

City Council Regular Meeting Transcript – 02/04/2021

Title: City of Austin

Channel: 6 - COAUS

Recorded On: 2/4/2021 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 2/4/2021

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.

[10:02:39 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: This meeting is being held virtually. The time is 10:02. Colleagues, as noted on the message board yesterday, we have a lot of people that want to participate in the

[inaudible] Today and have signed up to speak. A couple items on the agenda that may take us some time to work through so today could be a full day. Working with the clerk and trying to do speakers in batches so speakers don't have to sit on the phone for an entire period of time, we're going to start this morning with 154 speakers, one minute each. That should take us two and a half hours if they all call in. At noon wherever we are, we are going to take the sitcom speaker. We have one sitcom speaker

[10:03:41 AM]

so we'll take that person as close to noon. We'll finish the remaining speakers after sitcom if we need to, hopefully we can get through all the speakers and see if we can get to a vote on the consent agenda after we pull off the items that we need to discuss more. And then we're going to be able to break for lunch. We have an executive session we have to have at some point in the day but that can move around. At 2:00 P.M., we're calling the batch of zoning speakers, five of them, three minutes each will get a chance to speak to us. And then wherever we are probably about 3:00 P.M. We have a batch of speakers, 75, to speak on item 71. Those would be people that have identified to speak on 61, rather.

[10:04:41 AM]

So that's kind of the schedule for the day. I'm going to read the changes and corrections first. Number 10 withdrawn, 11 withdrawn, 17 withdrawn. 24 withdrawn, 25, 26, 27, 28, 33, all have been withdrawn. Item 35, it's too ratify amendment number 2 to the agreement rather than to authorize negotiation and execution. Item 49 adds two additional sponsors, councilmembers tovo and alter. Item number 64 adds councilmember [inaudible] As sponsor. We have some items pulled off the consent agenda. The consent agenda is items 1 through 51 and 60 through 64. The pulled items at this point are item 8, pulled by

[10:05:44 AM]

councilmember alter. I think she's posted some amendments for us to see. Also being pulled is 35 and 36 by councilmember Kelly. Also 49 pulled by councilmember Casar. And then 60 and 61 pulled by councilmember Kelly. We have some late backup on items 79, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 32, 33, 34, 48, 49, 54, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 68, and 69. I've also posted on to the message board some

[10:06:45 AM]

amendments to number 49. They are posted on our message board. You can find those and that's a motion sheet when that's available. Before we get into the meeting today, I do want to take just a moment of silence to recognize and remember commissioner Davis, Ron Davis, who passed away yesterday. Graduate of houston-tillotson was ground-breaking commissioner in so many ways. An incredible advocate for his precinct on the east side and was really at the cutting edge of a lot of the

[10:07:48 AM]

environmental justice issues that -- having seen that respect left a real positive legacy in the city. But his accomplishments were quite broad at improving things like the rma. So if we could, I don't know if anybody else wants to say anything, but a quick moment of silence. Colleagues, thank you.
Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: I would also like to ask if we could take a quick moment of sigh silence in honor of Dr. Dodson who was killed last week in a hostage situation that was tragickn and

[10:08:51 AM]

unfortunate. There are many people in our community who are real reeling from that tragedy and I would ask we also take a moment of silence to honor her life and legacy.

>> Mayor Adler: Absolutely. Very tragic. Just a moment. Okay. Thank you. We're real lucky in this city to have so many heroes and champions, some we sue publicly and some we don't, but have equal grace and gift to the community. Colleagues, we have -- councilmember alter.

>> Alter: I'm sorry, I came on just a little late and we had a lassie minute need to withdraw item 63 and I weren't a sure if you had mentioned that.

>> Mayor Adler: Did not.

[10:09:52 AM]

63 is withdrawn?

>> Alter: Yes. The developer has not yet signed the restrictive covenant that underlines that.

>> Mayor Adler: So 63 withdrawn.

>> Alter: Or private covenant that underlies it.

>> Mayor, I pulled item 59 and that was not mentioned.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. 59 is a Zones -- zoning case so it's not part of the consent agenda. We'll get to that when we get to zone cases after 2:00.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Good morning. Mayor, I just wanted to make a few comments before we get to the agenda. Tomorrow is the last day for Nicole golden who has served since 2019. Nicole has handled public

[10:10:53 AM]

safety for the district 9 team and also served as communications and outreach coordinator which was a new position for my office and one she really helped to define. Over the last two years she's helped our office communicate strategically and effective, helped build bridge to constituents as well as the media and has represented my office at events ranged from gun violence to golf and many issues in between. My office and really district 9 constituents in general have benefited from her skill at engaging and problem solving and providing opportunities for constituents to air their concerns. And to receive information, and we're all going to miss her. Her level-led, the level-headed and authentic way in which she engages ooms. Nicole, thank you so much for your service to the city. She helped found moms demand action, an organization that

[10:11:54 AM]

works to end gun violence in our community, and by advocating for sensible gun legislation and encouraging responsible gun ownership. Whether through moms or other endeavors, I know you will be acting to work to make Austin a better place and all of us on the district 9 team wish you the very best and our grateful thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Nicole, thank you. Mackenzie.

>> I'm voting no on items 8, 43 and 47.

>> Mayor Adler: Colleagues , we have a lot of speakers who have signed up. Without objection, we'll let the clerk take us through that number. Mayor pro tem, I am going to need to step away at 11:00. Hopefully I can do it and come back without being noticed, but just to give

[10:12:55 AM]

you a heads up.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Is the clerk ready to take us through the signed speakers, one-minute each, 150-some-odd.

>> Yes, mayor. Mayor, we have one Spanish speaker registered to speak and we have the interpreter on the line so we'll start with that interpreter. Did you want to provide instructions for the Spanish speaker before we begin?

>> Yes, please.

[Speaking in Spanish].

>> Go ahead.

>> Translator: [Speaking in Spanish] Okay?

>> Okay.

[10:14:00 AM]

>> Translator: She's ready.

>> Go ahead.

>> [Speaking in Spanish]

>> Translator: My name is -- I'm from district 2. I'm speaking on behalf of myself and my community. This is the first time I participate and I hope what I'm going to say takes into consideration.

>> [Speaking in Spanish]

[10:15:01 AM]

>> Translator: She has a few questions. The first question is how will the owners and the renters in this area will be affect by project connect when they pay taxes since the taxes are going to go up?

>> [Speaking in Spanish]

>> Translator: How will the 300 million will be spent? How are the members of the town are going to be assigned to guarantee

[10:16:02 AM]

there's going to be -- they are going to use [inaudible] And consider everybody in the community, the people of color. Are part of the decision-making process.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> [Speaking in Spanish]

>> Translator: And the third one is they would like to have equity and inclusion of the members of their community for them to be able to talk, speak and be part of the decision-making process.

>> [Speaking in Spanish]

[10:17:12 AM]

>> Translator: They hope that the decision is made in equity to be able to

[inaudible] The actual owners or people who live in the area and they are able to -- affordable housing without them having to go somewhere else.

>> [Speaking in Spanish]

>> Translator: Those are the four questions that they have and they would like to -- they hope that they get answers for this community.

>> Speaker, your time has expired. Thank you.

>> Translator: [Speaking in Spanish]. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

[10:18:15 AM]

>> [Inaudible] Gregory.

>> Hey, I'm here. This is sandy Gregory and I'm not sure which district I'm in. This is my first time not voting but speaking up. So I live in north Austin and I think I speak for my community and some of my friends. So we are against item 49 and 61. It's about homeless housing solution, and we are against for hotels for the homeless. Specifically for the wells branch and the one close to the park. We think it's not safe for the community and I think especially the location in the park, I think it's not convenient for the homeless people to stay there also

[10:19:16 AM]

because I think there's not much facility they need nearby and no public transportation --

[buzzer sounding]

-- For them to make -- make problems for the community. So I think that's what I have. Thank you.

>> Jenna Haynes.

>> Hi, my name is Jenna Haynes and I live in district 9. I'm calling to oppose agenda item 49 and ask it be postponed. While providing to unhoused neighbors is vital especially during a pandemic, any legislation that criminalizes camping will have consequences. You should oppose encampment suites. They don't deserve the constant threat of law enforcement in the places they call home. A threat which opens them up

[10:20:17 AM]

to potential covid infections and police brutality. I ask councilmembers to vote to postpone item 49 until the following revisions. First reach out and get their input on how this resolution will affect them. And second, remove all

[inaudible] For encampment suite including criminalizing camping. Thank you.

>> Ann D Aly Lesh.

>> I'm an organizer in district 5 for Black Lives. I support item 61. However, item 49 I'm opposed to as it is wrong right now. I believe it's not the right approach. Right now item 49 disproportionately negatively impacts Black people and that's racist. 35% of our homeless community is Black even though Black people represent less than 10%

[10:21:17 AM]

total population in Austin. According to the city's research, Black Austinites are disproportionately affected by police. Creating a policy that invites the police into the lives of people of color and Black people specifically is racist because we know APD's history of violence. The intent is to connect people with housing but the revised language in 49 does not rule out policing.

[Buzzer sounding] It matters what the impact is. Thank you.

>> Ariel Leget.

>> Hi and good morning. Ariel Leget. I'm a constituent in district 3. I may have been an Austinite, small business owner and invest in understanding the rehabilitation of our homeless citizens and speaking on items 49, 61 as well as item 32 today.

[10:22:17 AM]

I am so grateful for the approval of the first hotel last week so thank you and I would like to see the second purchase approved in item

[inaudible]. I would also like to ask to please postpone item 49 to ensure that we can list Italy, decriminalize camping and receive from those impacted for a permanent solution. A reminder that poverty and homelessness are not issues that get solved with handcuffs and I want to remind that handcuffs not only hamper rehabilitation but -- I would also like to express I am in favor of decoupling the forensic lab on item 32. Thank you so much for voting yes on 61, 32 and postponing item 49.

[Buzzer sounding] Hope you all have a great day. Thank you.

>> [Inaudible] Bell.

>> Hello, thank you for this

[10:23:20 AM]

opportunity. I'm speaking against the proposal to buy hotels in two locations in northwest Austin to accommodate homeless people. Hotels -- bungalows and suites and also old suites. Here are reasons

below. The only purchase of the hotel, but also the maintenance of the hotel costs a lot of money. According to the town hall meeting yesterday, the maintenance of one hotel is around 2 million. If you divide this number by the rooms, it is more than 1,000. It's almost around \$2,000 to maintain a room per month. This is around or above the rent of one-bedroom apartment in Austin. Even if we have the money to purchase a hotel where is the money coming from to maintain them? Even after we spend so much for one hotel, we can only accommodate 60 to 80 people which is less than 3% of the homeless people. I just want everybody to think about it.

[10:24:20 AM]

[Buzzer sounding] There are better options. Buy a farm a little ways away --

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Your time is up.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you for participating.

>> Anna Defrates.

>> Hi. Good morning. My name is Anna Defrates. I'm a co-founder of the survivor justice project. And I'm here to testify in support of item 32 to move the forensic lab away and to an independent forensic department. This is a change that's been a long time coming. We've been organizing around the DNA backlog since 2016. I'm glad we are finally here. I think it will resolve many of the problems. It's a great first step towards reimagining justice.

[10:25:21 AM]

I'm grateful to the racial justice organizers who have made more mainstream putting those dollars into community, into science in this case. I want to also add that for me this item is related to item 49. Related to the recriminalization of homelessness. We can't view survivors of sexual assault --

[buzzer sounding]

-- Justify this forensic move and at the same time vote for a policy that would put -- that would put homeless people at greater risk for sexual assault. Thank you for your time.

>> Bret bowman.

>> Hi, I'm a resident of district 7, against 49 and encourage all councilmembers to vote against 4 as currently written. I understand the intent is provide you are unhoused neighbors with more resources, but there are situations that ban camping

[10:26:22 AM]

in specific locations. There are something sick and ironic about councilmember kitchen's proposal called healing, increased criminalization. This past sum the same council indicated support for combating the issue of police brutality and now are putting up for a vote the ability to increase police presence in our unhoused communities. This is wrong. I received an unsatisfy answer from councilmember pool indicating her support for this. Please vote against it. You guys don't need to capitulate to the right-wing of councilmember Kelly and governor Abbott. It is racist, sexist, everything fell he austinities have expressed. Please vote against item 49.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Eliza Epstein.

[10:27:26 AM]

>> Good morning, I'm here as the organizer for district 5 in Ann kitchen's district.

[Indiscernible] People who have protested this place for generations. Today we're discussing the property. Thank you council for making homelessness a focus to make resources available to people in Austin who would like housing support. Homes not handcuffs. Issues that item 49 encounter. First this is a racial equity issue. 35% of people experience homelessness in Austin are black and even though Austin residents -- make up less than 10% of the population. According to the city's research, austinities identified as disproportionately negatively impacted by police interactions. Adjustments to policies that impact people experiencing

[10:28:27 AM]

homeless -- and a sensitive to this issue.

[Buzzer sounding] Those living in encampments. Second --

>> Monica Guzman.

>> Good morning. I'm Monica Guzman, policy director for gave. In the gave community there are concerns about anti-displacement funds ahead of the assessment tool being completed and the advisory committee being formed as well as lack of vetting for affordable housing developers tapping into the \$23 million acquisition funds. When developing the process to utilize the anti-displacement fund, the following questions need to be answered. What purpose is it meant to serve, who is experiencing the greatest impact in cost of living, who will be disproportionately impacted. Must focus neighborhood

[10:29:27 AM]

centered in continue's eastern crescent, build affordable housing homes at or below 60% mfi. We urge the city council, capital metro and other decision-makers to complete undoing racism training ahead of adopting the process to utilize the anti-displacement funds. We urge you -- residents --

[buzzer sounding] As affordable housing owners and tenants which have relationships with these communities. Thank you.

>> Roy Martinez.

>> Hello. Can you guys hear me?

>> Yes, go ahead.

>> Yes. My name is Roy Martinez. I'm a resident of district 10 and I am a member of the democratic socialists of America. I'm speaking to oppose the passing of item number 49 and in favor of item number

[10:30:28 AM]

61. We made an important and substantial step to reducing homelessness by buying one of the two hotels using funds from defunding the police. Now we have to go further and buy the second one. But more critically to me right now is this item number 49 which while providing some assistance in terms of advice, also essentially recriminalizes or puts back some pieces of the camping ban despite the intention of the you a tore. The truth is -- author. A study from Yale showed criminalization is not only expensive in Denver or in a -- cost five communities over -- it's also counterproductive.

[Buzzer sounding] Thank you.

>> Alexis Henderson.

>> Yes, my name is Alexis

[10:31:31 AM]

Henderson. I'm speaking for item 22 and 23. I'm a mother, a student and president of the resident council here and I've advocated for rosewood since 2013. I just want to ask if you guys' home was built in 1939, has toilet water, have you broken stones from falling down the stairs, have you waken up suffocating like you can't %-@brief bus the electricity cut off on your block and too hot to breathe. Rosewood was probably great in 1939 after sleeping on the streets after being forced east. All the invasion and jobs we still have a homelessness problem. If we don't rebuild rosewood there will be

nothing to see, pay respects to our house people. Please vote yes for item 22 and 23 so we can prove to our neighborhood that people do care and believe that the change is now. The hope is now.

[10:32:33 AM]

[Buzzer sounding] Basic necessities for living in 2021 is now. Thank you.

>> Danielle Rickman.

>> Hi, sorry. Please do not

[indiscernible] Being poor is not a crime. It costs our city more to -- please give a voice to -- I would like to proposal indication of land and mutual aid groups. Lgbtq, people of color, leadership. At the beginning I notice we took a moment of silence for people who died this year. I would like to ask for a moment of silence for Alexander Gonzalez who died protecting his fiance and

[10:33:34 AM]

baby.

[Indiscernible].

>> Jimena camboa.

>> Hi, good morning, y'all, thank you for having us. I am a district -- I am a resident of district 5 and I am incredibly against item 49. I don't know if you recall recall, but about a year ago Greg Abbott pushed our homeless neighbors, our houseless neighbors and criminalized their camping, and I live close to the community back then. And watching those people, our neighbors, be ripped out of all of their possessions was incredibly heart breaking. I hope that something no one ever has to go through and seeing people lose their few

[10:34:37 AM]

possessions is completely inhumane. I hope we can make the city of Austin better by treating all of our neighbors and comrades with humanity. I am also in favor of 32 to have independent --

[buzzer sounding]

-- Thank you all so much. Have a lovely day.

>> Tatiana [inaudible].

>> Hi, I am a resident of Travis county district 3. I'm calling today to express my concern and -- taking a neutral stance on the matter near for or completely against it is not enough. Quote, if Progressive plan is a blanket term and does not address the issue for our community. Personally I do not want to be our beautiful city of Austin turn to L.A. Where this issue was not handled properly either. It is not safe nor, air quotes, pretty to look at,

[10:35:37 AM]

but we need a better rehabilitating program to allow a chance to reintegrate into society with the right tools we all take for granted here. Concealed weapons should not be random and obstructive. Consider item 49 to include better enforced regulations in campsites. Meaning if campsites don't have many complaints, leave them alone. If there is, then they get removed. Those who are obviously still striving to do better to get into a program that will help get them out of that --

[buzzer sounding]

-- Enforce more consequences. Thank you for your time and consideration.

>> Katrina bocanegro.

>> Hi, I live in district 7. I'm a member of the Austin democratic socialist America. I'm speaking for item 49 which I believe needs to be postponed until it can be revised. I support the purchase of the hotel last weekend and I

[10:36:39 AM]

fully support the purchase of the second hotel, but I do not support any effort to criminalize homelessness. Counterproductive to healing and a racial justice issue seeing a large portion of our Austin homeless neighbors are black. I encourage all councilmembers to vote against it and the threat of criminalization of homelessness. I also call for outreach for those directly impacted so their voices can be heard. Thank you.

>> Joshua Stubblefield.

>> Hello. Good morning, council. I come to you today as both a constituent of Austin and president of pflugerville professional firefighters association. Our association is made up of the men and women employed as firefighters and paramedics by esd 2 that covers 77 square miles in northeast Travis county. Myself and those I represent

[10:37:39 AM]

respectfully ask council to vote yes on item 60 and allow the citizens to participate in the election. This would allow to participate in the election to approve the medical overlay. There have been three other medical overlays within Travis county, two of which approved by the council. Our district those are being funded out of fire budget and it's financially unsustainable. The overlay would resolve this. We initiated a petition more than 4700 signatures of citizens allowing them to endorse --

[buzzer sounding] I ask that you please vote yes. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Ann, I have a legal question related to the esd. You don't need to answer it right now. My understanding is the

[10:38:42 AM]

pflugerville city council voted not to give consent and my question is whether or not that is a question for us, the state will require all the cities in the district to approve it. So the question is is the issue in front of us moot given the city of pflugerville's action. Clerk, please go ahead. Please proceed.

>> Crystal Mayher.

>> Hi, I'm a resident of district 2. I am calling today in strong opposition of item 49. At the very least you could just make it easy and say no on it, but you must at least postpone. If an extra week to think over 61 an organized protest with business owners, to basically -- we can get an extra week to look to item 49 on what exactly you will be doing.

[10:39:42 AM]

Because essentially what you are doing is criminalizing

[inaudible] And you are going to start to -- you are not providing any support for community members and you are just basically trying to get them out of our backyards. You are trying to remove them from the areas already gentrified because the new residents of Austin don't want to see them. That is ridiculous and when people come on here and say we need to ship them off to a farm, I don't know how you can sleep at night. Thank you for getting forensics --

[buzzer sounding]

-- As a victim of sexual assault I can only imagine wait 30 years for justice. Thank you so much.

>> Joe Connally.

>> Hi. This is JP. I live in district 9. I work on housing and -- for the Austin justice coalition and I'm calling in to

[10:40:44 AM]

support item 62 and also to say a few words about item 49, which at the moment I am opposed to. Item 62 I think is a good idea. Yes, it's true we need to develop the equity tool and need community engagement. But right now we have funds and it behooves us to take immediate emergency short-term action to begin the process of neighborhood stabilization so I support it. Item 49 I'm opposed to as currently written, although the last minute updates that both Greg Casar and the mayor proposed on the message board make it a whole lot better. It's still the perfect example of a non-solution that doesn't really -- it's a band-aid.

[Buzzer sounding] It's a last-minute fix. It doesn't really get at the root of the problem and it's not a comprehensive and strategic plan. Thank you.

>> Jason Morris.

[10:41:46 AM]

>> Hi, yeah, I -- Jason Morris. I am a resident of district 5, a life-long austinite. Proud public union member and dsa member. And I work in public health care. And I just wanted to, like many people here, speak against item 49 as written. The language is very muddled. It seems like the first step to recriminalization, which I know is going to lead to more public dollars being spent with outcomes that are brutal and tragic. Like many are saying, we need a comprehensive strategy to improve the lives of our neighbors. In the most human way that we treat each other. Thank you.

>> Stacy lipsy.

[10:42:47 AM]

>> Yes, hi. I'm speaking to you today on behalf of the Rainey neighborhood association and the residents who live in the Rainey district. As we reviewed the upcoming projects proposed for our neighborhood including the one before you today of 84 east, the neighborhood has serious concerns that we want council to be aware of and we have an ask of council. They include the fact that to date there has never been a comprehensive plan presented for the Rainey neighborhood nor have any of the recommendations from the big red dog study been implemented. Also if we allow density over the 8-1 or 15-1 standard, will ambulances and fire trucks be allowed to access the buildings when people need them so they don't die in case of a imagine. Here's the ask, council. We request that you delay the approval of 84 east in order to allow the city to prepare a comprehensive

[10:43:49 AM]

analysis of where the Rainey district is headed --

[buzzer sounding]

-- After it experiences all the development proposed for the area. Thank you.

