilmember Flannigan, I switched my vote so that they could move forward. And so that you could vote no. So I think we're good on that.

[6:54:51 PM]

Again, thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Vote passes 9-1-1. Mayor pro tem. >> Garza: I just wanted to say how that was such a fun interaction, and very family-like. In so many ways, y'all have become like family to me. Anyway, that was -- >> Mayor Adler: We're going to miss you, too. >> Yeah, we're going to miss you, too. >> Mayor Adler: In any event, you're still stuck with us for another six months anyhow. So you'll be here for at least a little bit. Councilmember Ellis, did you want to say something? >> Ellis: I did. I know a lot has been said over these last few items, and I know that people really are approaching this from a good place. We want our community to be safe and accessible and we want people to be able to afford to live here. I think those are common goals, even if we don't always agree on every step of the process to get there. And Greg already stole my thunder, but I wanted to give a shout-out to Julie Montgomery who did so much work to make sure that our policy was good,

[6:55:53 PM]

and all of the feedback was being incorporated in realtime, and if you know her, you should totally text her and tell her she's amazing. And also, the advocates with Austin outside and with the wheel deal. Because I know that proposal came out, I think back in October, and it was kind of an aha moment that we dreamed big, we can go big, and this is going to create a better environment. It's going to fight climate change. It's going to create jobs. And it's going to get us that much closer to a city that we dream of, that we want to play in. And I think this is a really exciting to be able to be doing this work. >> Mayor Adler: Great. Pretty historic day for the council. Historic month, year. Does anybody want to say anything before we stop? I think we've taken care of all our business. It's 6:56. This meeting is adjourned. [Meeting adjourned at 6:56 P.M.]