>> Alexandra Stubbins.

>> Hello. I'm a resident of district 9. I am for the item 32, the separation of the forensic lab for the Austin police department. Over the years a pt indifference to violence. I'm against 49 because it gives no concrete solution for unhoused community members. For so long we have skated around any real action. I demand priority areas be data driven and based on health and safety, not the image for our city. I demand we do not take funds from existing programs. I demand that we use methods other than police to go

[10:44:49 AM]

enforce existing ordinances in the areas that are actually health and safety risks. Now is the time for action. I'm for item 61, the purchase of candlewood suites with the capacity of 80 units. We must be the voice for unhoused community members. Thank you.

>> Michael hull.

>> Good morning, mayor and council. For the record, my name is Mike Howe. I've lived in wells branch for 35 years and at one time was elected and served as president of the mud board. As we are not located within Austin city limits action we are not residents of the city of Austin and therefore we are not able to vote in any city election. I'm here to speak in support of item number 60 on your consent agenda. To avoid any confusion about my speaking, I serve at the pleasure of the Travis county commissioners court and esd 2.

[10:45:50 AM]

Today time speaking as a citizen of wells branch. To allow the Travis county commissioners court consider calling an election to allow residents outside the city of Austin to decide if they wish to have the overlay district recreated. This is not an uncommon request to council. The wells branch mud board passed a resolution in full support of the petition for this election. The petition presented to the commissioners court had over 4,700 signatures.

[Buzzer sounding] I ask you to approve this to allow us to go to polls and wish to support our needs for ambulance service.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Victor I can't remember Abby.

-- Victoria Abby.

>> Hi, I live in district 7. I am for items 32 and 61. I'm using my time to ask for postponement for item 49. I would believe that council before they vote on this needs to have more time to

[10:46:51 AM]

talk with advocacy groups of diverse communities to see what they have input on this. To remove any language that even remotely resembles a call for encampment ban and be more specific where the \$3 million is going and what you mean by path to permanent housing and what that would look like. I believe as written right now this program is ineffective, inefficient, immoral and will erode the trust and faith with the city and council after decades of being failed by you guys. Thank you.

>> [Inaudible] Luna.

>>> Hi, I live in district 5. I'm speaking in support of item 61 and asking that you please postpone item 49 as it is currently written.

[10:47:52 AM]

I support investments in housing to approve the health and safety of people experiencing homelessness, but I do not support efforts to criminalize people for by punishing people we are abandoning them and in doing so abandoning our humanity. Sometimes we don't recognize another person's humanity because of fear and hatred. It allows us to diminish, dehumanize and harm people that are beautiful rather than lifting them up. I ask that you please postpone item 49 until amendments can be made. Thank you.

>> Peter Martinelli.

>> Yes. I am calling -- my name is Peter. I'm calling from district 4. I'm calling in support of item 32 in support of item 61 and in favor of postponing item 49.

[10:48:53 AM]

Excuse me. There's language in the bill that's fundamentally contradictory. I think specifically councilmember kitchen's bill, it has language that to disallow camping while upholding the council's commitment to decriminalization. It doesn't make sense. We know this housing is -- to homelessness is

housing. This problem, the result of structural poverty requires a holistic approach, data driven with involvement of the communities. As others have said this is not a real solution. It's just extremely Lacey.

[Buzzer sounding] So thank you.

>> Brianna Arredondo.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> Yes, go ahead.

[10:49:54 AM]

>> Okay. Hi. I'm Brianna and I live in district 3 and I'm with family for justice. I'm calling to oppose -- I oppose item 39 and I support item 61. Where are your hearts at? Where are they at? I encourage all councilmembers to vote against item 49. Homeless people are human beings. Our unhoused neighbors are human beings. What had you all were homeless living in tents under the bridge and cars and there's groups in the city and city councilmembers want you out and criminalize you for living in the tent or cars under the bridge or in the streets. The solution is to house the homeless, not criminalize them. The homeless people. Do not -- my solution is to house our unhoused neighbors, not criminalize them. Stop the sweeps now. What if you all were homeless and the city comes out and steals your stuff and what if that was your stuff? What if you were homeless?

[10:50:54 AM]

What if you lost all your money and you are out there homeless out there? The solution is to house our -
-

[buzzer sounding]

-- Unhoused neighbors. House them now. House them. Thank you.

>> Debbie luckerman.

>> Good morning. I live in district 10. I agree with item 64, but request amendments. Please consider the amendments to this resolution to correctly characterize our government and remove language singling on out the right wing as extremists. I request our democracy be corrected to our democratic constitutional republic. Second, I request that you remove the language of line 35 -- line 25 through 33 of the resolution. Although I am part of the right wing political supporters due to my sincerely held religious beliefs, I do not identify with violent right wing

[10:51:55 AM]

extremists who commit crimes. I hope you feel the same about left wing extremists. Jesus Christ did not tell us to rise up violently against our government. I'm not alone with my concern for election integrity. Support measures to block foreign interference and valid id and transparency in the process.

[Buzzer sounding] Thank you for your service.

>> Colin Gildersleeve.

>> Hi. Good day to council. I live in district 3 and I'm a member of Austin dsa. I want to declare my support for item 61 and against -- I'm speaking against item 49 as it currently stands. I've been a registered nurse in Austin for the past seven years working in labor and delivery so I'm professionally god in the health and safety of unhoused neighbors, some of whom have abouten my

[10:52:56 AM]

patients. We cannot waste any time in getting these people into housing because we've already waited long enough. Let's not be distract by concerns that are not evidence based. There are plenty of resources close to the toe toe -- hotel. We saw an example of a previously homeless austinite who was provided so we know this stuff works. It's a great anecdote. Permanent housing saves lives, improves quality of those lives and this impacts our whole community's health in a positive way. Thank you so much.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Katie Drucker.

>> Hello. Can you hear me?

>> Yes, go ahead.

>> I'm Katie from district 9. I'm in favor of item 32, 61

[10:53:56 AM]

and against 49. Item 32 as a survivor, I trust an independent lab over APD, to experience trauma and backlog -- I'm not sure how the saying goes, but fool me once, okay, what does that look like for fool me for three decades. APD has lost the trust of survivors and support the independent forensic lack. Council with black lives matter last summer and 36% of unhoused people being black, council must act in favor of these items that support black lives instead of -- this does not support our community, the listening is misleading. Echo Austin asks you postpone this and I stand with them and ask that you take it a step further and decline it until a real solution is made. Work with organizations that do the work on the street --

[buzzer sounding]

-- Instead of proposing items backwards to recriminalizing homelessness. Thank you.

[10:54:59 AM]

>> Julia Atkins.

>> Hi, Julia Atkins, I live in district 9. I'm speaking to postpone item 49 until it receives input from directly impacted people to ensure it meets their needs without threatening to criminalize them. Please -- any form of this resolution that would reach criminalizing camping in Austin. I'm concerned about this item because funding sources are unclear and we don't want money to come from funds earmarked for ongoing supportive housing efforts. I applaud the council to purchase the hotel using funds diverted from the police budget and hope you will vote to purchase another one today. Thank you.

>> Brian Furlong.

>> This is Brian Furlong. I'm talking about item 54, the spot upzoning of --

[10:56:01 AM]

currently the area the F.A.R. With 15 by exception, three projects that are asking for 21 to 32 F.A.R. In contrast, the -- Manhattan is 10 F.A.R., upgradeable to 12 with incentives. Manhattan has the infrastructure in terms of subways and street grid to support. Rainey has none of those things. Once 21 to 32 F.A.R. is approved by council, it will become norm. The whole neighborhood is on track to be built out and may become the densest spot in the United States. Like climate change, the time to have preventive action is now before the situation is set in stone and can't be engineered around. We recommend a study of the neighborhood's future at these higher densities before considering spot zoning, upzoning of particular properties.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Selena Shea.

[10:57:07 AM]

>> Hello, my name is Selena and president of the Austin EMS Association speaking in opposition to item 60 allowing ESD to be placed on the ballot. They have shown they resort to half truths over and over again. They do have an ESD tax dedicated to fire and sales tax that is supposed to be dedicated to EMS which they collect. Last night Pflugerville City Council decided to not put this on the ballot in May in

order to study possible options for a municipal fire department and other ways to generate revenue including the use of city debt financing to pay for capital expenditures. If we cannot come to an agreement, they will put esd on the ballot. This will create a much more complicated issue that won't figures anything and possibly hurt efforts at a true solution. I'm asking to you postpone this item until the

[10:58:08 AM]

pflugerville study comes back and decides to put it on the ballot. Thank you very much for your time.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Cesar Augusta.

>> Hello?

>> Yes, go ahead.

>> Thank you. I am president of aura. I speak in favor of item 61 to afire property to use -- the entire design of the proposal is inequitable. Whose interests are served with the four locations to force people out of. Where will our neighbors living in those areas be able to go and what will be the consequences. What about their possessions and routines and livelihoods. As I understand it, community organizations that work with these populations

[10:59:08 AM]

have not been sufficiently included in the proposal so -- and the services needed for a condition will not be provided. I do not willingly choose to make Austin an in humane place. Take care, all.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Amber mills.

>> Hi, I'm amber mills from district 3. I'm the move Texas Austin advocacy organizer. I testified last week in favor of the votes to purchase two hotels for housing people experiencing homelessness. I am testifying again in support of investments and improvements for housing and safety for our community members. But I strongly oppose any efforts to criminalize someone for being unhoused. Once again public safety means more than crosses, criminalizing people including many students because of precarious situations and hardships worsens the problem. There's been a long-standing effort to save Austin

[11:00:09 AM]

instead of saving it from decades of policy making that has pushed people into these situations. I ask that you please vote to postpone item 49 in order to hear from people most directly affected just as you voted to postpone the vote on item 32 last week. Thank you.

>> Bethany Carson.

>> Good morning. I live in district 4. I'm here to oppose item 49. The humanity of people unhoused is not a bargaining chip that can be exchanged for housing. We know that contact with the criminal injustice system is a barrier to housing. The Austin camping ban is also quite literally the brain child of white

[11:01:13 AM]

supremacy crafted by a known white nationalist. Mayor Adler, for whom has decriminalization not worked? Yes, repealing the ordinances has visualized people experiencing homelessness. I live near several of the location where unhoused neighbors are camping. Las Vegas, Austin has the fewes affordable housing units available than any city in the country.

[Buzzer sounding] I support item 61 and we must address root causes of affordability and displacement. Thank you.

>> John Alford.

>> I'm the senior pastor at university united methodist church and leader with central Texas interfaith and live in district 8. We have opposed any measure that would criminalize homelessness. My church and central Texas

[11:02:14 AM]

interfaith, we have primarily pushed for greater funding and action by the city toward a comprehensive plan that would effectively end homelessness. Item 49 appears to do some of that. It talks about rapid rehousing but overall appears to be another temporary fix to satisfy folks that the city is doing something about homelessness. It's a shame I would note of the 73 million devoted to combat homeless, 31 million was left unsent. That is not urgency. I'm hear today to urge you to do what you proposed doing every year, move homelessness to a real priority and do what we already know works, create emergency transitional housing. Our friends who sleep under the stars deserve no less than our best effort. Thank you.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Marina Garrett.

>> Hi, I just wanted to

[11:03:16 AM]

Speak today in support of item 32. I definitely believe in decoupling the forensic lab from APD. I'm a sexual assault survivor in Austin and my own kit sat on the shelves for about two years in the backlog. I think this is just one piece of the puzzle. The amount of trauma that I got from my kit being in the backlog was just exponential from what I would have received if my kit would have been tested in a timely manner. This is just one piece of the puzzle. We brought it to attention five years and it's taken five years for things like this to happen. I worry about how long it will take for, you know, other things to change and so that survivors get justice and get the healing they deserve. So thank you.

>> Alexander Anderson.

[11:04:16 AM]

>> Hello, council. My name is Alexander Anderson and I'm a constituent of district 5 speaking on behalf of myself and my district. And we are strongly against item 49 as written proposed by my representative Ann Kitchen. This item would not allow camping in places where camping is already taking place. This meaning this would evict people already houseless. Council, this proposal is dehumanizing. This is district 5, south Austin and we respect and value you all of our neighbors. We must value all people who live in Austin and stop with misguided issues that target our most vulnerable neighbors. You should be developing programs that help with homelessness, stop attacking my neighbors and do your job to support the people of Austin. Remove the ban and policing efforts and please consult the people this measure

[11:05:18 AM]

actually affects. Homelessness is going to continue to affect Austin --

[buzzer sounding]

-- I support item 61. Thank you.

>> Terry Russell.

>> Good morning. My name is Terry and I'm a constituent in district 6 and I'm calling to speak and rather oppose oppose item 49. It's just deplorable to me that the idea of criminalizing people who are already homeless is even a thought that we have to consider. Two weeks ago, two, three weeks ago it snowed and as I was riding in my car comfortably warm, I saw people struggling trying to find places to be able

to lay their head while we were having a winter freeze. We need to figure out something better than what we have in place at the

[11:06:18 AM]

time. I do support the item number 61. We need both of those hotels and we need to act now. Thank you and have a good day.

>> Katherine wittington.

>> Hi, I'm Katherine wittington and I'm a physical therapist that has treated people homeless here in ten. I live about two miles from the Y where there's a large unhoused population. Item 49 makes the distinction being homeless is not a criminal offense, however by having a camping ban you make people choose. Rather than arguing fundamental legality of how public space is utilized, we should prioritize root cause intervention. Clearing them out by force, all this disregard makes no sense. In a competitive housing market, landlords have an

[11:07:19 AM]

option to rent to someone with a criminal record. Thinking about safety, shelter and resources, we need to focus on desirable alternatives like housing first and tackles issues such as employment, substance abuse and mental health. Not an an aesthetic fix --

[buzzer sounding]

>> Rachel Shannon.

>> Hi, I'm a resident of district 1. I appreciate the passionate residents speaking out with care for our unhoused neighbors and laud the purchase of the first hotel in support of item 61 and support 32 decoupling forensics will APD. At the same time I ask to postpone item 49, healing and safety are imperative for our community and will never happen through punitive decriminalization efforts. We know better. Housing is what

[11:08:20 AM]

homelessness. Until this item can account for the effective persons and operate in respect for those people's needs it will only stand a a testament to the brutal racism and even equity in our city. Safety for austinites is a worthwhile investment. Decriminalizations is deeply impacts Austin's black community. The real cost will be our own integrity if we don't take time and care now. Will Austin rise --

[buzzer sounding]

-- To the challenge of reimagining real solutions their than actions that lack integrity and care? House our people.

>> Sally zeleski.

>> Hello, councilmembers. I'm asking to you pass item 61 and postpone or oppose item 49 as currently written. Item 49 needs input from those who are directly

[11:09:22 AM]

experiencing homelessness before it is passed. Please reach out to our unhoused citizens and ask what they need and how we can help. Don't sweep them out of sight and out of mind. I support efforts to expand housing for those who need it, however, I think it's deplorable to possibly recriminalize camping in areas when there's no way the city can possible house everyone currently homeless. Where do you expect them to go if there's not enough Housen a if you are not allowed to live in public spaces? I would like to voice support for 32 allocating the forensic lab away from APD. Thank you.

>> Douglas winter.

>> Was that Douglas switchard?

>> Yes, go ahead.

[11:10:22 AM]

Okay. I'm Douglas. I live in district 1 and I'm also the vice president and a resident of rosewood courts. And I'm speaking in favor of items 22 and 23 to get the tax rate to help redevelop and do the restoration and rebuilding here at rosewood. This complex was built in 1939, and I am so thankful to have a roof over my head. I was homeless for two years but it's past time to do the restoration work to move this property go the 21st century. The wiring is in conduit. The apartments are tiny with no ventilation whatsoever. And it's time to make this a good place for not only the residents who live here now

[11:11:22 AM]

but residents that live here --

[buzzer sounding] In the future. We want people to feel like they have a home they can be proud of --

>> Speaker, your time has expired.

>> Okay.

>> Susan gazana.

>> Yes, thank you so much for having me. My name is Susan. I'm a democratic precinct chair for precinct 229 which is in wells branch. I have lived in wells branch for 31 years. I'm representing myself and the members of my precinct. I'm asking you to approve item 60, thus allowing the residents of Austin's etj to vote on the creation of the emergency service district 17. A medical overlay. This would give us the opportunity to learn more about this he shall and have a say in our district, how our district receives emergency services and how we are taxed.

[11:12:25 AM]

The wells branchrd mud board voted to support the creation for the loafer yay district and calling -- overlay district. So that the district has a voice in determining whether the overlay district is ultimately created. I'm asking you not to --

[buzzer sounding]

-- To connect us with pflugerville city council. And what they do. This should be an easy decision for you --

>> Speaker, your time has expired.

>> All right.

>> Corrie Maddux.

>> Hi. I'm a member of the Austin democratic socialist of America and live in district 6. I Kathie tovo -- I cannot believe I'm having to spend time talking to people much less city councilmembers to say criminalizing people for being too poor is long.

[11:13:26 AM]

I want to give full support for item 61 and oppose 49 as written until we can ensure no sweeps happen, no recriminalization happens and ensure the \$3 million is not being diverted from any long-term housing project, I am strongly opposed and ask you to postpone or vote against item 49. Thank you very much.

>> David Johnson.

>> Hello, my name is David Johnson and I aim with grass roots leadership and also a rent of district 5 -- resident of district 5. I'm embarrassed my representative would present such a poorly thought out and conceived and absolutely underjustified proposal. Request for proposal was to deal with the proximity to vehicular traffic but there

[11:14:26 AM]

are already laws on the books that address that. And prove an evidence based solution that could be implemented instead. Nothing has changed sense we pushed back the homeless ban and the homeless -
- we

>> Kathleen [indiscernible].

>> Hi, my name is Kathleen and I'm a resident of district 9. I'm here today to ask that we postpone item 49 that

[11:15:27 AM]

clearly criminalizes homelessness. I am for the purchase of a second hotel to house our homeless population in Austin; but criminalizing them to do nothing but exacerbate the problem. I think Austin has a history of going -- starting out very strong with Progressive legislation, and slowly but surely whittling away at that until we're back where we started. I think what happened over the summer defunding the police by millions of dollars was a great start to start to reallocate those funds to programs that actually help people. And we are getting somewhere by buying these hotels for the homeless, but item 49 clearly starts to chip away at that Progressive movement. So I'm also here in support of item 32 and 61. Thank you.

>> William Keesling.

[11:16:27 AM]

>> Hi, my name is William. I'm a resident of district 7 and I am speaking to modify item 61 on the agenda regarding homelessness. I agree we need to pursue a humanitarian solution and house these folks. I think the intent is right. I think the strategy and implementation of that is wrong. I live about a quarter mile from the Texas bungalow purchase and suites and my issue -- and I think a lot of my neighbors would speak the same. We were not given any notice or consideration and this feels like a ram down of a controversial use in our neighborhood without any input sought or given in our neighborhood. And so we feel Luke we ought to have a voice in this and, you know, the plan should be amended to address some of the neighbors' concerns regarding the -- no. 2, the

[11:17:29 AM]

supportive housing. My understanding that is low to no barrier shelter and you're moving -- [buzzer sounding]

>> Folks with severe mental illness and drug abuse in our neighborhood. So I feel like we have some questions that we don't have answers to and we'd like --

>> Speaker, your time has expired.

>> Anna Aguirre. Anna [indiscernible].

>> Good morning, can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can hear you.

>> Okay, good morning, my name is Anna Aguirre, speaking on item have 2. I serve on the [indiscernible] K34eugs but not speaking for or representing snap. I'm here as a district 2 resident and taxpayer. I demand the following be considered specific to the

[11:18:29 AM]

300 million project connect and the displacement monies. Prior to the distribution of these funds our expectation is that the equity assistance to be come plead and implement. We expect and demand all members of the city council, capital metro, Austin transit partnership, and austining housing finance corporation, city manager and staff dealing with the 300 million and the displacement funds to undo the race am training which is now available virtually. The 300 million is taxpayers' investment on anti-displacement. Put the funds into interest bearing accounts and dedicate the interest into neighborhood stabilization measures. An expenditure report must also be provided to the public on a quarterly basis. We checked at the equity office to ensure current data is utilized. I have participated in three project connect scoping meeting in -- [buzzer sounding]

>> To date nothing has been provided. Thank you for your time and service to our community.

>> Warren Berkeley.

[11:19:39 AM]

Warren Berkeley?

>> Hi, this is Warren Berkeley. I'm with Austin justice coalition and

[indiscernible] And I wanted to speak against item 49, either postpone or vote no. It's a half baked plan and a blatant attempt to

[indiscernible] Homeless which should not be a strategy in housing them if your solution is not a house for housing the homeless, then it's not a solution. And pull that crime lab -- that forensics lab from APD. Cops shouldn't look at science.

>> Mitchell Bramski.

>> From district 7. I'm speaking on behalf of myself as a neighboring resident of the Texas

[11:20:39 AM]

bungalows experience health care professional as well as representing over 300 that signed a petition that was submitted to city council along with a statement explaining that. I refer you to that and hope you read in detail. I can't hit a lot that's on there and we live in the neighborhood around the Texas bungalows. We're not in opposition of the property because it's in our neighborhood. We support supportive housing in general. This is not the right Lowe indication or the right property and it is not suited for the use and we object to it on that grounds plus we didn't have advance notice. We weren't given the luxury, like district 6, to have advanced notice on that. And because we live there we're qualified to do that. Something Kelly pointed out last week and I want to make sure that is shown in the minutes. I want to make sure it's in the minutes that she rightly asked for a delay. Everybody should agree to it. Ellis pointed out that there

[11:21:41 AM]

was -- they wouldn't delay anything.

>> Speaker, your time is expired.

>> Leona Hernandez.

>> Hi there my name is Leona Hernandez. I'm a resident of district 7. I want to thank council for moving forward with the purchase of one hotel to house the homeless. And I would like to urge council to vote yes on item 61 to buy another hotel to provide a home for our houseless neighbors. I want to echo calls from the community to postpone or vote no on item 49. I do not support efforts to criminalize people for being unhoused and believe item 49 should receive input from those directly impacted. Before it is considered further. If city council isn't willing to postpone, they should vote against any form of this resolution that recriminalizes camping in Austin. Finally, I want to voice my support for item 32 to create an independent

[11:22:41 AM]

forensics lab because Austin is safer when science is controlled by scientists, not the police who, by the way, are still killing and brutalizing people in Austin. APD killed Alex Gonzales, Jr. In front of his family almost a month ago and the people want justice. And city manager correct me city manager cronk, you have blood on your hands and you need to resign.

>> Jacob chic.

>> Hello, this is Jacob chick from district 5 for black lives I'm an organizer there and litigator here in Austin. We're in favor of most of item 49 except for the decamping portion. Like so many issues this comes down to expectations of white culture. White people, white culture, expect to be comfortable at all times. Now, we eliminated the camping ban a year ago. We're asking you not to

[11:23:41 AM]

stop. Don't allow some people being uncomfortable at the sight of homeless people impact the actual lives of those homeless people. If these camping places are unsafe, make them more safe. Slow traffic. Put in traffic mitigation now, but more policing does not make homeless people safer. Don't back down. We will report you and we will win. Know this, if you give in to these reaction areas, we'll organize and we will still win, but we will do it without you.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Thank you.

>> Jamie concern.

[Indiscernible].

>> Hi, my name is Jamie and I live in district 4 and I'm calling to speak against item 49. I believe item 49 is not humane. I believe what is humane is to give the people a choice

[11:24:43 AM]

rather than taking away their power. In the end, it seems like what the authors really want is for certain areas to be cleared and not actually to help the people that live there. And so the first part is okay where you're trying to find housing for people or options for people, but the second part where you disallow camping in those areas later makes it clear that that's what you really want. So I hope you work to protect the most vulnerable people in this city. At the library, for example, they have access to meals -- two meals across the street per day. There is reasons why they are there. There are reasons why they are in central locations. Thank you.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Valerie ramnes. >>

>> Hi, Valerie R amnes and

[11:25:45 AM]

I'm with challenger newspaper.org. A low barrier job on a donation basis. Our motto is nothing about us without us. I believe hotels are good, but I want to take all the criminalization out of this item 49. I believe we should do hotels, tiny homes and camps like Esperanza community. That camp is full and I understand they are putting 68 square foot tiny homes out there. I think we should put tiny homes under the overpasses also. Foundation communities has 27 apartment buildings all around our city. Once people sleep, they blend back in to our community. I don't think we have to fear if people are fearful, it's because that's their relatives who are out there, most of the people in Austin who are homeless are from

[11:26:46 AM]

Austin.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Texas is 47th in spending on mental health. Stop the sweeps and stop the rapes by cops. Thank you.

>> Marcus Rosen.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> Yes, go ahead.

>> Cool. Hi, my name is Marcus Rosen, I'm a district 9 resident. Vote yes on items 32 and 61. These are important steps in creating a safer and better Austin for all. And will help to build a more trustworthy justice system in our community. Absolutely no on item 49 by standard agreement with most of the other folks who have spoke own this item, but it can't pass in its current form. This is a problem the city has created for ourselves by not acting sooner on these issues -- decades ago -- and it's our fault that they don't look pretty.

[11:27:47 AM]

[Indiscernible] Try to actually solve these issues. A gentle reminder that these are human beings and not cattle we can corral around the city as we see fit. Or extend to a farm outside the city as I think someone said earlier, I really hope I misheard that statement. We can and need to do better than this political S. Let's help. Thank you.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Austin Hess.

>> Hi, item 49 is a violent policy to disallow camping in many of the safest most popular encampments for unhoused people in the city. Disallowing camping is a pseudonym for a camping ban. Residents say locations near pedestrian walkways are safer and let prone to violence. These locations are also close to public transit and unhoused peoples jobs, friends, family and social service providers. Unhoused peoples are not

[11:28:47 AM]

pawns to be shuffled around to whatever shelter the city claims it can find with item 49's tiny increase in housing funds. And people will not trade their camping spot for a shelter many miles away from their responsibilities and support systems.

[Indiscernible] Public health issue refusing to display a --

[indiscernible]. The despicable mayor, Steve Adler, your support for public health concerns is ironic for a rich person who vacationed in Cabo.

[Indiscernible] You would not have to ban camping. Thank you.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Paige Shilt.

>> Hi, my name is Paige Shilt. I'm an organizer with district 5 for blam lives and graduate student of UT school of social work. I oppose item 49 as written and urge the city council to

[11:29:48 AM]

consider homelessness as a racial justice issue. My concern is that the council is once again prioritizing the comfort of white homeowners like myself over true safety for black austinites. We know that people experiencing homelessness in Austin are disproportionately black and we know that black austinites are disproportionately negatively impacted by policing from traffic stops to officer involved shootings. If the council is truly concerned with the safety of unhoused residents, they will re[move] references to campings and re[indiscernible] As a response to people living outdoors. Thank you.

>> Dustin Wyatt.

>> Dustin Wyatt, district 1. I'm here to speak out against item 49 and ask that it be postponed until it can be further revised. While the initiative claims to uphold city council's

[11:30:50 AM]

admit to decriminalization, it also paves the way to disallow camping without citations or policing. This language leaves ample opportunity for city staff, particularly the virulently antihomeless Mackenzie Kelly and her allies to

[indiscernible] Standard camping ban enforcement likely to resume when they are under a less scrutiny. The Paul trihousing funds included in this plan serve as a Progressive cover to reintroduce the camping ban and while the city has made only modest steps to providing permanent housing, these steps are simply nowhere near enough to provide permanent housing solutions for our city's most marginalized people. Any door that is opened for criminalize camping, is a slippery slope. And it is morally reprehensible. I would also like to speak out in favor of item 61 and 32. Thank you.

[11:31:51 AM]

>> Peter Kong.

>> Hi, Peter Kong, district 3. And speaking in favor of more effective law enforcement in regards to the unhoused, as well as the forensics lab. So I am speaking against 49. When trust is broken with our community members, including those that are unhoused by being used to criminalize their housing situation, that breaks down trust and leads to less effective law enforcement. The same goes for the separation of the forensicslab from APD. That has been done successfully in the city of Houston for many years now and that model can be replicated here successfully. Also in favor of 61. I think that the supporters

[11:32:51 AM]

and sponsors of 49 are being disingenuous when they do not offer up a viable housing solution if they are opposed to 61. I think that is the more effective -- [buzzer sounding]

>> Solution for housing the unhoused. Thank you.

>> Michelle Edwards.

>> Hi, my name is Michelle Edwards. And I live in district 5 and I'm part of district 5 for black lives and a sociology professor at Texas state. And I support item 32 and 61. But I'm particularly calling in terms of item 49. I greatly appreciate council member kitchen's efforts to speak with our group, but -- and she told me to say this -- I do not support item 49 as written because the verbiage doesn't exclude policing from the implementation plan city manager cronk can come back with for disallowing camping. This is a racial injustice

[11:33:52 AM]

issue. Because of our race institutions, including our criminal justice system, people of color are disproportionately replatted among our unhoused neighbors and disproportionately affected by violence at the hands of the Austin police department. City manager, please know that research shows that any plan that involves the police, moving along orders, confiscation of properties, sweeps, anything, all these things exacerbate trauma, reduce safety and widen existing racial gender and health inequalities. They do not reduce homelessness. Please change this prior to the initiative and show you want to build trust with people who are unhoused. Thank you.

>> Travis word.

>> Hi, my name is Travis ward I live in district 7 and I'm ' member of Austin dsa. I'm urging city council to vote against item 49 as written. It's a poorly drafted owes Y luges that leads to criminalize. It's not enough for to you say we won't criminalize homelessness. At the very least council

[11:34:53 AM]

member Casar's amendments would be the only acceptable way to move forward, but there is no sense in rushing this with so many glaring problems. Y'all coupled over Kelly not being prepared last week and willing to give her time to drum up a bunch of fear about the hotels and encourage solutions by buy a farm, the least can you do is delay this horrible resolution. I'm also supporting item 61 and item 32. Thank you.

>> Janice squire.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> Yes, go ahead.

>> All right, I'm Janice, I'm in district 7 and I live close to the Texas bungalows hotels and suites and representing concerns of a petition and materials we submitted to the city relating to last weekagenda item 31 and 32. Council member pool we did not find any evidence of extensive community education and outreach in our district, and we ask for transparency. This is a quiet residential

[11:35:53 AM]

district unlike the hotels purchased in the other locations in the city. And the \$6.7 million price point to help these individuals --

[Indiscernible] Does not seem good. We're in full support helping the homeless, but we question the suitability of this location.

[Indiscernible] Green space around it but in truth there is not. It sits on a busy highway access road. All the surrounding residents around it is in development or will soon be in development. Permanent supportive housing is questionable in terms of basically a health and safety to residents. Within a ten minutes walk is a liquor store and a charter high school. We demand the council members investigate the site and perform due diligence and address these issues.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Erin Giglio.

>> Hi, my name is Erin and I am a member of district 1

[11:36:55 AM]

and I'm here today to comment on items 61 and 49. Want to comment I was so proud of Austin for dedicating resources from the police budget to purchasing a hotel to house our unhoused neighbors. My partner --

[Indiscernible] Had been homeless and developed skills working in a kitchen and we know a lot of unhoused folks need a little help and compassion to get back on their feet which is much cheaper 230r9 community in the long run. But I oppose -- and for that reason I support approving item 61 to buy a secondary hotel for this purpose. However, I support postponing 49 or opposing as written until such time as criminalize homelessness is not part of that bill. We have a real opportunity to be leaders for the nation, but we won't be able to do that unless we take care carefully. We can't rush this initiative by throwing in initiatives to criminalize being unhoused or impede community members without taking time to understand community action have

[11:37:56 AM]

objections and understand what those objections truly are. We have an opportunity to be an example for only if we're not too hasty.

>> Speaker, your time has expired.

>> Amelia Casas.

>> Hello. My name is Amelia Casas with the Texas [Indiscernible] Project and resident of district 6. Speaking in support of item 61. Our city is in deep need of more supportive housing and I strongly encourage the purchase of the candlewood hotel. I ask for the postponement of item 49. I think council member Casar and mayor for their amendments. These are a great first step but there is more work to

do. The city needs to reach out to the individuals and families that would be directly impacted by the heal initiatives. This item has the potential to move and displace many of our unhoused neighbors and they're entitled to have a voice as is the resolution justifies the tactic for disallowing camping in pry

[11:38:56 AM]

are the areas. I am opposed to sweeps and Gail to keep anybody safe. If you're not willing to postpone this item, vote against any form of this resolution that criminalizes camping in Austin. Thank you for your time. I'm also in support of item 32.

>> Fran tatu.

>> [Indiscernible]. Good morning, thank you for taking my call. I live just south of the city and own a home in the hill country. I'm calling in to speak against item 49. You are calling this the heal initiative which is an oxymoron for a camping ban. I have envisioned

[indiscernible] We believe the Earth belongs to all of us and to none of us. Before colonization, all people were free to roam the land and to set up their tent camps wherever it suited them close to resources they needed to survive and where they felt

[11:39:56 AM]

safe. It's the same today request our unhoused neighbors. They are out in the open where they feel safe from violence, near to resources they need to viver. Many are urbanites. Ronnie and elder with a disability has lived in Austin all his life. I met him in the alley, sitting in the rain with his cane. With the help of Austin mutual aid we were able to set him up at the camp pes. Whether you admit it or not all of these unhoused neighbors are our neighbors and we are to love our nay horseas thigh self. Come to some solutions where we speak to our impacted on the streets. I leave with you this quote: Whatever you do for the least of my brothers and sisters, you do for me. Thank you very much for the time.

>> Heidi Sloan.

>> Good morning, my name is Heidi Sloan. I live in district 1. I am with homes not hand

[11:40:57 AM]

castles and Austin dsa. I have also worked alongside people experiencing homelessness for the last eight years. I want to say first that I am for item 32 and 61. But I am speaking and ask you to postpone item 49 unless I can include the specific amendments put forward by council member Casar and by the mayor this morning at the very least. I believe these amendments follow the expressed intentof the authors of

not involving policing and provide important clarity that closes hoop holes that would allow that to happen in the future. I think these amendments speak to many of the concerns expressed here today. So if you can't postpone, please include those. I maintain that actually talking to people living in camps across Austin would have gotten up here more quickly and to better resolution and remind council members that these are your constituency, too.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> I think it is important to note that the data isn't even back on the last time Austin shuttered a camp and

[11:41:57 AM]

we need to look at that first.

>> Emily garrick.

>> Thank you. Emily, Texas [indiscernible] Project speaking in support of the hotel and forensic labs and asking to postpone or amend item 49. Item 32 moved nearly \$12 million from APD's budget to create an independent forensics lab head I by scientists instead of police which is an important part of the work to reimagine justice. We ask that council pass item 61 and postpone or amend item 49 with council member Casar's amendments which would prevent this item from becoming a back door to criminalize and ensure it would not take away funding from the housing effort. Before the ordinance changes in 2019, we represented people who were tracked down, ticketed and arrested. Simply because they were too poor to pay criminal citations for sleeping outside. Now with the pandemic displacing more people than

[11:42:58 AM]

ever from their homes and the disease spreading through the jail. It is important important than ever to fund supporting housing and move away from solutions like criminalization. Thank you.

>> Jessica Madison.

>> Hi, my name is Jessica and I'm a resident of district 4. As a sexual assault survivor I support item 32. I'm here today to ask stownd to move forward with item 61, the purchase of candlewood suites and also to postpone or vote no on item 49 until revisions are made to protect the health and safety of our unhoused community. I was born and raised in Austin. So I'm very aware of the scwie rocketing cost of living and low wages. Tickets our unhoused citizens will only set them back and put them at risk. Being homeless should not be a crime. Overpasses shelter them from severe Texas weather, gives

[11:43:59 AM]

them a work space where they collect food, money, water, goods to keep them alive. Unless there is a room available they should not be bothered. The lines [indiscernible] That shall be driven bye-bye as conscious or unconscious. The objective is to provide housing until they are mentally stable but I feel we are will harm the community. Phase I is to remove the people then this entire effort will fail. Don't house them so the rich feel comfortable.

>> Speaker, your time has expired.

>> Alexander

[indiscernible].

>> Hi, I'm a district 6 resident and I'm speaking in favor of item 32 to decouple forensics from APD. I wouldn't trust APD to run a bath, so they definitely shouldn't be rung forensics. I am also in favor of item 61, which is permanent

[11:45:00 AM]

supportive housing for our homeless community. There is nothing wrong with that. And I'm proud to be in the district where that's going up. And finally, I'm against item 49 which is the Trojan horse camping ban. The last thing I'd like to say is that you should fire chief Manley and if cronk won't do it then you should fire him. He's massively overpaid as it is. He makes \$300,000 in a city where the average income is \$40,000. So you could definitely find someone for cheaper and, pay, put that money into more supportive housing. Thanks for your time.

>> Emily sawyer.

>> Hello. My name is Emily sawyer. I live in district 4. Thank you to the council for voting last week to purchase one hotel to provide long term support and housing for the folks experiencing

[11:46:00 AM]

homelessness. Please vote yes today as well on item 61 to purchase the second hotel. Any further delay is unnecessary and frankly disrespectful to our unhoused neighbors and to the immeasurable energy and countless hours spent by council members, city staff, voters and advocates to make these purchases and supports possible. Please also vote no or to postpone item 49. While in support of investments to provide housing for and to promote the health and safety of our neighbors experiencing homelessness, I do not support any action that would recriminalize camping and do not support the use of sweeps. Sweeping people currently experiencing homelessness out of sight for our own comfort and

convenience is at best a waste of time and resources and at worst it is cruel, callous and inhumane. Please also vote yes on item 32 to create an independent forensics lab. Thank you.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Awais ahzar.

[11:47:03 AM]

>> My name is awais ahzar, I'm on the leap team of

[indiscernible]. We ask you vote in favor of all amendments by council member Casar if you cannot postpone the item at this time. We also ask that you vote in favor of item 61 and 52 today. Me and my colleagues have been working with representatives from the Austin area urban lesion, Austin justice coalition and homes not hand castles to see how you can best achieve the expressed objectives and have shared our concerns with you all. We appreciate the efforts made by couch kitchen to address some of the advocates, the third draft of the resolution posted on February 2nd needs further changes to ensure the initiative does not lead to unintended consequences. I ask that you vote in favor of the amendments shared by council member Casar and mayor Adler this morning because it addresses these concerns. These amendments are critical to ensuring the heal initiative is equitable and does not harm the most

[11:48:03 AM]

vulnerable. Unlease these amendments are accepted, we ask that you listen to the community and postpone taking action on item 49. Thank you all.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Jasmine Harrison.

>> Hi, my name is Jasmine and I'm a resident of district 9. I'm support of item 61 and item 32 and I'm calling to urge the council to postpone item 49 which prioritizes politics and white comfort over black lives. I am not in favor of any camping ban which are racist, violent and traumatic. Austin has only begun to take our first baby steps to protect our unhoused neighbors. Ticketing, arrests, fines, displacement and police brutality are the only things that will come of reinstating a camping ban. Do not push these people out of sight just to make affluent white austinites feel more comfortable. Stand with our unhoused communities and push for

[11:49:05 AM]

long term compassionate change which centers the voices of those experiencing homelessness. I urge the council, especially my representative Kathie Tovo who I was disappointed to here sponsored this bill to postpone on item 49. Thank you.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Cathy Mitchell.

>> Hello.

>> Yes, go ahead.

>> Can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can.

>> Hi, this is -- sorry. This is Cathy Mitchell. And I am here to speak for item 32. I have to say it's my intention was to remind you all of the history and how we got here, but just thinking about that long history kind of made me

[11:50:06 AM]

depressed. I will just say thank you. It's long overdue and I hope that we continue to do dialogue as a member of the reimagine task force, I very much look forward to imagining a better, bigger, safer and more independent and completely independent system for evaluating evidence in criminal cases that will help the women who have been waiting for their rape kits to be tested and it will help every victim of violent crime and it will help every person who was accused of a crime. Thank you.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Marina Roberts.

>> [Indiscernible] But don't worry about, you know --

>> Marina Roberts.

>> Today we're just trying to get those ideas down.

[11:51:07 AM]

You don't have to put your ideas in order. We are going to do that later.

>> We're going to call this speaker back. Valerie Wells.

>> Hi, my name is Valerie, I'm a resident of D5 and also a local social worker in the community. And I'm calling to speak in favor of 32 and of 61 and I'm also against 49. Recriminalizing homelessness does not

solve the problem. You cannot disappear people out of homelessness. And the current way we are doing things cost us far more money than just providing the housing, not to mention the undue stress putting on our er staff and ems staff. We have people over utilizing our er and emergency medical services because we have nowhere to send them and no ways to meet their needs. On weekends, that's the only way they can get a sandwich or a drink. So we need permanent housing solutions, people need a

[11:52:07 AM]

place to go. People need resources and we also as staff need them to have to send them because we are burning out fast. We got in this profession to help people and you have totally hindered our ability to do that. Thank you.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Blake Smith.

>> Good morning. I'm here today as an Austin resident and voter, social worker and an employee of family elder care. I agree with many of my fellow speakers that council should vote to pose own item 49 and approve item 61. We're in the middle of a pandemic and so many of us are facing financial crisis. We need our council to focus on equitable solutions to preventing and ending homelessness. The city is far behind on affordable housing goals, especially for extremely low income austinites.

[11:53:08 AM]

Item 61 is a real solution, but I don't think the heal initiative is. As many have said, this is an equity issue. Policy should be driven by data and people with lived experience and postponing item 49 will give advocates and the community more time to provide feedback. I'm thankful to live in a city that has madek quit a priority and I hope council continues to take action that moves also us towards this goal. Thanks for your time.

>> Yosha [indiscernible].

>> Hi, I live in district 1. I'm speaking in Sprong support of 32 and 61 and will use my time to oppose or ask for postponing on the vote for 49. I'm glad someone brought up the liquor store. As a current medical student and a masters of graduate from the Yale school of public health I'm informed of the need of housing as a determinant of health. The health care costs

[11:54:09 AM]

associated with homelessness often far exceed the costs of providing housing. Numerous studies, plenty of which have been conducted through controlled trials which is the gold standard of scientific experiments prove housing is a requirement and often improves outcomes related to substance abuse and helps mental health, in addition there is ample evidence that the criminalization of poverty is detrimental to health outcomes as well as unconstitutional. A growing number of courts have struck down laws that punish sleeping and camping in public on the basis of the fourth, eighth and 14th amendments. When our unhoused neighbors are saddled with high fines and fees, it hurts their employments and housing options and their sense of community which are all detrimental to health.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Finally, it's a moral imperative --

>> Speaker, your time is expired.

>> Zenobia Joseph.

>> Thank you, mayor, council

[11:55:09 AM]

members. I'm Zenobia Joseph. I do have a technical correction. Do you want me to just say it?

>> Go ahead.

>> I actually signed up for and against lofts, item no. 11 and I would ask the clerk to correct it to for. There is no way to go back in the system and change it to myself so I registered twice and then for the item no. 1, I just wanted to ask you, mayor, if I could have my written comments for David chapel submitted into the record. Last week I didn't get the code for zoning.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> It was timely submitted when I actually registered. Okay, thank you. As relates to today's agenda, I just want to go ahead and oppose no. 49. As council member kitchen to

[11:56:09 AM]

actually share how she determined the four locations. I would ask council member Casar to remind his colleagues that homeless people sleep a little walnut creek library as well so the other one should not be prioritized. I want you to recognize as relates to the 9% low income housing tax credits. I oppose no. 17, council member pool, I would ask you to postpone that item and to ask Mandy to give you an overlay. I want you to recall on August 27th you approved 430 units which is one mile away for permanent supportive housing next to Mcbee elementary which is also about a mile away from walnut creek elementary. I do support no. 61 which is your candlewood suites and I oppose the two letters from the

elected officials in Williamson county for 180 day delay. I want you to actually look at the amount of --
[buzzer sounding]

>> Density in this area and lastly, mayor, I oppose item 003, which is on your next

[11:57:12 AM]

agenda for the Austin housing finance corporation. And those comments were sent to Texas department of housing and community affairs. I thank you for taking my comments. If you have any questions.

>> Marina Roberts.

>> We're trying figure out -- you're not writing today, right? So this is not writing. You're not responding to the prompt. What you're doing is brainstorming.

>> Marina Roberts?

>> They don't have to be incomplete sentences and you're going to choose the prompt that is connected to the --

>> Marina Roberts, if you wish to speak at the city council meet, this is your time.

>> You can let me know and then I will -- I can go off --

>> Tyler walker.

>> Yeah, hello. Can you hear me?

>> Yes.

>> My name is Tyler walker. I'm the founder and CEO of

[11:58:12 AM]

out cast ministries. I'm a resident of district 7. I'm calling to ask to postpone or vote no on item 49. We are new 501(c)(3) Organization here in Austin whose board is constructed of men and women with long term sobriety and we've been serving our local homeless community each week on Burnett and 183 to 35. Currently, we just wanted to talk to somebody and let you guys know we are here and we are willing to serve and we do have a plan of action that could help with this homeless crisis. And we would love to discuss it further with those willing to listen. Our mission is to help the less fortunate struggling with drug and alcohol addiction, mental health issues ordinary people that are just plain down on their luck by providing food water and basic necessities offering prayer and fellowship and other services. We'd like to encourage all city council members to come out with us on Fridays. Let's talk to our homeless brothers and sisters and come up with a solution together. Thank you and god bless.

>> Nora Hansel.

[11:59:15 AM]

>> Hi, thank you. My name is Nora and I was born and raised in Austin. I have also spent some time living in the bay area. And so I've seen the changes in housing crisis and places. I'm here to urge yes on 32 and 61 and for y'all to please either amend or postpone or no on no. 49. Anything that further criminalizes camping or allowing for sweeping of homeless encampment.s or the criminalization of poverty is really contrary to helping people at all or addressing the root causes of the issue. I urge you all to please look at the big picture and see the connections between our current housing crisis and city policies. And also real estate development and the ways that some people in this city have profited. Have directly resulted in the large amount of people

[12:00:16 PM]

who are not able to meet their basic needs in terms of housing and other things right now.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Remember that much of black Austin is also houseless. Thank you.

>> Jessica Ramirez.

>> Mayor. Mayor. If I may, a couple of speakers ago we had somebody who I think might have been a speaker who was called and she unmuted and it was clear -- I'm not sure whether she's a teacher or parent. But I just want -- if it's possible to allow her -- with a great understanding for the various roles all of us are playing, I would suggest that if it's possible, if the person who was called -- and it's possible to allow her an opportunity to speak today, I would be in favor of doing that. Again. We're all balancing different roles.

>> Mayor Adler: I think we actually -- this was the second time I think going back to her.

>> I see.

>> That is correct, mayor.

[12:01:17 PM]

We've called her twice.

>> Mayor Adler: But if she reaches out to us, we'll accommodate that.

>> Sounds like she is having a busy day. Doing great work encouraging writing strategies.

>> She is I think a teacher.

>> Mayor Adler: All right, clerk, proceed.

>> Jessica Ramirez.

>> Hello, thank you so much. Yes, can you hear me?

>> Yes, go ahead.

>> Okay, appreciate your time today. Hi, my name is Jessica Ramirez, I'm a homeowner in district 2. I have lived here for 12 years speaking today to urge you to approve 61 and 32. The forensic lab needs to be more -- moved to independent investigation and out of APD's control. Mismanagement sexual assault files, further mismanaging Austin. Believe and support survivors by approving 32. As well as a vote against item 49 if you cannot

[12:02:18 PM]

postpone it. It is inhumane, unacceptable. These policies are racist, sexist and transphobic. While my property taxes rise and [indiscernible] Is continue to be wealthy pockets of the city of Austin, being poor should not be criminalized. We see redistricting and rezoning for profit and criminalizing our poor community where they are communities of color only making up 10% of our population, we know the police department continues to kill unarmed blacks and brown austinites like Alex Gonzales, Jr. Who was murdered by an off duty police officer on January 6th before the insurrection. Similar to 2012 --

>> Speaker, your time has expired.

>> Do the right thing --

>> Tza'ar ba'alei chayim Collier.

-- Zach Collier.

>> Hi, my name is Zach.

[12:03:18 PM]

I live in district 1 and I'm calling in opposition of item 49. As others have noted, Ann kitchen cynically named heal proposal as insufficient to resolve homelessness now and in the future and it engenders violent displacement tactics which traumatize unhoused people and exacerbate their conditions of homelessness. It is clear you have made no preliminary effort to engage with the people whose these decisions will affect and I think it's imperative for to you do so before you come to a solution which will resolve homelessness in Austin. Thank you.

>> Ashley lane.

>> Hello, thank you so much for having me. I'm Ashley lane. And I live in district 10. Please vote against or postpone item 49 and for item 61. In summary, do not blame the

[12:04:20 PM]

homeless for the city council's failure to provide housing. I'm going to focus my time on addressing my support for item 61 because much of what I said in opposition of item 49 has already been said. Studies have shown that a housing first approach is more effective in terms of cost and efficiency than traditional approaches. It is shown that the creation of affordable housing benefits the entire community and this can hold true even when affordable housing is built in wealthy neighborhoods. I live in district 10. I know we have a lot of empty property here and I would personally support affordable transitional housing being created in my neighborhood. When people express fear of affordable transitional housing being built in their communities, those fears are misplaced and counterproductive. Every neighborhood must be a part of the solution for housing our neighbors.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Thank you for your time.

>> Julian [indiscernible].

[12:05:20 PM]

>> Hi, I support housing first solutions as well as other productive measures to support people's lives as their wish I do not approve any measures for

[indiscernible] People that are unhoused and vulnerable to police abuse. Police abuse is still a crime by the way. I support the decoupling of the crime lab from APD. This is your land. This is my land. You're sitting on stolen land. Stolen from our indigenous people, tread lightly. To the people, these council members do not represent Austin and its values. They have lost all moral authority for their violent mandates and have sold us all out. They have sold us out to big developers and mayor, wealthy politicians over \$380 million. Steve Adler alone could end the poverty and homeless in Austin. Greed is a carnal sin. To date you have not speak Eem or talked to street advocates or especially the people that you will be acting against them in their so-called tents that they call home.

[12:06:21 PM]

Home is where we live. I oppose all actions to criminalize people that are poor or unsightly in Austin. Each is rich and beautiful to me. Many like me were wrongfully evicted -- [buzzer sounding]

>> By slumlords. The same developers and real estate agents that give money to these blank hole politicians. Thank you.

>> Carmen Yanez Pulido.

>> Hello, this is Carmen Yanez pull I had oh and I'm calling particularly about item 62, signed up at neutral currently in regards to anti-displacement funds with project connect. I'm leaning toward against and the reason is you have it written that exclude the 23 Mary Magdalene dollars from the equity tool. You also have it written in a way that excludes the funding to the project connect lines. And uses the uprooted

[12:07:21 PM]

methodology which is very broad and open-ended, so in theory, with this money going to land acquisition, this could be a really good thing. And it could be a way to get things fast moving. But without a seriously vetted equity tool, and scorecard, without going through a process that is transparent, you are not necessarily going to get that. And most likely we're going to get dress up funds, the kind of funds that subsidize luxury developments, future transit-oriented development without the people -- current people in mind. I really encourage you all to pause, figure out how we're going to get voices like [indiscernible] Who you heard earlier in Spanish. By the way, there was some rocky translation there and she said how is this going to impact and how are you going to engage the currently affected residents? Not the actual residents, but the current residents, not hypothetical folks. So we need -- this resolution, those of us who are connected, educated,

[12:08:22 PM]

privileged advocates, we know this resolution was about the go bond. It was about affordable housing money and all of a sudden it's the project connect anti-displacement fund. Why is that? And why is it that anti-displacement and housing always get scooted around for different priorities? I'm thrilled you all are trying to get people a roof over their head in the hotels, but now our affordable housing money is being used for a temporary homelessness solution.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Please don't side step this and enforce the equity tool from the beginning of these funds. Thank you.

>> Sally Chen.

>> Hi. My name is Julie. I'm from district 10 and I'm here to speak against item 61. I understand that you all wanted to help with the homeless problem in Austin, but buying hotels to house them might not be a good option. While spending millions of

[12:09:22 PM]

dollars on some hotels will not solve all the homeless problems. Running the hotel costs even more in the long run. So it's not financially reasonable. And also making such a hasty decision is not wise. Did you all get enough time for the neighbors to ponder the situation? The site is near three schools, Anderson mill elementary, [indiscernible] Middle school and Westwood high school. Do we really want to house the homeless near our schools? As far as I know, many parents are concerned about the safety of their kids in schools. So really house them near schools is not a good option at all. So I strongly urge you all to rethink this deal. Please postpone or vote no on item 61.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Thank you.

>> Melania berry.

[12:10:24 PM]

>> Hi, my name is Melania berry. I am a resident of district 10. I am in favor of item 32 and I would like to ask council to postpone item 49. I'm not in favor of the language changes, and it's only fair that the city takes time to properly engage with those facing homelessness in the same way that council postponed for engagement with district 6 and the hotel purchase. To reiterate, I support postponement for review and engagement with our neighbors who are experiencing homelessness. Thank you.

>> Caleb Todd.

>> Caleb Todd?

>> Hello. My name is Caleb Todd. I'm a resident of district 5, and I worked for eight months in 2020 in bringing meals to the

[12:11:26 PM]

homeless camps near me with a total of 50 residents. So I'd like to support resolution 61, but mostly ask for postponement of resolution 49. We specifically (indiscernible) Language criminalizing homelessness can be amended. I worked in camps, and providing supplies was lost when the city did sweeps. I would

like to push back on the narrative that homelessness causes danger. I'm 5'5", 120 pounds soaking wet, I worked in these camps for eight months. At one point I had to stop delivering after dark because I was scaring people, coming up to them. These camps are full of older folks, disabled people. You don't have to be concerned.

[12:12:27 PM]

It may be your grandparents next to you. All right. Thank you for your time. Bye.

>> Megan lash?

>> Hello, this is Megan lash. I'm with the social industries. I live in district 10. I just wanted to thank you for your continued support. I'm speaking about items 9 and 12. And look forward to hopefully putting more quality affordable housing in areas of Austin. Thank you.

>> Ann Alvarez?

>> Hello. Can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can. Go ahead.

>> Okay. Great. My name is Ann Alvarez, and I wish to speak regarding item 49. I'm a resident of the east Travis neighborhood in district

[12:13:30 PM]

3, with one of the encampments being considered in removal is located. I'm in support of camping, ending a failed solution attempt that is not humane or safe for either the housed or the unhoused. I'm concerned that the proposed plan in item 49 will only push people to camp in other areas. Camping is not humane or safe. They need temporary or permanent housing that provides bathrooms, safety, heating, and cooling. The camping ordinance for the homeless has also caused a large increase in the homeless population and in population residential areas such as the east Travis neighborhood. Within a seven-block area of our home there are services that attracted unsustainable increase in the homeless population and those that prey upon them

[buzzer]. We had a man break into our property in the middle of the day when my children were home

[12:14:32 PM]

and threaten to stab my husband. Now that man is in jail.

>> Speaker, your time has expired. Jeffrey Clemens?

>> Good afternoon. My name is Jeffrey Clemens, district 3 resident and president of the (indiscernible) Naacp. Council, you have two choices, perpetuate the criminalization of homelessness or item 61 finish the work started last week and keep on the path of progress directly affecting the issue central to the crisis, lack of housing in our city. It is counterproductive according to the data and history to work on this issue for it to create a criminal intent for camping. It's the only home they've known. Moreover, now that we know save Austin petitioned the city-wide camping ban will be on the ballot this may, item 49 can be banned as well. We should be paying more support to the organizations and

[12:15:32 PM]

initiatives which already

(indiscernible) To do work proposing to duplicate without the potential for abuse. I urge the council to vote no on 49 and postpone for several weeks to get more clarity on the voices of those affected by the policy and prevent [buzzer]. Thank you, I yield back my time.

>> Mallory hart?

>> Hi. My name is Mallory hart. I'm a resident of district 1 and homeowner. I'm calling to oppose item 49 as it stands. Ideally, this item would have been postponed, and not even up for vote today, due to the lack of outreach to our neighbors who are unhoused. And who would be directly impacted. I ask why we wouldn't want to center those directly impacted

[12:16:33 PM]

by this initiative that's proposed. Also, as it stands now, community groups service providers, potential partners are not ready to commit as is. So if we're not willing to postpone, I strongly urge you to vote no on item 49. It is not a data driven approach. We could not have a resolution to decriminalizing encampments in Austin. I just ask you to imagine rt trauma of having all your possessions taken and being forced to move. Where will our neighbors be able to go. This is an issue that is a racial justice and inequity.

[Buzzer] I urge you to vote yes on 69 and no for item 49 if not postponed. Thank you.

>> Karen dodia?

>> Hi. My name is Karen, and I'm a

[12:17:37 PM]

resident of district 6. I would like to address councilwoman Kelly. The healing that housing focuses on the (indiscernible) is in part the mending of relationships in housed and unhoused neighbors in the city. We may best respect our neighbors experiencing homelessness (indiscernible). I ask for a brief period of silence to remember the golden rule and reconnect

(indiscernible) For our unhoused neighbors.

>> Aleecia torres? Aleecia torres?

>> Yes. Hello?

>> Yes, go ahead.

>> Hello.

[12:18:37 PM]

Can you hear me?

>> Yes. Go ahead.

>> Okay. Hello, my name is aleecia torres, I live in district 3. I'm calling to oppose item 49, and in support of item 61. As a city we need to stop this behavior pattern of moving forward with short-sighted solutions that in no way come from those most directly impacted by the actual issue. As many folks have already stated, this is an attempt dressed in nice language to decriminalize our neighbors experiencing homelessness. Austinites have already said a big no, no, we do not want to criminalize homelessness. So why is the city council backtracking on commitments that we have already made as a community. Provide the resources to address the issue of homelessness should not have strings attached.

[12:19:38 PM]

Especially ones that hurt the very community, those resources are meant to help. I am ashamed, I'm really ashamed that my council representative is [buzzer] Harms that community instead of protecting it. Stop being short-sighted. Put the money and work where it matters in our community.

>> Your time has expired.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. Colleagues, by the way, we are unable to get the sitcom speaker on the phone. That's why we've continued to move forward. We have about ten speakers or so left. Then we'll see if we can get a vote on the consent agenda. Go ahead, please.

>> Kyle Harmon?

>> Hi there. My name is Kyle Harmon. City council must postpone or vote no on item 49 today. You haven't heard from the people these policies impact and

[12:20:38 PM]

until folks who are unhoused to speak. Further when we criminalize camping, we put people behind bars to cause trauma and put them back in the city to harm them without offering reparations for the systemic failures for people unhoused in the first place. The very money that made the hotel (indiscernible) Possible is to keep people out of the system. If you pair that with recriminalizing camping, giving us the charade for how you're acting for all of us. There will be no camping to criminalize. If you criminalize camping, your plan falls short and it's just a replacement with a paint job. The answer is to not resign and be complicit in the violence we aim to dismantle. Thanks.

>> Councilmember tovo, it looks like the speaker called back in from earlier. So we're going to give this another try.

[12:21:41 PM]

>> Thank you.

>> Of course. Marina Roberts?

>> Hello. I'm a public schoolteacher in district 1, and a member of Austin dsa. I'm testifying in support of item 61 and in opposition to 49. When you wage war against the idea of living next to the homeless even living beside you in a home, you're really saying you believe homelessness that people cannot stop homelessness and would rather tear a building down than live next to poor people. This skips over the parts of the bible (indiscernible) Encampment for blood on their hands in a second. I hope you will not accept it.

(Indiscernible) Taking advantage of the opportunity to provide services to them more easily. You ban camping, therefore closing against the possibility of future benefit from said congregation. You don't do this if your aim is to help the war. You do this for the barbaric

[12:22:42 PM]

anger of people. I would trade 2,000 pounds of a rich person's comfort for

[buzzer]. I ask that you not make the mistake.

>> Sylvia blanco?

>> Hello. Councilmembers and mayor Adler, I'm the chief operating officer for the housing authority of the city of Austin. Simply put, now is the time for rosewood. On behalf of rosewood court families, we're deeply grateful for your support of agenda items 22 and 23, that will significantly improve quality of life for current and future families in need of stable housing and meaningful support services while also honoring the rich history and legacy of rosewood park. Through this effort a property was antiquated and obsolete, systems with little to no

[12:23:42 PM]

accessibility will be revitalized with modern energy-efficient units. We're excited about introducing affordable opportunity as a unique element to this project. We're especially grateful for the support from councilmember harper-madison, former councilmember Ora Houston and partners like Austin area urban league, and goodwill. We look forward to working together to provide rosewood families can be proud to call home. Thank you very much.

>> (Indiscernible) Javy?

>> I'm a licensed msw working with the (indiscernible) Authority. Asking the council to vote against item 49. I work with individuals experiencing homelessness every day in Austin. These folks struggle with mental

[12:24:43 PM]

health [lapse in audio] Substance use. 49 is not Progressive. It's obviously racist. Sweeping camps perpetuates homelessness in our city. Increasing policing [lapse in audio] For the already vulnerable. Focus on their basic needs which start with housing, and continue with mental and physical health support.

[Lapse in audio] Ben white boulevard, and 183 [lapse in audio]. Please consider bringing social workers and other informed citizens to help your council make better choices. I'm also asking for [lapse in audio].

>> Sarah zamaripa?

[12:25:46 PM]

>> Hi. My name is Sarah. I live in district 3 around the corner from the trosk library. I'm sorry that, first of all, I'm a single brown woman, raised by a single mother, and so who would like me to actually leave my house and move somewhere else so I could be safe. I support 49 and actually would support a full ban. The residents on my block are tired and exhausted from having people come to their house, yelling at

them on their porch. We've essentially become social workers, and we're not qualified. Because on a given day anyone can come screaming down our street. I want these people to have mental health services, most of them belong in hospitals, and need rehab. But in the surroundings community, it's not fit to manage the needs of this population and the unfortunate nefarious elements that come along with this.

[12:26:47 PM]

We can [buzzer] Multiple videos of what goes on. Thank you for your time.

>> Suki McMahon?

>> Yes, I'm criminal justice policy director and a d-9 resident, speaking on item 32. It is in our best interest to

(indiscernible) When the city and county behave in a most transparent manner and when forensic matter is handled by unbiased scientists whose goal is neutral scientific testing. This is to the benefit of survivors of sexual assault. One reason we've been working with survivors on this issue for years now. This is to the benefit of anyone who is faced with a criminal justice system. We believe more transparency can

[12:27:50 PM]

result from a forensic department than the structure we have in place right now which requires the lead forensic scientist to report to several layers of leadership. This is a step in the right direction. And we'll be working with the reimagine task force to make recommendations to council, in which the forensic department can be accountable to the community. Thanks.

>> Frank metsure?

>> Hi. This is frank. I am a member -- I'm a homeowner in district 1. A member of the Austin dsa and employees union. I am calling to ask you to vote in favor of item 32, against 49, and for 61. To address the issues I've heard on the call so far, people experiencing homelessness is

[12:28:51 PM]

said to not be moving to the city. They're more to be victims much crime than the partnership waters. They recommend not moving camps in the middle of a pandemic, so let's listen to the CDC. And ask that there be no legal consequences for banning camping. We know in a year you won't come back and say,

oh, we tried that, it didn't work. And that is bad. Because the camping ban on extension of Jim crow practices

(indiscernible) Racist track.

[Buzzer] We ask you for a delay on the hotels, and then add a rally against it. Thank you very much for your time and attention. Have a great day.

>> Annie hart?

>> Did you say Annie hartneck?

>> Yes, go ahead.

[12:29:51 PM]

>> Thank you very much for letting me speak. So, I'm calling because I would like to register my opposition to item 49, or a postponement, and my support of item 61. And I'm speaking with experience, volunteers for the past six years. And I deliver folks around north Lamar and 183. Over that time, I have come to know some of the people that I serve. And I would just like to say that these are not criminals. Homelessness should not be criminalized. And at this time, with evictions, and unemployment on the rise, I think that it's important for everyone voting on this to consider the fact that

[12:30:52 PM]

there but for the grace of god go all of us.

[Buzzer] Many Americans are just a few paychecks away from being homeless. So please take that into consideration. Thank you for your time.

>> Brian register?

>> Hi. So I'm Brian, I live in Austin, and so I want y'all to vote for 32. As they explained a couple of minutes ago, why to do that. Pretty straightforward. You need to vote for 61. We need the housing that that encompasses. There's a little bit of irony in the panic over buying this hotel, which is something that has been discussed for quite some time. And the need to delay buying it until we can talk with all of the neighbors. Twinned with the desire in 49, to go ahead and move a whole bunch of encampments without bothering to talk with the people that live in them. You can't be both paranoid about a regular real estate deal and

[12:31:52 PM]

push it off until we have all kinds of community conversation, and also just sort of willy-nilly and destroy a bunch of people's homes without so much as talking to them. Look, until homelessness is a choice, which it is not, you can't regulate it as if it were a regular choice. I don't want homeless encampments in any of the places 49 tries to get rid of [buzzer] But until permanent safe housing is available, you cannot restrict homelessness. It is not a crime. Thank you.

>> Heather Forbes?

>> Good morning, my name is Heather Forbes and I live in district 7. I support 61 and oppose 49. Item 49 provides assistance on a timeline that ends in the destruction of the homes of our neighbors. It doesn't hide the problem to clear the area, it creates

[12:32:53 PM]

suffering and makes people's lives harder. It would be devastating for a shelter to be torn down and belongings taken in a police sweep like item 49 would enable. Overpass happens to be a roof. The sensible way to clear the areas is provide more and better roofs. Wrap-around services like mental health and job assistance is a valid way to improve our homeless neighbors' lives. I hope the democratic input you have heard on this call is a reminder.

>> Madelyn dedelict?

>> Hi. My name is Madelyn. I am a resident of district 7, and I'm a member of the Austin democratic (indiscernible) For

[12:33:55 PM]

America. I'm calling in favor of item 61, and in opposition to item 49. I think it's terrible that we're allowing the demonization of homelessness to continue when it is a group that is just vulnerable to violent attacks. We don't want to live in a society with so much poverty. We want that to end. But until that happens, we're all going to have to live around it, and live with the consequences of -- we all have to live -- we all have to see it, we can't avoid it. We should fight to end the poverty instead of demonizing homelessness, as so many

[buzzer] On the city council have done. Thank you.

>> Mayor and council, that concludes all the speakers.

[12:34:56 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Great. Thank you. And thank you to all the people who spoke. Colleagues, it is 12:34. Let's see if we can get a vote on the consent agenda and then break for lunch. Councilmember kitchen?

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I think I'd like to pull item number 62. I support it. I think it needs a bit of conversation and explanation. So I'd like to pull it off of consent. We did have some speakers asking about it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. The consent agenda, colleagues 1 to 51 and 6 to 64. I'm showing the following items being pulled. 8, 35, 36, 49, 60, 61, and 62. Is there a motion to approve the consent? I'll ask for comments in a second, but Mackenzie Kelly?

[12:35:59 PM]

Sorry. She makes the motion. Is there a second? Discussion on the consent agenda? Councilmember alter?

>> Alter: Thank you. I wanted to comment briefly on three items. First I want to thank my co-sponsors on item 64 for joining me in advancing this resolution. When the anti-defamation league members approached my office last week about sponsoring this resolution denouncing the January 6, 2021, acts of domestic terrorism at the United States Capitol, it was during the same time we commemorate Holocaust Remembrance Week which underscored for me the risks of extremism. We cannot allow our children to think these acts are normal and happen without consequences.

[12:37:01 PM]

Too many times in history we've seen the dark realities of hatred and extremism left unchecked. It is our responsibility as community leaders to demonstrate that violent extremism and domestic terrorism will not be tolerated. I know that the anti-defamation league is working with the municipalities across the nation to pass resolutions like this, and I'm really proud to see us joining and leading in that effort. Switching gears, I also wanted to speak about two environment related items that are on the agenda. Item 2, Austin Energy membership in various state utility associations, as we passed this item I want to highlight that the resolution I led declaring a climate emergency in 2019 included language that the city manager should support advancing climate change solutions in these types of organizations. I'm confident that Austin Energy is a leader in sustainability

[12:38:01 PM]

and will do this. I just want to underscore that I look forward to seeing that continue. And then finally, I wanted to comment on item 47, which I'm pleased that this extends the contract with the American

youth works to provide training in green jobs to those economically impacted by the pandemic as part of the Austin civilian conservation core, an initiative I launched last may. I would very much like to see the city invest additional funding as part of the economic recovery effort. For those of you who may not have seen it last week, president Biden included one of his executive orders tackling climate crisis at home and abroad, and it included a call for the establishment of a civilian climate core, initiative to put a new generation of Americans to work restoring public lands and waters, increasing for es trags, and improving access to

[12:39:02 PM]

recreation. This is exactly what I worked to put in motion here in Austin with the conservation corps. And I'm speaking with staff about how we can best leverage this opportunity at the federal level, and seek available funding. I'm excited to see this on our agenda today. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler:

>> You're on mute, mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem, and then councilmember tovo.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you, mayor, I appreciate it. I really do appreciate all the callers calling in. It helps to -- it helps us to really take this time before we have to make these critical votes to see where folks are coming from. So I appreciate that very much. I'm also thrilled to see the

[12:40:02 PM]

number of projects we have on this slate of 9% tax credit applications going west of I-35. Access to affordable housing option. It needs to be available in all parts of our city. That said, there's a particular project in my district that is near and dear to me. It's a major piece of black Austin history. The land sits on a major piece of black Austin history. It's extremely timely we're taking the action on this item today, in the first week of black history month. The claim to fame is that it was the first federally backed public housing project for African-Americans in the country. This was a step in the right direction for a nation whose constitution initially defined black people as only three-fifths of a person each. This segregated housing idea was also based on the grossly unjust so-called principle of separate but equal.

[12:41:02 PM]

Furthermore, the city used eminent domain for emancipation parker. The parkland had been home to our annual celebration and countless other important community events. Like a lot of black Austin

history, rosewood stands as a testament to a community that has endured, in spite of decades upon decades of discrimination. But as important as rosewood is, a part of our history, council in 2018 also recognized it's an important part of eeshlt Austin's future. The plan to upgrade part of the community while also bringing in brand-new units with modern conveniences is so important to the people who live at rosewood now. And to those who will live there generations to come. As a former resident of rosewood, I sincerely mean it when I say that I'm deeply, reply grateful to our staff

[12:42:04 PM]

shepherding this plan through the process. And I'm especially excited to give the green light to 172 new income restricted units in this rapidly gentri fying part of town. We're in a housing crisis right now. These units are a drop in the overall bucket, but I'm so pleased that this important piece of black Austin history is playing a small role in all of Austin's future. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember tovo?

>> Tovo: Thank you, mayor pro tem. There are things coming forward on the agenda we'll just pass today, and that really relates to the housing projects. I want to appreciate councilmember alter for her leadership, the item she just addressed, decrying the actions that happened in Washington. But really, what I want to do right now is correct the

[12:43:05 PM]

minutes. On our last council meeting, there was an amendment made to -- with regard to the pear case. The amendment was to remove the part that prohibited service station use as permitted use of the property. And in the course of the conversation, I expressed my objection to that. And so I just want to ask the clerk to make that correction to the minutes. It now reads councilmember alter offered the amendment, it was accepted without objection. If that language could please be, edited to reflect that I did have an objection that I stated on the record.

>> Mayor Adler: Sounds good.

>> Tovo: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Colleagues, a couple things. I want to speak to just real briefly the housing tax credit issues that are in front of us. The numbers 8 through 28. I also want to just recognize that these developments are responding to our city's goal of getting affordable housing in all parts of town, including

[12:44:07 PM]

several projects here in west Austin. I also am proud to offer the support that our council is moving forward on rosewood court for all the reasons raised by mayor pro tem. It's been a long process. It's important to restore community landmarks like the emancipation park. I do want to just flag and suggest that we have a future conversation about these tax credits. I'm not suggesting we do anything other than approve the ones that are before us now. But next year when we're considering these, my hope is that we have added a consideration that does not exist now with the emphasis that I think that it I think what is largely missing given our priorities is an emphasis on supportive housing.

[12:45:10 PM]

That would help us to deal with the homelessness challenge. Tax credits are one of the greatest tools that we have to make sure that our greatest needs are met. And I would ask staff to prepare some guidelines for us to consider in the upcoming cycle that will clearly give a priority to permanent supportive housing. And I would ask that as developers prepare projects that they plan to compete at the beginning of this process based on how they would help our city solve its most significant challenge. In urging this, I know that I'm not doing it -- I'm not the first voice to do this. And that some of my colleagues have expressed a desire to also use this as a tool to further this in the past, and I want you to know that I join with you in that. And there's further support for this, I think that earlier in the process as people are

[12:46:10 PM]

developing projects we should create that expectation. Other comments on the consent agenda?
Council member Renteria.

>> Renteria: Mayor, I agree with you, it's very unfortunate, we can only normally apply for just two, 90% tax credit. You know, there's such a great need out here in our city. You know, I have some very good projects that I think, you know, that we need to get going real quickly. And I hope that the state hears us, they give us the ability to provide more tax credit. This has really hurt Austin. We had some really good projects in line that were ready to go and because of a two-mile radius limit, we had to pull back and to make the tough decision of having to pick over the other

[12:47:12 PM]

one. And I don't think that's really fair. And I hope that the state and our state rep will get more tax credit for Austin so that we can provide necessary housing that we need.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. Any further comments. Counselor member Casar.

>> Casar: I want to first clarify for item 32, what we agreed that would be on consent is item 32 with the amendments as posted on the council message board that we seem to have agreed to without objection during work session.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objections to 32? Hearing none, those are incorporated into the consent motion.

>> Casar: Thanks, mayor. So I just want to speak to a few items briefly. First, I want to speak to item number 32, this move is a long time coming. It's because of many survivors and other advocates, hearing your stories, that we're able to

[12:48:13 PM]

make the lab finally independent of the police department. I'm thankful for all of your support on the amendment which makes it clear scientific integrity and the pursuit of justice are the goals of this department. And it should concern that the governor listed to punish cities that would make even a move like this to adjusting their budgets. The crime labs being independent of law enforcement is the national standard. It's important in order to prevent future events like the rape case backlog discovered years ago. And it's important for us to raise up the leadership of our forensic scientists and assure accountability and equal justice are served. So I'm proud of this latest important step towards improving safety and civil rights in our community and I appreciate everyone on the community's work on it. And I also want to speak to item 30 briefly. We're bringing on council for

[12:49:13 PM]

the lawsuit brought by miss Ramos. And I want to note that it's required under state law that we defend, you know, all of our city employees and it's essentially a requirement for us to make sure that we have a legal counsel on this. But I think that it's important to note that these lawsuits do cost us money, and that it's really important as we think about investing in things like the reports that we've been investing in, to find ways to improve training and shift culture, and to reduce shootings, which we all want to avoid. That those investments can save lives. And that also are well worth it because it does end up not only costing lives but costing dollars here on our council agenda when we have these -- when we have these lawsuits. I also want to recognize council member alter's leadership on item 37, the conservation corps

[12:50:14 PM]

and I am glad to co-sponsor that and I'm glad to see it before us today. I want to recognize rosewood court and no one could put it better than the mayor pro tem on this. Early in my time on council I met with many folks living there who urged us to get to that report and so I support your leadership on this, mayor pro tem, along with others. I didn't get a chance to talk about commissioner Davis during the moment of silence because while it is tragic and sad whenever anyone passes, it was a kind of fun story that first came to my mind about running into him in the hallway in commissioner's court and him saying to me, Casar, don't send me an email on that meeting, I'm with you on the worker stuff. As a young person who is really trying to get things done who didn't get that kind of encouragement, it stuck out in my mind. So I hope that he rests in power.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, council member pool.

[12:51:15 PM]

>> Pool: Thanks, mayor. I also wanted to speak to the tax credit applications that we're submitting and point out that two of them are in district 7 and they are -- while they may not have the permanent supportive housing piece, although one that we approved I think that it was three years ago by the same developer that was north of 183 in the northwoods neighborhood, does have significant numbers of P.H.S. And it's working out well in the neighborhood. The two that are on our list for approval, one in brentwood and one in district 7 on the other side of mopac, will have significant numbers of 30% M.F.I. Or below housing which is also one of the targeted categories of affordable housing that we're really trying to bring to our community. So I'm really appreciating the work that the developers are doing in this -- in this area, and glad that they were able to

[12:52:15 PM]

locate them further west. Including west of mopac, which I think that is significant as well in brentwood, which is also in district 7. So the one that we approved that is in the northwoods neighborhood, I invite the folks to go up and to have a look at it. It's really beautiful, the work -- the structure that has been built. And I know that the people who will be moving in there soon will thrive. Thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Counselor member tovo.

>> Tovo: Sorry to take us back to another technical point, but I think that I'm clarifying my position on the minutes. I didn't clarify one other element. So I did not support the amendment. I do want the record to reflect that I supported the overall zoning. And while -- while I'm talking, I did want to say that I do support the evaluation that you suggested. I know that's something that Ann Howard, now our commissioner,

[12:53:17 PM]

our Travis county commissioner, has long advocated for and I think that it makes a lot of sense, and that we should incorporate our most pressing priorities as we assess this application, including units for those exiting homelessness. So I would look forward to working with you on that if there's a will among council to see that kind of analysis.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. I think that would be great. And I have heard you speak to this point before as well. Any other conversation on the consent agenda? Yes, mayor pro tem.

>> Thank you, mayor. I appreciate it. To go back just a little bit, I wanted to speak to our forensics item and just really talk about how moving that testimony is when folks call in about it. And it's deeply, intensely personal, and I really appreciate when they take the time and are brave enough to

[12:54:17 PM]

call and to share their stories for us. And in 2009, the national academy of sciences recommended that public forensics labs be separated from law enforcement agencies. Our local judges asked to us do this in 2016 and I am glad that we're finally getting around to doing it wrong with the support of Austin P.D. This shows that reimagining public safety is not the divisive sort of work that some people out here would have us to believe. This is the stuff of nimble and responsible government. Responsive government. We're more efficiently investing our tax dollars in a system that creates more trust and, frankly, more accountability. At the same time we're easing the load on our police department so that its officers can focus on ensuring the safety of our citizens. With council member Casar's amendments, I think we're

[12:55:18 PM]

looking at an end result that puts us one step closer to a forensic lab that produces quality science that benefits everyone and results in unbiased justice for all. I appreciate all of the work put into this plan and I know that it was a long time coming and I'm ecstatic about being able to vote for it.

>> Mayor Adler: The consent agenda is moved and seconded. Those in favor of the consent agenda, items 1-51, and 60-64 and pulled items 8, 35, 36, 49, 60, 61 and 62, raise your hand. Those opposed? I see unanimous on the dais with the comments added on the record. Colleagues, it is 12:55 and let's come back at 1:55 and we can knock out one or two items that will be real fast. And at 2:00 we'll take the five zoning speakers and see if we

[12:56:18 PM]

can knock out the consent agenda on zoning and let people go and then we'll hit the items that we pulled. And remember that we have the next batch of speakers starting to queue up at 3:00 to speak on 61. Yes, council member tovo.

>> Tovo: Mayor, can you give us a sense when we might be having the executive session, please?

>> Mayor Adler: My preference, my suggestion, would be that we hit these items that the public might be waiting for, and then if we have a break that we'll go into an executive session. If not, maybe right after the speakers speak on 61, and we can ask then what people's preference would be.

>> Tovo: Okay, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Yep. All right, and then this meeting is recessed until 5 minutes to 2:00 and I'll see you all then.

[12:57:24 PM]

Bye.

[1:40:27 PM]

... ..

[1:45:36 PM]

Approximate

[2:01:33 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: We have a quorum present. I just see seven people. We'll wait for a few more to jump on so we have a little bit higher mass.

>> We have eight now.

>> Mayor Adler: Good deal.

[2:03:36 PM]

I guess we can get through some of the planning commission stuff and call the speakers. We have gavelled the meeting back again. Colleagues, something that I forgot to mention earlier, is I asked the clerk to put planning commission appointments on our next work session agenda so we can talk to each other about it. You will recall with respect to planning commission in the past we wanted to get together as a group before we made appointments because there was a limited number of spots for people that were available for real estate or other kinds of background, I don't remember what the standard was. Um ... There were two planning commission actions we took this morning. Leslie renominated her person, so it was not a person that had one of those more limited

[2:04:38 PM]

spots. And it was not a new applicant. The resolution that we had that we'll go ahead and make sure it gets posted, where we said let's not take action for 10 days until we see the applicant CV was intended to give people time to see that stuff. In any event, Leslie's person on there was a reappointment and was not one of those more limited spots. And then Mackenzie Kelly removed a planning commission member, which is consistent with the charter change that we had that allowed for terms to be less than two years. Remember, we were in a place before where you couldn't end a term early. And it is the same kind of action that the mayor pro tem took when she ended the term for someone that had been appointed by her predecessor in that office. That said I wanted to get the

[2:05:39 PM]

others of the group to talk about planning commission members collectively in the past. So I asked to put that on the work session agenda for us to talk about for additional appointments to the planning commission. Ok? It is 2:00. You want to call -- do we have the zoning speakers here already?

>> Yes, mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Ok. Let's call the five zoning speakers and then have Jerry take us through the consent agenda.

>> Ok. The first speaker is Bethany Fidel. Hi, this is Bethany Fidel, I'm calling in support of the zoning change for 7800 Burleson.

>> Go ahead.

>> I'm not sure if it is my

[2:06:40 PM]

turn to speak.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, go ahead.

>> Ok. So I'm an architect and part of the ownership of the property and we're looking to rezone from LI to grnu. We're a local firm located in east Austin. We have garnered much of the neighborhood support. We look forward to going through the change with you. Thanks. That's --

>> Mayor Adler: Are you the applicant's representative?

>> Mayor, we're going to call back. It looks like it get disconnected.

>> Mayor Adler: Ok.

>> Michael conati.

>> Hello, this is Mike conati with the central west Austin compliance contact team. I understand our item is supposed to be postponed today because of a notice issue. Do you guys want me to present anyway or wait until the new

[2:07:43 PM]

meeting?

>> Mayor Adler: If it is being postponed it would be best to wait until it has been postponed. Which number are you talking about?

>> I'm sorry. Item 66 and 67.

>> Mayor Adler: Jerry can you confirm they're postponed.

>> Yes, we will offer those for postponement today.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, why don't you come back, if iis ok, come back when it is before us.

>> Yes, thank you. That will be fine. Thank you very much. Bye-bye.

>> Mayor Adler: Bye.

>> Next speaker is --

>> Mayor if I can clarify that those are postponed because of a notice error, not because of a request by the applicant or the neighborhood.

>> Mayor Adler: Ok. Next speaker.

>> Next speaker is Anna agila.

[2:08:47 PM]

Anna agila.

>> Hello. Yes, this is Anna agila, I am the past chair of the neighborhood contact team. Our contact team voted back in November to approve the zoning and plumb change. We feel this will be a beneficial zoning change for us because we have the transportation department headquarters that is going to move in. This will add additional housing stock for us. And also it would also provide us with -- floodplain and environmental features to be protected. And the applicant has agreed to preserve those areas. We would appreciate your full support. Thank

>> (Indiscernible).

>> Yes, hi, I'm laurel francell and I'm with the team in the

[2:09:49 PM]

H.O.H.. And we're in support of this rezoning change. The contact team had voted with the majority in favor of the zoning change request. And we also support this. As Hannah said that txdot is being built in close proximity to this project. We do need more residential and support this change for 7733 Burleson road. Approving the zoning and designation is consistent with the site and other nearby properties. So we ask that you do support this and appreciate your consideration in considering this. Thank you.

>> That concludes all of the speakers. We did attempt to call miss

[2:10:50 PM]

Fadel back but she is not answering. We have called twice now.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. My sense is that she said that she represented the applicant, in which case she'd be given another chance to speak if her case is called. Do you want to take us through the consent agenda?

>> The housing and planning department. And on your agenda is item 58, c14-220-0128. I can offer this case... And 59c14-2020-011, the vineyard Christian fellowship case. Counselor Kelly would like to have that pulled, item 589.

>> Mayor Adler: Would you do the first one again, you cut out as you were describing?

>> I'm sorry, mayor. The first is item 58, c14-2020-0128 with consent approving on all three readings. And item 59 I believe that

[2:11:52 PM]

counselor member Kelly would like to approve. And and 26 for a request to March 4th, and related items 67 which is a staff postponement request to March 4th as council member alter stated due to a notification there and so staff will bring 6667 back. And item I can offer this for consent approval on all three readings and the related item is 69,... And can also offer this for consent approval on all three readings.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. The consent agenda item 58, 59 and 66, 67, 68, 69, and being pulled as item 59. Is there a motion to approve the

[2:12:54 PM]

consent agenda? Council member tovo seconds. Any discussion on the consent agenda? Member tovo.

>> Tovo: Mayor, I'm sorry I'm flipping back and forth between two halves of the agenda. And I am making sure that the item is not included in what was just read. I'm sure that it's not, that is 54.

>> It is, council

>> Tovo: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Any further discussion on the consent agenda? In favor, raise your hand. Those opposed? Unanimous on the dais. What is in front of us 59. I'm sorry, yes, 59. Let's go ahead and pull some that we can go ahead and deal with some of the items that have been pulled here. And let's do the Austin housing finance corporation agenda if the staff is available. Are they here? Are they close by?

[2:13:55 PM]

>> Yeah, mayor, we'll pull them over, just one second.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. While they're coming over we have item 53, which is a public hearing on pard's standards of care. We have taken all of the speakers. Is there a motion to approve item 53. Council member alter makes the motion. Council member second itself. Any discussion on this item? Hearing none, let's take a vote. Those in favor of the motion on 53, please raise your hand. Those opposed, I'm seeing it unanimous on the dais. And now going to recess, and director, are we ready to do this -- we'll recess the city

[2:14:56 PM]

council meeting here at 2:14 on February 4, 2021. And we are going to convene the Austin housing finance corporation meeting on February 4th, 2021, time is 2:15 in the afternoon. We're handling this meeting virtually during the pandemic. The quorum, there's a quorum of the board of directors president. Director, do you want to take us through the consent agenda? You're muted. Can't hear you still.

[2:16:09 PM]

No.

>> Can you just call in?

>> It's relatively straightforward, mayor. I'm happy to walk through the agenda.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> So three items on consent. The first is approval of the minutes from December 3rd and 10th of 2020. And the second item, on consent is setting a hearing and then public comment regarding the issuance of \$22 million for a housing development at 440 Nichols crossing. And then the third item is setting a public hearing to receive public comments on the issuance of \$20 million for bonds for development on 1934 rutlin drive.

>> Mayor Adler: And items 22 and 3 the hearing for February 18, 2021?

>> Correct.

>> Mayor Adler: We can handle all of those on consent. A motion to approve the three items on consent?

[2:17:10 PM]

Council member Kelly makes the motion. Second, council member Ellis. Any discussion on the consent agenda? Those in favor please raise your hand. Those opposed? Unanimous on the dais. And that concludes all of the business I think, with the Austin housing finance corporation. With that I adjourn our meeting here at 2:17 and that I will convene the Austin city council meeting here at 2:17 on February 4,, 2021. Meeting is continuing to be handled virtually during the pandemic. All right, guys, let's go through some of the pulled items that we have. And, by the way, the caller's case was another one that was a consent case, so that case has now been approved by the

[2:18:13 PM]

applicant. Let's go to item number 8, the council funding. Alter?

>> Alter: I approve 8 with the amendments as I posted on the message board and were distributed out. The first part of the amendment amends the funding model to have a language factor for chambers providing regular translation services for the membership. And the other two parts amend the resolution to include -- to be it further resolved statements. The first is the city manager is directed to update the data underlying the funding model to coincide with the execution of new contracts. This means that the first multi-year contracts negotiated subsequent to the release of the most recent seasonus information should have that updated census data.

[2:19:13 PM]

Secondly, be it further resolved when a new chamber is added the to the funding model to update the allocations for the equity dial to ensure they do not face a reduction in funding.

>> Mayor Adler: Those are the amendments of council member alter. Is there a second? Council member pool seconds. Discussion, council member alter.

>> Alter: Thank you. So we have been working to move forward this model for a while, and finally came to a better understanding of the approach that was being used. And I think that the adjustment of adding the language as a factor seems to me to be, um, the best way forward at this point to recognize that you have language needs among our community and that the chambers can help to meet that.

[2:20:14 PM]

This is both something that is, you know, a function of who the people are, but is also something that the chambers can be delivering. And then the other two parts really clean up things to be clear to provide clear direction to staff.

>> Mayor Adler: So with the first one of the amendments on the funding model, does that change the allocation that we're approving here today?

>> Alter: Um, it does, yes.

>> Mayor Adler: And -- and help me understand what that -- what that is. I saw the additional information.

>> Alter: Right. So the additional information that they put forward shows that four of the chambers would satisfy this. I'm not sure if that's true or not. Certainly, all four of the chambers, communities that they serve, have language needs. The way that we have framed this is that they would have to be providing regular translation

[2:21:16 PM]

services that will look differently across the different chambers because of the different types of language needs. But it needs to be something that they are regularly doing, not just that the community has a need for it. And so the example that they gave would be if all four of them satisfied that and all four of them are perfectly capable of doing that. But this -- this sort of sets out the expectation that, you know, as a matter of equity that we should be meeting the language needs of the communities. And all four of them are capable of meeting that if they provide those services. If, you know, if any one of them doesn't provide the services, then they would not receive that funding boost. It's a recognition that you have a lot of people in the community that cannot be reached without addressing the language assets.

>> Mayor Adler: Does the staff that prepared this have any comment on this change to the

[2:22:19 PM]

model?

>> Mayor, this is the assistant city member Robbie Gonzalez. Yes, they look at the language factor and make notation in regard to how that model would be enacted with the language factor.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Mayor -- I'm not sure -- mayor? I'm sorry, it's council member pool. I wasn't sure what the assistant city manager Gonzalez actually said, if you wouldn't mind starting over.

>> Sure. Sure. With regards to that language factor, staff has worked with the consultant to understand the implications of the model. And so that information was sent to mayor and council and you should have it in your inboxes. And so we just wanted to notate, of course, that that current model currently looks at

[2:23:20 PM]

decreasing two of our cultural chambers, the hispanic chamber and the black chamber, from what the current level is. So we just wanted to make sure that council is aware of that.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, council member Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: I don't feel comfortable for the hispanic chamber or the black chamber. And especially adding in a language factor, we are basically incentivizing there -- I mean, having translation services is certainly part of what our chambers do. I think that mayor pro tem Harper Madison spoke to the language needs with our black chamber. So if we're adding language services as a factor, I'm confusing how that is decreasing funding there.

>> Council member, we have the

[2:24:20 PM]

and our consultant on the line that could go into the details. At a high level by the funding model that we have proposed to you it takes into account a certain number of factors and an overall pool. If we add an additional factor and we do believe that all four chambers could potentially qualify for that factor, that decreases the other levels, which could result in a decrease to the firm it's -- two chambers, apologies. Jeremy, I don't know if you would like to add to that.

>> Essentially as you add more factors into the model, the weight and the budget assignment of each factor would decrease and that's why there's a change in every single factor would adjust the model accordingly.

>> I will add that we Sunday a piece of back-up as they have mentioned how the details -- you can see on there the chart of how that funding would be

[2:25:21 PM]

impacted.

>> Mayor Adler: So my concern with this is I like the idea of including a language element, because I think that's an extra duty that falls to that chamber that I know that they do in terms of translation services and the like that relates to I think the equity issue. But the way that it plays out here where everybody gets an equal amount just pulls everybody towards the middle, and I don't know that's what the goal was. And I wonder, council member alter, if it's -- if it's not trying to do it in this action, but asking staff by way of direction, like, in your other two, to really look at any disproportionate language requirements required of that chamber. And to agree that they are, to make sure that gets reflected in the model.

[2:26:27 PM]

That is my thought. Further discussion, council member alter.

>> Alter: So I just want to be clear that this is not a reduction in their funding relative to where we were started. We had funding that happened in December because the model was not accepted by us and they went ahead and authorized them at the funding level in the base model. The base model though is reducing funding for the Asian chamber and for the gay and lesbian chamber, over what they were having in the prior year. So to stop -- not stop the -- the moving forward of the contracts this year, they

went ahead and kept everyone at those levels. This does though reduce significantly the Asian and the gay and lesbian chambers' funding relative to what they were having before. So I don't think that the statement earlier by staff was accurate in my view of what is going on and how we should be interpreting the model.

[2:27:29 PM]

The language issues, you know, you have the Asian chamber that has to translate into 20 different languages. And there is no mechanism in this model, nor in the contract, in my view from what I have seen having reviewed the contracts, that addresses that issue in any way. The way that the model was put together, it was put together for simplicity sake to give each of the factors equal weight. And that was a choice that staff made. So if you add any other factor in it, everything gets equal weight, and it comes out in this direction. The amounts that are changing are not huge amounts from the perspective of, um, you know, the black and the hispanic chamber. They're on the order of 10,000 or less. And the same thing is on the increased size. But what it does do is to introduce some performance-based approach, which is what we were searching for in part two, that

[2:28:30 PM]

addresses the equity issues that come with language. For a population like the Asian population, when you have 20 different languages, if we're taking a model of equity that has, you know, the boxes that you're stepping on for that particular element of what you're trying to look at, that box needs to be higher in order to be able to reach the full community. And there was no way in, you know, there was not a mechanism as I saw in the contracts and the approach that was used was to -- to box it in into economic discrimination. But then, in fact, the definition of economic discrimination that they were using didn't actually include language in the reference from the urban institute. So in my mind this is a need that we have in our community. It is something that the chambers disproportionately need to reach. And if you don't put it in the funding model, there's no extra funding for doing that work.

[2:29:34 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Robbie, did you raise your hand?

>> Yes, mayor. Just to add some more context to this statement that was mentioned earlier. About 11:30, the council received the additional backup with the word document with the two tables. And so the lower table is the base model. And council member alter is correct, council hasn't adopted the report. However, we did set the report in motion back in 2019, with these figures in mind. And in December, council could -- the hispanic chamber at those levels, at the 230,000 and the 252,000

respectively, and they kept the Asian and the lgbt chambers constant, if you will. And so my statement is that if the model moves forward under this premise of the language factor, that the black and hispanic chamber contracts would be decreased from what is currently approved.

[2:30:35 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Council member kitchen. You're muted.

>> Kitchen: Sorry. Well, you know, I appreciate the amendment that council member alter is bringing forward. You know, the important thing that we need to be considering here are what are the right factors to include in this funding model. And I think that language, as council member alter has articulated, is important for these chambers. And it's a role that these chambers need to fulfill. So the impact on the funding is only that impact because we're operating with the same pie. You know, and you're talking about an impact in the future. So it's quite possible that we could say in the future that we want additional dollars for these chambers. And you could also look at the model itself in the future in terms of the waiting. But I think that to say -- to operate in a zero-sum

[2:31:36 PM]

environment and to say that we can't introduce additional factors that are important factors from an equity standpoint and from a standpoint of what these chambers are doing for our community, um, is -- is not the right approach. I think that it's important to look at it from the perspective of the fact that introducing language into the -- into the model is really an appropriate and important consideration. And so -- so I just want to -- I will be supporting this and I want to thank council member alter for bringing it forward.

>> Mayor Adler: Any further discussion on the alter amendments? Yes, council member Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: This question is for staff and, council member kitchen, I agree that language is an important factor and we should definitely include it. But also I think that for me it's important that if we're looking at this equity funding from a lens of economic

[2:32:38 PM]

disadvantages, knowing our black and brown communities are disadvantaged the most, you know, and then we're adding in this factor -- a factor that I agree that should be included -- but it results in a decrease of funding -- you know, is there a way to add this factor that doesn't decrease the funding in this -- in the model as proposed? So I want to ask staff if there is a recommendation there or any thoughts on -- on the potential changes.

>> I think that we'd have to work with our consultant to come back with that information. And I also want to mention that, you know, we don't have any concern with it overall as being a factor. We know that we wanted to present the council with the information if the dollars are held constant, in recognizing as council member kitchen just mentioned is that in the future those dollars could increase. But currently they're held

[2:33:38 PM]

constant. So if they're held constant, that we wanted to present you with the impact. So we're not necessarily planning on the factor itself, but just the consequence of adding the factor. Now we could, of course, you know, work with the consultant to figure out a way if there is no impact, but currently this is our assessment.

>> Mayor Adler: Part of it to me is how it gets applied. So my experience is that the Asian chamber does a lot more with respect to language than the lgbtq or the black chamber. And I'm not real sure. But under this scenario, the Asian chamber gets \$5,000 more for the inclusion of this element. You could still give the Asian chamber the same \$5,000 increase because of the language issue, and then the other numbers don't change by more than 1600.

[2:34:41 PM]

Which seems to me to be a more reasonable end result. So my issue isn't the inclusion of the factor, it's, I guess, that it's how it's being included. Which I didn't see until just now. I mean, just before the -- the vote. That's my issue. Now I guess that it's just how it doesn't seem right. Council member Casar.

>> Casar: I hear some broad agreement amongst the group for us to include a factor that takes effect, and then I think that there's heartburn in this particular vote it might move a few thousand dollars one way or another. Is there a way that we could take this vote and factors it in in more of a going forward basis without having to deal with the small but real number impact

[2:35:42 PM]

right now? I just sort of hate that we're -- that there sounds like there's so much agreement but we're stuck on something with \$750,000 budget moves like \$5,000 one way or \$6,000 another way. And it's part of politics that I think that we are trying to break out of and escape of here in the city -- in this little limited sum game, exactly amongst the groups all trying to get better off and who gets \$4,000 or \$7,000 this or that way, and we just have to be able to get past that. I think that is the way to hold it up. Is there a way to take this vote that incorporates language on a go forward basis but doesn't change the numbers before us?

>> Mayor Adler: Council member alter.

>> Alter: So this is precisely a vote on the go forward basis because this is the funding model if you weigh these factors the way that have been proposed in this model, that we would be using moving forward. And what I am suggesting is that

[2:36:43 PM]

as part of how we do that moving forward, we should have language as part of that. And we could not get to an agreement where we found a way. There was not a way in the contract to do it, where you got additional money for it. There was not, you know, the only way that you can get money that is recognizing the need for the language as I saw it from what I have played around with this model on multiple occasions is via adding a factor or changing the weights. So, you know, you could change the weights for economic discrimination and everybody else gets more money under economic discrimination. But there was no -- there was no distinction in there otherwise for that. And the way that, you know, I -- I have no way of evaluating whether all of the chambers are doing the translation. I know that two are certainly, and I know that there are

[2:37:43 PM]

opportunity for other ones and needs for other ones to do it, but, you know, this is moving forward and so this is kind of what would govern the model moving forward. One could add more money to this over time. But, you know, that's essentially what the vote is today and the vote back in I think in December when we did that, that was the stopgap so that those contracts could be renewed and moved forward and rather than give certain groups less than what was in the base model, the decision was made to give them what was in the base model and to keep other ones at the same level moving forward. But the fact remains that the lgbtq and the Asian model would go down moving forward, in either my scenario or the other one, given the way that the model was constructed.

[2:38:49 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Further discussion? Mayor pro tem.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you, I appreciate it. I really appreciate the conversation. Council member alter really laid out her amendment list. And I think that for me she's assuaged any concerns that I had with that. But I also understand and I respect the question that council member Fuentes is bringing. And then subsequently, council member Casar's question about can we move forward without changing the number. I'm taking all of those things into consideration and it has me wondering -- did we make communication with all affected chambers before today? They all know that we're talking about this?

>> Council member, we have had conversations with the chambers. I am not certain that we've had conversations in particular with

[2:39:49 PM]

the specific motion really, because it was put forward last night and we have been responding to it this morning. Sylvia, I don't know if you know differently.

>> No, they were aware of the December memo but not the update from last night.

>> Harper-madison: So I wonder if it might be prudent for us to speak with them before we move forward? Or maybe you can tell me what the implications for we don't. That's a better question.

>> I don't foresee immediate implications. I think that if council decided to postpone this item, we would not want to go too far into a postponement, but to the next council meeting. That would give us some time to reach out to the chambers and to have a conversation with them.

>> Harper-madison: Council member alter, are you comfortable with that?

>> Alter: Sure, I mean, I was working -- I mean, staff had wanted to get this passed this

[2:40:50 PM]

week and so I was working to try to do that. And I didn't have material back that I could post until yesterday. So I'm perfectly fine if we want to take more time to bring other folks into the conversation. But I do believe that you will find that the way that the model is constructed that it is taking the equity basis, you know, and trying to accommodate different needs across the different communities via the factors that are in the base model. And so if you want to add language in there, you have really two options. You can add a factor of language. Or you can increase the amount of the money that falls under economic discrimination at the base. But if you do anything else within the model you're not really going to accommodate that. And that if you want to have performance measures such as they are at this moment, they are coming in the contract piece. And I say that just because it took me a really long time to

[2:41:51 PM]

understand how this model worked and perhaps I can save some other folks some time on addressing it. And the contract piece is where we really address the original concerns that we had, which we were having chambers being paid differently for the same amount of work. And so now they're all being paid the same hourly work -- hourly wage for the work. And that for some chambers that may involve that

they have to put more hours in, because the capacities may vary. But they're not being paid differently for, you know, the hours that they are -- that they are working. And so we -- we addressed some of those underlying concerns, but where the equity model comes out is a different determination of how much funding should be going to each chamber than prior to the December vote. With the December vote being, you know, based off of -- off of this model. And I understand where all of the model is coming from and I

[2:42:51 PM]

have a better sense of where it is. But given the choices that were made with that, there are some constraints on things and I welcome other folks helping me to think through, um, the solutions. This is kind of where -- where I landed to address stuff and, you know, to the extent that, um, you know, there are a host of other issues that you may find as you look more deeply into it. And I welcome your input in it.

>> Mayor Adler: That's actually really helpful to me. And I guess that I just wasn't paying close enough attention to see that the fact that the amount that each chamber is being paid for the time that they put in is the same. It's only a question of how much we're asking of each chamber in essence, which is dictated by then the total amount. And then the performance objectives and relate them to that total amount. That makes more sense. And I hadn't understood it that

[2:43:52 PM]

way.

>> Alter: Once you understand it that way, the whole process makes more sense and it all comes down to what we're voting on as the funding model moving forward and an approach that we need to add another chamber, and how you would go about evaluating, adding the other chamber, if you don't have additional money to add. And so one, you know, one of my amendments is to say that before you add another chamber, you need to look at the dial, which is essentially how much money is in the pot for the equity chamber so it doesn't just can cannibalize the issues.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem raised the issue of proponentments and the staff said that you certainly can if you want the motion in front of us is the motion and the second. Are we ready to take a vote on that? Let's take a vote on it.

[2:44:56 PM]

Yes.

>> Fuentes: This is a motion to table so we postpone it for further consideration?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Fuentes: I would like to postpone it.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there a second to that? Councilmember Kelly seconds that. Any discussion of the motion to postpone to the next meeting? Those in favor please raise your hand. Those opposed? I don't see anyone opposed. Then the motion to postpone passes. It will come back to us next week. Let's go to the next item. Thanks, guys. Let's pick up item number 35. Councilmember Kelly you pulled that one.

>> Kelly: I did. I have questions for staff if they are available to

[2:45:57 PM]

answer. Is staff here?

>> Councilmember, they will be. Just take a minute to get them moved over.

>> Kelly: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: While we're waiting for them to come over, we also have item 65, which was the municipal civil service commission chair. Do you want to make that motion, councilmember alter?

>> Alter: I would move passage and Theresa Perez lively as the chair of the municipal service commission and the resolution officially does appoint her as chair. She's a current member. We would just be making her chair.

>> Mayor Adler: Sounds good. Mayor pro tem seconds. Any discussion? Those in favor of that?

[2:46:57 PM]

>> Casar: I just wanted to thank Ms. Wisely because she served on this so long and appreciate her chairing such an important commission. Thank you to the committee for bringing this up.

>> Mayor Adler: Those in favor? Opposed? Item passes.

>> Alter: Mayor, we are currently seeking two additional members of the municipal civil service commission and would ask colleagues you should have received an announcement from Pio about those openings and if you can help us circulate that so we can have a good group to choose from for our next appointments, we would appreciate it.

>> Mayor Adler: Sounds good. Thank you. Manager, would you interrupt me when staff is here for 35 and 36. Item 54, did you have a comment before we get a motion? Councilmember tovo?

>> Tovo: I do, mayor I

[2:48:02 PM]

would like to add a few comments.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there a motion to approve item 54 on first reading only? Is there a second?
Councilmember Kelly seconds. Councilmember Tovo.

>> Tovo: Thank you. So I -- I have some -- one I would like to request this be scheduled staff for -- or city manager, rather, for a work session conversation at the earliest opportunity. There are a couple issues raised by this -- by this case that I think we need to talk about as a full council and we'll just highlight what those are, but I did promise I could keep this in light of the day and the many pressing things we have on this seemed like the best solution. We heard some concerns from residents this morning. I share those concerns and believe that we do need to plan for infrastructure in Rainey to support increases in entitlements. But I really want to just raise the issue that the

[2:49:03 PM]

request would ask -- the request is asking us to raise the F.A.R., to allow for F.A.R. That exceeds the cap. And so we have an 8.1 setting. You can go to 15.1, 15 to 1 with downtown density bonus and that's the cap. This project would exceed the cap. We've only ever had that happen once before. I think it's a significant opportunity and mandate really for us to talk among ourselves about what happens when you exceed a cap. Right now this project would come in and use the same calculations that have been used for the other piece. And in my mind the impact is larger. If you are Gooding to exceed a cap, the language that's in the code speaks to going above and beyond. And so we really as a council I think need to set some parameters for what that looks like. The project is going to include a couple additional

[2:50:04 PM]

onsite or some I think five additional onsite where could have done in lieu, but with regards to this specific request I think there's a larger policy matter at the heart of this which is, you know, how we truly -- how we really set a threshold for community benefits on these cases. So I can elaborate more if anyone wants.

>> Mayor Adler: I think you are right.

>> Tovo: I am sending this forward and I've got a the look of constituents who are really concerned about it. I'm sending it forward with approval today.

>> Mayor Adler: Motion is to approve this on first reading. It's been seconded. Request the manager to put this on work session to discuss policy issues associated with it. Moved and seconded. Any discussion? Those in favor of passing on first reading only raise your hand. Those opposed? I'm seeing that as being

[2:51:06 PM]

unanimous. And number 54 passes. First reading only. The folks here yet on 35 and 36?

>> We do.

>> Thank you so much. With the talk about what the city is doing for those experiencing homelessness, I thought I would pull these items so we can highlight them, but I also have questions about them. And so my first question is how are item 35 and 36 different? In the sense that are we feeding the same population of individuals? Are the meals going to the same people individually? How are they being delivered and when [inaudible] Going?

>> Stephanie hayden-howard, director of --

>> Mayor, can you -- the

[2:52:09 PM]

director --

>> Mayor Adler: We can't hear you. Director Hayden, director Hayden? We're having trouble hearing you. Can you turn off your video? And speak? You are frozen now. Now you are back. We're having trouble -- can you come off your video and just speak to us on audio?

>> She may have been hearing her.

>> Mayor Adler: We can hear you now. Please start at the beginning, please. Yes, please start at the beginning.

>> Okay, I'm sorry. Okay. So with item number 35 is the good work, that is a part of our eating apart

[2:53:10 PM]

together program. And so that provides 4,000 meals and there are about 5,000 each and it's going to be for 16 weeks. And number 36 is the shelf stable food, which those are 200 -- I mean 2,000 bags per week

that are filled with food for four to five days. Our outreach teams are taking those out to the public so those various teams and we have partnered with to provide those meals.

>> Okay, that's great. I was just curious because I had questions from constituents about the food that we give out. Is it ever wasted? Are there ways to determine it's healthy food?

[2:54:11 PM]

And that it's actually being consumed?

>> The food is -- the food is healthy. It is shelf-stable food. Because we -- and it does include water as well as hygiene items. It also for some homeless people they have animals, so it also includes pet food as well.

>> Okay, that's great. Thank you for explaining. I have no further questions on these items.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there a motion to approve items 35 and 36? Councilmember Kelly makes the motion, seconded by councilmember kitchen. Any objection to 35 and 36? Argue -- hearing none they are approved. Item 49.

>> Mayor, on the last two

[2:55:14 PM]

items, councilmember Casar's video was off. Could he confirm for us?

>> Casar: I'm here.

>> Mayor Adler: You voted for 35 and 36?

>> Casar: Correct. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen, do you want to make your motion on item 49?

>> Kitchen: Yes, I would like to make my motion and make a comment or two in explaining the motion.

>> Mayor Adler: That's fine. Councilmember kitchen moves item 49. Is there a second to that? Councilmember Renteria seconds. Councilmember kitchen, do you want to address it?

>> Kitchen: Okay, I want to make a statement. That repeats some of the conversation we had at the work session, but I think it's helpful for people. There's been -- there's been some conversations this morning that were not accurate, and I believe there's some misunderstanding and perhaps miscommunications about what heal does and doesn't do. I want to state again what the heal initiative is for

[2:56:14 PM]

clarity purposes for folks. So the purpose, of course, is -- is pretty simple and focused on starting with four areas, and it's focused on providing a path to connect people to housing. This is about connecting people to housing and the services that are important with housing. And to cease camping in unspecific areas. So we're talking about connecting to services and housing options based on the expressed and individual needs of the people living in the locations. We heard some concerns earlier about consulting with our unhoused neighbors. That's exactly what this does. It begins with our social service providers, our health providers working with people in those areas

[2:57:15 PM]

and based on their express needs and their individual needs connecting them to housing and services. So the housing services depends on what the person needs. So it could be rapid rehousing, it could be permanent supportive house, it could be housing focused shelter. It depends on what this person needs. Rapid rehousing is short-term rental assistance and services. That's what some people need. Permanent supportive housing offers more permanent services for people who need more support. The other thing that's really important in order for this to be successful and really help our unhoused neighbors is case management support and health care services. Such as medical, behavioral health and substance use disorder services. To help people maintain their housing. That's what the heal initiative does. It connects people based on their needs, their expressed

[2:58:20 PM]

and individual needs for housing ab support. There seemed to be some misunderstanding in the conversations earlier from folks. This adds to existing services. It does not divert resources from existing programs. It does not divert resources from permanent supportive housing or rapid rehousing. It is focused on addressing the need for safe and stable housing for individuals living in locations that pose risk to their public health, to public health and safety, risk to their safety. It's also, it's important to understand this is not a comprehensive strategy for dealing with homelessness. It was never intended to be and it's not. It's a key strategy as one piece of a puzzle. The city is working on a comprehensive strategy, I appreciate the efforts the mayor has been mentioning about conversations through

[2:59:21 PM]

summit. That's all necessary and important for a comprehensive strategy. This is immediate action for our unhoused neighbors who are facing risks to their health and safety every day. So another thing that I

want to just say just to recognize some of the concerns that people raised and some of the misunderstandings and statements that were just not accurate that were made earlier is that really heal recognizes that some places in our city pose particular health and safety risks and people are living unsheltered in unsafe locations. The resolution asks our city -- the other thing to remember, this is a multi-step process, and the resolution asks the city manager to bring back to us strategies and an implementation plan to disallow camping in these four unsafe locations after, I want to emphasize after

[3:00:26 PM]

completing the heal initiative. It's not about sweeps, it's not about moving people to other places, it's about connecting them with houses and only after that recognizing that these places are not safe for camping and identifying them as being disallowed for camping. And we have also included in the resolution for clarity the policy statement that when the city manager brings this back the how, how are we going to disallow these from camping, when the city manager brings us back strategies and implementation plans, we do want issuing citation and policing. So again, I want people to understand we have -- people to understand this is a multi "Step process that will take time. So the last thing I would say, it's really, really

[3:01:26 PM]

important that we act quickly. This resolution is a commitment to start the process. It's a commitment to start developing the heal initiative to house our unhoused neighbors in unsafe locations. I think we all agree, and I really appreciate hearing from people this morning and all the folks that we've had the chance to talk to, because people really care. People care about our unhoused neighbors. And everyone cares. I think it's important for us to recognize that people on this dais, the people in our community care and what we want to do is connect people to housing. So I think there's broad consensus to move forward with helping people, with connecting people to housing and we just need to get to it. And the longer we wait, the longer people will rely on living situations that pose major health and safety risks to them. Finally I just have to say

[3:02:27 PM]

this, I just -- I really believe fundamentally that we owe our unhoused neighbors, we owe our unhoused neighbors protection from living in unsafe places. Just as we do for our housed community. I do not, I do not believe it is kind, I do not believe it is humane to allow places that pose health and safety risk to remain available for camping. So no one should have to live, for example, next to lanes of traffic at risk of -- at risk of stumbling into traffic, at risk of having a car, you know, jump the curb as you said, mayor,

and plow into their tents. So it's -- it's critical and I think -- I think that our community can do better than this. And I don't think that it is -- I don't think it's right for us to continue to

[3:03:30 PM]

allow people to camp in places that are unsafe. So mayor, thank you for -- forgiving me the time to make that clear. We saw from our earlier testimony that there was some misunderstandings and some statements that were made were not accurate about what is in this resolution. I would like to invite my co-sponsors if anyone wants to add anything, please do.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Kelly.

>> Kelly: Thank you. I just want to add that I've heard from district 6 residents and people across Austin, from visitors to business owners, renters, owners of homes and even our unhoused neighbors themselves regarding the heal initiative. The city of Austin staff and our partners have been working incredibly hard over the last year to assist in these issues. The heal effort prioritizes making clearly needed basic sanitary and safety improvements, makes living conditions for homeless neighbors better and

[3:04:30 PM]

emphasizes our goal of treating them respectfully as individuals. The case management and support services indicated in the heal initiative will help address the needs of those experiencing homelessness. Really that is heart. Housing alone won't solve the homeless crisis. I want to thank councilmember kitchen for her leadership and all of the co-sponsors for invite me to work on this initiative to help our unhoused neighbors and proud of the work we've done to make that possible.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Colleagues, further discussion on this item? Mayor pro tem.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you, mayor. And thank you to my colleagues for laying that out. It's helpful. I think none of us doubt how this is one of the greatest challenges -- I was going to say of our time but it's all time. During these conversations over the last couple of years, I've been reading up about the problem, you know, the symptoms and the disease

[3:05:34 PM]

and finding that since the 1800s, you know, communities have been trying to find a solution for vagrancy, homelessness. You know. And so I really am grateful for councilmember kitchen and her co-sponsors. I believe it is from the heart, you know, to dig deep for solutions to actually help people, but I

don't know -- I mean we don't have to keep having conversations about compassion and humanity, but I don't know we're ready to move forward especially given some of the territory we heard from folks. I think -- testimony we heard from folks. We were able to -- we have been able to get so far with just a little more time to talk through, to talk through what people's concerns are. Councilmember kitchen, you acknowledge there was some misinformation and, you know, folks said things that weren't accurate, so I wonder if given that we were

[3:06:35 PM]

able to -- from last week's item on a similar topic if we could do that again, in which case I would like to motion to postpone item 49 until the February 18th meeting.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. We're going to give other people a chance to speak. And then you can make a motion. We should start with the motion rather than the debate.

>> Harper-madison: I assumed everybody was done speaking.

>> Mayor Adler: That's okay. Further discussion on this motion?

>> Kitchen: Wait.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar, do you want to make amendments?

>> Pool: Mayor, I have my hand up.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar, do you want to make any amendments before I do? >>

>> Kitchen: Mayor, councilmember pool is a co-sponsor.

>> Mayor Adler: You just can't die one side gets to

[3:07:35 PM]

speak the first four times. The person who gets to speak first is the person who made the motion. That person gets to speak first. Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: Mayor, I would like to make my amendments, but I will also allow some discussion before I formally make them. I direct folks to look at the message board for those amendments. I believe that we could get to a place where the speakers that we heard would be unanimously in support if it were clear in the language that as councilmember kitchen has just said that the goal is connect people to housing and only disallow folks from camping in places if it's a dangerous location or if it's otherwise against the law. I think that it's understandable given the different versions of the resolution and frankly given the latest one why there might not be clarity about

[3:08:36 PM]

that. I think that -- and I would support a motion to postpone that if we can't settle that today. But if we can settle the question today that this is not about expanding criminalization, that this is in fact really just about housing people that are in a dangerous place, in a data driven and transparent way we can show that a dangerous place is breaking the law, I think there wouldn't be controversy about this. It's clearly a difficult challenge we've all struggled with what the right way is to work on this, what the right policies are, how to lead effectively here. But at the end of the day, the goal has to be to actually address and solve homelessness with housing and I think it's right for us to be very careful to make sure that we are not intentionally or unintentionally leading down a path towards violating the

[3:09:37 PM]

civil rights. People who aren't doing anything wrong or aren't breaking any rules. And that I think is the caution that we've heard. Because I'm proud of and believe in the steps that we have all taken to say we're not going to continue the persecution of poverty and sickness and we're going to do something to solve the problem. And I think that we could move forward with this today if we can get to language that I believe reflects exactly what councilmember kitchen said, that we're going to address this with housing and services and this is not about expanding criminalization. If we can't get to that point today, then I would support, as mayor pro tem harper-madison said, postponing.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: Thanks. I'm -- I think we need to take this up today. I would not support a postponement for a couple reasons. One, we are asking the city manager to take this information and come back to us on March 4th with his

[3:10:40 PM]

fact finding and additional information, and I anticipate we'll have a full debate at that time. This -- this initiative, the heal initiative was never included any elements of recriminalization that was introduced by folks who didn't I guess understand what was written. And -- and I really want to emphasize that that the concerns raised by speakers are entirely in line with our concerns. Except that we want to act. We have been vamping on the topic for more than a year on ensuring that we have safe and clean housing for people currently living out of doors in circumstances that are not safe and are not clean. It's inhumane. And we feel like at the beginning of this year

[3:11:42 PM]

because we had to be slowed down by the covid last year we need to step up to the plate and very robustly identify folks who need our help. We have the help to give. We have the homes for them. And we want to move them out of spaces that are not safe, not clean, and pose a very real personal risk to the people who are living in those circumstances. And this is not the end of it. This should in fact be our entire -- this should be our entire goal. I think we have talked about housing all of the people who are not housed in our community. That is our end goal. We agreed we weren't going to do it in ways that would identify any kind of actions as criminal. We are not doing that. We are entirely on board with that. That was a unanimous vote of these -- well, I guess councilmember Kelly was not on the council at that time. But the other four of us

[3:12:42 PM]

that are on this item took that vote. Councilmember kitchen, councilmember Renteria, councilmember tovo and I. So it's -- so I just lay that out there really strongly and emphatically, but we have got to act, and I think that councilmember kitchen has shown real leadership in pulling this together. And it rating and reiterating the specific intentions and the specific goals. So I just want to ask the city manager one question, and we've had a number of conversations with Diana gray, with our new homelessness outreach officer, and it's been super productive and I'm glad she's on board working with us, but city manager cronk, and I am putting you on the spot and apologize in advance. But I want to ask you in

[3:13:43 PM]

your reading and discussion with your senior staff and those who are specifically working on homelessness, on behalf of the policy directives of this council, is there anything that you read in the heal initiative that would lead you to believe that we intend to reintroduce criminalization of -- of these folks who do not have homes and have to resort to sleeping outdoors.

>> Obviously this is an ongoing discussion as you debate the resolution in front of you. And so we'll continue to hear from that. But I know that our homelessness strategy officer is closer to this issue and I don't think as you mention the decisions that have been made previously from this council would move in that direction, but as we know, as councilmember kitchen has said, this is a phased approach to this process.

[3:14:46 PM]

>> Pool: And we're all taking these steps together with linked arms to show the community that we really mean it and really do care. So that's -- that's why I don't want to postpone, mayor pro tem. It's

because I think enough time has passed, enough water has gone under that bridge and it's time for us to kick this over to staff to give us some specifics to move forward and then we'll get that report back at the latest March 4, which is two meetings from now. And then we can have that additional information and make sure it lines up, which we are insisting that it does. But at that point we can confirm that it lines up with the comments we received earlier today.

>> Mayor Adler: Colleagues, I just want to say that I appreciate councilmember kitchen and the sponsors bringing this forward and I think it is important and I very much want to vote to move this forward today.

[3:15:47 PM]

I also think that based on the discussions that we've had that vehement agreement on the points. I think that everyone's intent appears to be the same or really similar. And I think that going through the amendments will give us a chance to sharpen the language to make sure that everybody is comfortable that we are in fact in agreement. That being the case, I would like us to be able to move forward. When we acted back in the summer of '19, we passed on that same day a resolution that talked about what we wanted to see happen next. And the very first resolve clause in that resolution is to add greater depth to the -- and definition to where people should and shouldn't camp or should and shouldn't be. And that's always been a part of this -- the system that we set out.

[3:16:48 PM]

So I appreciate the opportunity for us to be able to give that greater direction and I think we need to and I think the community is asking for that. And I think it's realtimely. The amendment that I want to be able to bring after we've gone through the kind of amendments that make sure that everybody is on the same page with respect to the points, there's a -- apparently a meeting taking place with the daa and the chamber. Also with echo. Also involving the justice coalition, also the homes not handcuffs group to get everyone together to talk about both what are the long-term kind of implementation schedule that's necessary, and I know that one of their two big

[3:17:49 PM]

goals is to deal with exactly this issue of dealing with street management and encampments. And I think that that also will be a really good place for this kind of direction to really -- to really cook because I think that a lot of these things we have different people in the community that are coming from different places but with different ways they would prioritize what they would do first or how they do those things. What we've seen over the last two years, if everybody is not pulling together on all

elements of this, that the whole system doesn't move forward the way that it needs to if we're ultimately really going to be successful. And frankly, probably now some kind of tradeoffs or agreements or compromises to really move a whole

[3:18:49 PM]

community forward. I think it's also apparent that while we have great resources in the city and great people working on this, the city doesn't control enough of the levers itself to actually be able to end homelessness in the city. There are other organizations outside of the city that are critical. Echo gets the federal funding and deploys that. Haca gets federal funding for housing. A lot of the organizations that participate, Caritas, Mobile Loaves and Fishes, these are independent organizations that need to be part of, I think, if there can be agreement and that community consensus can really put things in the right place. So I just want to when the time comes offer an amendment as I've posted to the board that allows for that if that happens over the next couple weeks. And compromises are made and

[3:19:51 PM]

people join together and major funders commit to bring in resources, that that can be when the manager comes back in the first week of March maybe, you know, the kind of direction that -- because of the details of the logistics being worked out in that environment, that the manager could come back to us, we allow the manager to come back to us and say, hey, since you guys addressed this resolution, there seems to be a community consensus over all we move in this direction and on these particular directions we move in this particular direction. I just want to make sure that we allow for that. But I believe that we need to move forward with this resolution, but I also believe -- I agree with both Councilmember Pool and Councilmember Casar that we can in fact move forward, but I think we can also do

[3:20:51 PM]

it in a way that makes everybody come together and all are on the same page. Further discussion? Councilmember Kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I will -- I have some other thoughts, but I'll hold them. I think what you're laying out we'll work our way through amendments.

>> Mayor Adler: That's what I would do. I don't know how long it's going to take us. I know at 3:00 we have the second cue of a large group of people that wanted to speak on item 61. If we think we're going to be a long while on amendments, then we should consider taking those people. Or we can start on the amendments and see how quickly we can --

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I think they are fairly straightforward. I don't think we'll be a long time on them and so I think it would be good for, you know, since we've been talking about it for us to

[3:21:51 PM]

just go through them.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Do we want to move forward with amendments?

>> Tovo: Don't we need to vote on the postponement first? Mayor, do we need to vote on the postponement first?

>> Mayor Adler: There's ban motion to postpone. Certainly someone could make the motion to postpone now if they wanted to. Mayor pro tem.

>> Harper-madison: I would like to officially make the motion to postpone the item until our next meeting but also like to speak to the postponement.

>> Mayor Adler: There's been a motion to postpone. Is there a second? Councilmember Casar seconds. Mayor pro tem, you can speak.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you, I appreciate it. I just want to make sure that I preface the request for postponement that I fully understand the amount of work and diligence that's gone into this. Councilmember kitchen and her leadership on the discussion of homelessness

[3:22:52 PM]

is incomparable. That to say though, I also recognize that our community has expressed some significant concern and I always want to make certain that we take the opportunity to -- to get a consensus if possible. I appreciate that councilmember Casar says that, you know, he thinks maybe the language could change in a way that we assuage people's fears, but resoundingly that was the concerns from constituents. Maybe the language can change and that fear is assuaged, but that was the purpose in making the request. I'll be honest with you, one of the callers said something that brought an image and disturbed me. They talked about creating sort of temporary spaces, like what we're proposing, even with, you know, with the full intention of not further criminalizing people. The full intention of offering the wrap-around

[3:23:55 PM]

services and the permanent supportive housing. I cannot unsee the visual of us putting people in a place and for whatever reason things grow and become something we didn't originally intend and then having to move those people. I have that image in my mind and that gives me pause. So I just want to make certain we've taken the opportunity to fully understand all the implications of our actions and build in some sort of, you know, I guess fail safe around, I mean can we guarantee that we'll never have to take people's tents and throw them in the trash and their belongings and move them from a place we said was the appropriate place to go at another time.

>> Mayor Adler: Further discussion on the manages to postpone -- manages motion to postpone? Councilmember kitchen.

>> Renteria: Thank you, councilmember harper-madison.

[3:24:55 PM]

I appreciate your sincerity. I need to Christopher, this is not about -- clarify this is not about moving people to temporary spaces or throwing their things out. As I read to you earlier and the language that's in the resolution is connecting people to services and housing options such as rapid rehousing, permanent supportive housing, housing focused shelter. Those are not temporary places. This is about connecting people to housing and a path to permanent housing. While I appreciate some folks said that is correct I just wanted to make sure you understand that the language in this resolution does not talk about, you know, moving people, throw out their things and having them in temporary housing.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you. I appreciate that. I just wanted to make certain to express what my concern was.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Kelly.

>> Kelly: So mayor pro tem, I can definitely appreciate your thoughts on

[3:25:55 PM]

that as well. It's hard for me to imagine back when this vote was taken before I was on council that it would have been such a forethought for you to know the homelessness would get to the point where it is now. So speaking to that, I see a lot of value in passing this resolution today and not postponing it because we need to act now. And we need to do something to help curb some of the side effects of what was passed before I was on council. So I hope that you would consider some of that. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Ready to take a vote? Those in favor of the postponement, please raise your hand. Fuentes, Ellis, mayor pro tem and Casar. Those opposed, please raise your hand. The balance of the dais. Motion to postpone does not pass. Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: Mayor, I would like to move my amendments that I post odd the message

[3:26:56 PM]

board and can speak to them or we can debate them in turn. I would be interested in whether any are incorporated as friendly given I tried to structure them in line with all the sponsors' comments at work session today and on the message board.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar has offered his amendments. Is there a second to his amendments? Mayor pro tem seconds the amendments. Discussion? Councilmember Kitchen, do you agree to any of them?

>> Kitchen: Yes, let me speak to that. So -- okay. So councilmember Casar, I think yours are numbered so let's talk from the top. So the -- item number 1, which is page 3, line 3, and

[3:27:58 PM]

this is the section that relates to the locations, the priority one locations. So my co-sponsors and I are -- think that some of this is helpful, and so what we think would be helpful and not duplicative of what we already have is to say -- duplicative in meaning but helps with clarification, is to say the four -- so we have the four phase one heal priority location shall, and you said only. I think that that is consistent with our intent. Include locations where individuals are camping, and then you are adding in a place or in a manner that presents public health and safety risk and/or that otherwise is already prohibited by 9-4-11. We think that is helpful. And in line with the intent.

[3:28:58 PM]

And so that language is acceptable. We do not think that the remaining language is necessary because there is already language in the resolution about using data and other information. So I would say, mayor, that we would accept as a friendly amendment the language that says only include and then the language that says in a place or in a manner that presents public health and public safety risk and that otherwise is prohibited by 9-4-11 and then the parentheses around that. Page 3, line 3.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Up to the period just before incoming.

>> Kitchen: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Objection to that amendment? Hearing none, it's incorporated into the motion.

>> Kitchen: Shall I go on to the next one?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Kitchen: The next one -- the next one is your

[3:30:00 PM]

page 6, line 19. We do not think that this is necessary because we already have this type of language in there. What this just does, this just points to -- for phase 2 and phase 3, our public health and transportation departments identifying areas that pose health and safety risks. That language is already in the resolution so we do not believe that this is helpful or necessary for clarification. So we are not accepting the second --

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: -- Amendment. Going on to the third, the third one is page 5, line 21. This actually -- let's see. Okay, this is the section that speaks to making --

[3:31:02 PM]

okay, yeah. This is -- this is the section that speaks to the priority one locations not being available for camping. Councilmember Casar, your language actually makes the camping -- makes disallowing camping and creates a camping ban that is broader than we intended. Our intent was only to speak to the areas already the priority locations. We don't want to accept this because we're not trying to create a ban that that's broad. The other thing I would say is we're not -- the other thing I would say is by accepting the first language that you have, because I know what you are trying to do is make it really clear that we're focusing on areas that pose a risk to health and safety and are reflected

[3:32:03 PM]

as you mentioned in the 9-4-11. So accepting that in the first section make sure that we're focus on that. And so it wouldn't -- well, again, I don't want to make it the ban as broad as you've stated in your amendment. So we did not want to go forward with that one.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: Then your last one, your last one relates to page 6, line 5. And it says -- it adds language again that we don't think is helpful or needed.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: We already have language that says the funding for the heal initiative will not be diverted from programs serving the homeless. What you have added a duplicative.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar, let's take them in order. The first one is the language that begins in

[3:33:05 PM]

coming to a determination of and includes the addition to the first line of the next paragraph.

>> Casar: Right.

>> Mayor Adler: Any discussion on that language?

>> Casar: Mayor, could I speak to that?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Casar: I'm getting some interference from some of the unmuted microphones. So the language time suggesting -- first of all, councilmember kitchen, I appreciate that it is you and the co-sponsors have included so what we're trying to do is get to language where we can all agree it upholds the intent we've all talked about. The language that I urge that we add is that as the manager comes to a determination on the priority locations, that the manager should should a transparent and data driven approach to determine those locations. I think that's important so

[3:34:06 PM]

that any of our work is done -- we can transparently say it's not done in any arbitrary manner. That the city manager's office is then empowered to in a data driven way say, well, actually this place and this area is particularly dangerous, say, because this particular area is prone to flooding or we have had cars come across this curb. I want to empower and give to the manager the administrative responsibility really clearly to determine what is dangerous and what is not. So I -- I would like discussion about what might be objectionable about saying we are asking for the manager to use a transparent and data driven approach to analyze the health and safety risks as they consider which areas to prioritize getting folks into housing. And if it's duplicative, I -- I would urge caution

[3:35:09 PM]

general try to include it or print it to whereas and does the exact same thing.

>> Kitchen: Should I speak to that?

>> Mayor Adler: Please go ahead.

>> Kitchen: Okay, the language that is in the resolution now already speaks to -- I'm looking for it exactly -- already speaks to using data and other information. It also describes four locations in diverse areas of the city without naming them. It is up to our city manager to name places based on these descriptions. And -- and we have explained that beginning with diverse areas of town gives our

[3:36:11 PM]

homeless strategy officer the opportunity to pilot, assess and learn from heal approaches in these four diverse areas and immediately begin to address pressing needs. The language that's in there right now says that these are different areas that pose risk to public health and safety. The so the language you are proposing is both not necessary and not appropriate because what we have said is that these are the descriptions of the four types of areas that pose public health and safety for the city manager to use when identifying specific locations and by accepting the language, the first language that you propose, you have some assurance of the intent that these are only locations, only locations where individuals

[3:37:11 PM]

are camping in a plaister -- a place or manner and already prohibited by 9-4-11. I cannot accept your amendment.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Further discussion on the amendment? Take a vote. Let's take a vote. Those in favor of the Casar amendment here, which is the balance of the first amendment, please raise your hand. Fuentes, Ellis, mayor pro tem and Casar and me. That's five. Those opposed? Is the balance of the dais. This does not pass. Next amendment.

>> Casar: Mayor, I'm just -- because we incorporated the -- sorry,

[3:38:12 PM]

this one I would still urge this and I'm stilling getting interference on your microphone, Ann.

>> Kitchen: I'm sorry.

>> Casar: That's okay. So again in this one I think again what I'm trying to urge is that the -- well, mayor, actually if I might. I think the most important ones are two of the remaining ones I would like to prioritize those for council and take votes on those.

>> Mayor Adler: That's fine.

>> Casar: I think of importance is councilmember kitchen, I am willing to in the page 5 beginning at line 21, the one about the camping ordinance, I'm willing to leave the language that you have up top and not insert the new language. That is fine with me. Your point is well taken that the phase one locations

[3:39:12 PM]

will be based on health and safety or people camping in a place that's currently disallowed. So I would leave that. But I would urge the amendment that strikes bringing back an ordinance potentially to amend, to further amend the camping ordinance. In this case I think it's really important if we're communicating to the community that we are not trying to expand criminalization, but we are actually just going to house people and to try to make folks be in safe places, then we would need to bring back an ordinance because the ordinance currently prohibits people being in dangerous places or making public's access to space inconvenient. I don't think there would be a need to bring back an ordinance if we are just prioritizing areas where it is already prohibited or dangerous. I would urge the amendment to cut that sentence that we

[3:40:14 PM]

have struck.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Thank you, councilmember Casar. I appreciate the concerns you are raising. Let me explain why I cannot accept that amendment. The language already speaks to not relying on policing or issuance of citations. And it also in reference to the ordinance, it only says if necessary. It also does not presuppose what kind of language might be brought back to us in an ordinance. It's quite possible to make a change in an ordinance without -- without implying or using existing enforcement mechanisms that are in the ordinance. So I do not want to hamstring our city staff by saying that they couldn't bring us back a change to ordinance if that was necessary.

[3:41:14 PM]

Understanding that we have stated our policy preference that we do not want to -- stating our policy preference to not use policing or issuance of citations. So -- and the other thing to remember is that we're not making a change in any ordinance with this resolution. So I appreciate your -- your perspective, but I can't -- cannot accept this amendment.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: Thank you for the explanation, councilmember. The ordinance is only really useful in so far as it gives powers for citations and policing. And so my preference would be that we strike this section and that if the manager comes back and I would be -- I would be really concerned and we want to hear from the manager how

[3:42:15 PM]

it is if we were trying to do non-policing and non-citation strategies why we would have to expand the ordinance. Because the ordinance currently says that you cannot camp in a dangerous place, you cannot camp on a sidewalk, you cannot camp in parks. And so I don't see why it is that we would have to bring this back. And I would hate to put I will ever it back on the council to try to write specific geography into an ordinance that already lists everything we've listed here as far as danger and everything we wanted to list so far as people camping in illegal places.

>> Mayor Adler: So on this amendment I'm going to decide with Ann kitchen and the sponsors. I don't believe there is an ordinance change that needs to be made in order to be able to make sure that people are not camping in a place that presents a public

[3:43:15 PM]

safety risk or public health hazard. And we've had this conversation before going back to the summer of 2019 and the fall of 2019. And I continue to believe that the ordinances that we've drafted enable our city to be able to -- to make sure that we do that. But we haven't done that and I don't know exactly why, but if it's a ordinances reason, I think this language would allow that to come forward and then we could then maybe have a conversation that advances that ball just because if it comes back for ordinance change, but it may give us the conversation to better understand what it is that exists that stops us from being able to enforce our ordinances now and in ways that I think they could be. So in that sense it doesn't

[3:44:15 PM]

require an ordinance change, but leads us to that conversation and may enable us to daylight that issue, I'm going to vote against this amendment. Further discussion? Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: I've been

>> Casar: Mayor, I've been doing this long enough to have a sense of where the votes are going so I don't want to have to put everyone through that vote, and without objection I would want to move on.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any objection to moving on? Hearing none, go ahead.

>> Casar: My suggestion then is as councilmember kitchen stated, if the preference is not to expand the ordinance or to rely on policing to do this then I would ask a sentence that says at the end of this section right after the word appropriate signage that the

[3:45:16 PM]

preference of the council is to not expand the scope of the ordinance or expand policing or citation as part of the heal initiative.

-- The heal initiative.

>> Kitchen: I cannot accept that amendment because it is already written right into the sentence before that.

>> Casar: The sentence right before it says upon completion of the heal initiative, including strategies that don't rely on it, but doesn't express the preference explicitly.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I think it's police it and been -- explicit and been stated over and over. Mayor, I cannot accept that.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: If there's a second to that I would urge

[3:46:18 PM]

that.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there a second to that? Councilmember Fuentes seconds that. Further discussion? Let's take a vote. Those in favor of that amendment, adding that last phrase at the end, please raise your hand. Did you raise your hand, councilmember tovo?

>> Tovo: I didn't intend to, sorry. The hands raised I see Fuentes, harper-madison, Casar and me. Those opposed raise your hand. It's the balance of the dais. That amendment does not pass. Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: Mayor, I would urge my last amendment because I think it's among the most clarifying and important, but if me and councilmember kitchen agree and the staff agrees that this last line means the exact same thing, then I don't have to put us through another vote on this. What I heard councilmember kitchen's explanation for

[3:47:21 PM]

not [indiscernible] And I don't want to put words in your mouth so check me here. But my goal is that I do not want the funds to be diverted from existing programs which in my mind makes me think of housing that a person experiencing homelessness is getting put in today or the food programs that are feeding someone today, yesterday and tomorrow that we voted on. And then the existing programs. And then I am fine going anywhere in the city budget that is not doing that or that is not about to provide us permanent supportive housing next week. Essentially I do not want us to trade -- I'm fine with us making hard choices and trading other things. I just do not want dollars that our homeless strategy office might deploy for a third hotel this year on a fifth hotel ultimately. I don't want that diverted. I don't mind them coming

[3:48:21 PM]

back with my recommendation. I don't want to food out of someone's mouth from yesterday or permanent supportive housing for tomorrow. That's why I brought this language. I know we just took some votes where we disagreed but I think on this one we're all on the same page. I would urge that we at least get this one done in some way.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, we're on the same page, councilmember Casar, and it's in the language written. I think we're on the same page so I don't think this amendment is necessary.

>> Mayor Adler: Manager, downed if we're approve -- do you understand that if we're approving this this because it is already the sentiment of what it is that we're approving.

>> Cronk: Yes. I'll get a nod from our homeless strategy officer. I think she's talked with both of the individuals, the councilmembers, and that's the agreement, yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

[3:49:22 PM]

>> Casar: And forgive me, when you bring the Fleming back for me to answer that question, for me to triple check. Thank you for the pre-organized forgiveness.

>> Mayor Adler: Colleagues, if you look at the motion sheet that I handed out, there were four amendments on that page. The first one I think has already been covered by the earlier vote. I'm not going to urge number one. Number four I think probably isn't timely right now. Number four was intended to go to helping ensure that we didn't need police or citation intervention. The goal has all been to have the ability to be able to tell someone always where they can be if we ever go to someone and say you can't be here. I think we're going to need that if we're going to not

[3:50:22 PM]

have and encourage non-policing interventions. I don't think we need to address that now as part of this initial process. Probably something that gets added later. The third amendment I think is really part and parcel of the second so I'm not going to urge that. I'm just going to focus on the second one which I think is important. We have I think a lot of people coming together, including the entities that are listed here in that group. And if there is a community agreement or consensus that results from trade-offs or different parties stepping up to be able to offer different solutions that are not something that our city could do with that group that's coming in two days -- in the next couple of weeks, I would want the manager to be able to come back with things that were part of that community consensus that we might not be able to anticipate and I want to make sure that that work can be brought back to us and

[3:51:23 PM]

that we're not needlessly setting up a separate process to be doing what appears to me to be real similar work. Certainly we could be doing more than just this, but this is -- this street management issue and encampment management issue is a real significant part of why a lot of people I think are going to be participating in that community summit. So I would urge the amendment number 2. Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I really appreciate and am excited to hear about the proposed community summit and I appreciate the work that you've been doing on that. I think it's going to be really helpful for really setting a comprehensive plan and informing investments as we move forward. However, it is a

[3:52:23 PM]

different -- that's not what the collaboration is. The collaboration -- you know, the -- so the summit cannot serve as the collaboration as you've mentioned because the collaboration is a project team to work with our homeless strategy officer to work on the specific operational aspects of the heal initiative. So I do think, though, that perhaps with some language change here we could get to your intent. I think that the summit conversations could provide information to -- they will be providing information to our homeless service officer, of course. And could help inform the heal initiative. But your last part of it is part that doesn't work to me because the language you have is could serve as the collaboration. This collaboration is a project management team, a

[3:53:25 PM]

summit is not a project management team. The collaboration is a project management team that is ongoing for the operations. So perhaps that language -- I mean, perhaps not the language that you have, but just language that says that something to the effect that the homeless strategy officer, you know --

>> Mayor Adler: How about we do this? Because the I don't know how it would turn out and it could be that the actual project team that does the actual work associated with dealing with the camping involves [indiscernible] Team people different or apart from or assignment or responsibilities of different entities. How about if we kept the beginning of the language and explained what it was. And then it says instead can serve as foundation for the work of the collaboration, and just put a period.

[3:54:28 PM]

>> Kitchen: Let me let councilmember tovo go first.

>> Tovo: I also want to express my appreciation for these in the community who are working on creating this summit. As I've always tried to emphasize whenever we're having these conversations, you know, I'm really supportive of the city continuing to prioritize issues related to homelessness and working to end homelessness, but fact is they need those public partners to participate in it then this has to be a community effort to end homelessness in Austin. So I'm extremely appreciative of all those working to make the summit -- to pull together the summit and pull together those voices so we could have a community plan for how we're going to do that. I am not comfortable with the language the mayor suggested for the same reasons councilmember kitchen is not. I would rather in terms of what you were just

[3:55:28 PM]

suggesting, mayor, about recognizing that that initiative is happening, I would suggest something more like after community consensus, something more like that will inform -- so it says the proposed -- I thought I had it in my head and then I got myself distracted by taking. The proposed community summit intended to address and reach a community consensus that includes addressing cammies and street -- encampments and street management can serve as additional information to inform the city's direction, something like that. Certainly I think that process should inform it, but I am -- I believe that need to really be clear about what our role is and what action we're taking, and we need to have that forward movement that several of my colleagues have spoken to before. So I absolutely think that work at the summit informs our process, but it does not slow it down nor does it

[3:56:30 PM]

dictate to constituent what our direction is going to be.

>> Mayor Adler: As I understand it, Kathie, and tell me if I have this right. After management, comma, it would say could serve as additional information to inform the city's action.

>> Tovo: That's a little different than what I said, but that's fine.

[Overlapping speakers]. What did you say, mayor? Could serve as additional information --

>> Mayor Adler: Could serve as additional information to inform the city's action.

>> Tovo: I think the intent is great. I generally -- that's exactly what I was aiming toward.

>> Mayor Adler: Let keep with this unless someone has a quick one.

>> Pool: That would be to inform the city's actions. You don't need additional information to inform to say -- which will serve to inform.

[3:57:30 PM]

Anyway, there's a way to get there.

>> Mayor Adler: I know it's not really artful. Anyone can work and serve as additional information to

[indiscernible] Would be fine with me. You're shaking your head yes. I want to make sure if something comes out of that that we can incorporate it to whatever the manager comes back with. Any objection to that amendment being added. Hearing none that amendment is added. That gets us to the main motion unless there are any further amendments? Let's take a vote. Those in favor of this item 49 please raise your hand.

>> Casar: Mayor, I'm trying to speak.

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead, councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: Mayor, I want to explain my no vote today. We heard concerns from community members that this could lead to expanded policing and criminalization. We heard from members sponsoring the item on the message board in work

[3:58:30 PM]

session that that was not the intent. And that if there was clarity people wouldn't have those concerns. I hope to vote for this today by bringing forward amendments that would make that very clear. And I believe that it remains unclear. I agree and see in the resolution that this does not actually change our ordinances and our criminal laws. But it does open up the door without stating a preference that that could be where this heads. And I believe that it's important for us to be proud of and stand strong

behind that we shouldn't have criminal laws that criminalize poverty or sickness. And when someone isn't actually doing anything wrong. And I don't think that we need to signal that those laws potentially would have to change because I think that the overwhelming

[3:59:30 PM]

majority of people on the dais and the folks that we've heard from believe that we should have rules, but that they should be reasonable and that they should not persecute poverty because instead we need to address it. I support bringing more housing solutions that are included in today's vote and I continue to support continued housing and services going to people living on the streets, but I believe that we need to focus on housing folks if we want to really address the problem. I hear too much from the folks on the ground from service providers that folks who no longer are in front of the arch are now in front of terraces so. And they could be moved from there. And I know many of us do not want to see that happen. And I know that with the continued work and with the leaders on the council that we get dollars to actually house people.

[4:00:31 PM]

At the same time I think we have to recognize we are -- that there is a persistent campaign to misinform people in our community that the civil rights protections essentially that we have enacted are somehow causing people to experience homelessness. And we know that that just isn't true. Taking your foot off of someone's neck does not mean that you're welcome with them being on the ground, but it is an important thing to do and I think now it is our task to give people that handout. So I appreciate the work to address this challenging issue, to dedicate resources, even more resources to folks sleeping in tents and to pull folks into housing, but I think with the lack of clarity and I think that opens the door to potentially changing the ordinances in a way that I can't support this today.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you.

[4:01:33 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Any other discussion on item 49? Those in favor of item 49? Those opposed? Councilmember Casar, Fuentes and the mayor pro tem. The others voting aye. It passes. All right, guys, we've had some folks that have lined up to speak here on item number 61. I'm going to ask the clerk to call those speakers for us. I'm showing still to be handled is items 60, item 61, item 62 and item 59. Now let's bring up the speakers who have been patiently waiting. I apologize for the delay. I appreciate you

[4:02:33 PM]

participating in the process. Each speaker gets one minute on this issue. How many speakers do we have in the queue?

>> Mayor, we have about 47 speakers.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Go ahead and call them, please.

>> First speaker is chivas Watson.

>> Can I be heard?

>> Yes, go ahead.

>> Can I be heard?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, go ahead.

>> I'm which I was Watson, leaper of working group 512. In support of the housing solution in item 60 but seeking an incremental implementation to item 49. I know you already decided that but I was in the morning session and did not get a chance to speak because of the issues with the system. We need a renew discussion to be had where everybody is clear. Greg, thanks for advocating

[4:03:35 PM]

the amendments best you could. Truth is and what's not being said is exactly how the hso and city manager plan to succeed in the first phase of this heal initiative. Councilmember kitchen, councilmember pool, I applaud that you continue to be a part of these efforts. I'm not saying what you're doing is not valuable. I'm saying if I could be accurate, what you're doing still has hints of white supremacy within it. Integral care, caritas, echo, what have they proven thus far? To be clear, right now we need again a clear process that cannot be simply apiecing to those like Mackenzie Kelly and the cohorts who are scared of those people of color and others by in addition. This will turn about perpetual --

[indiscernible].

>> Speaker, your time has expired.

>> If you already decided, let's keep talking for a few weeks. I've got 15 homeless folks with me. They do not trust this plan. Thank you for the time.

[4:04:38 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Justin green.

>> Hi, my name is Justin gasoline, resident of district 9 and a member of Austin dsa and I'm calling in support of item 61. I want to thank councilmember Casar for leading the charge on the hotel purchases from last week and fighting for the postponement of item 49. I'm pretty frustrated that that item passed. I just think it's kind of a joke to -- it's called the heal initiative. Y'all should be comedians for passing something that opens the door to recriminallizing homelessness. Same on councilmember Kelly for attempting to criminalize our community's most vulnerable all for the comfort of those who do not wish to be confronted with the end results our broken economic system. I urge the rest of city council to make a compassionate choice and invest our resources in creating permanent housing.

[4:05:38 PM]

Really the only effective treatment we have. Including treating homelessness. Thank you.

>> Preston manez. Preston manez. Mayor, we'll try to reach back out to this person.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Nicole Maddox.

>> Good afternoon, Nicole Maddox, I live in district 6 and I volunteer with the eat apart together initiative to deliver food to the homelessness on Sundays and also a member of Austin dsa. I want to speak in favor of item 61. I also opposed 49 the way it was written and I'm disappointed that the amendments didn't pass.

[4:06:42 PM]

I think it was pool that said something about shared the concern that Cass czar had, but just because [indiscernible] Might think duplicative, it is still -- we're finding -- it's worth seeing loopholes and loopholes can be exploited. So if we need them we need to address those concerns. As for 61 we need to do our best to house the homeless. This is a great opportunity. And especially as it is permanent supportive housing. It is not a shelter. This will not negatively impact a lot of the neighboring facilities like people think it will. So I'm just really hoping you guys continue your support of 61. Also, Mackenzie Kelly, looking forward to seeing your email update. I registered for your email list and have not seen anything on that yet. I had to find out about your -- [indiscernible].

>> Speaker, your time has expired.

[4:07:47 PM]

>> Preston manez.

>> Hello, I'm calling in support of item 61. I remember the autopsy captain of the democratic -- I'm a member of the democratic socialists of America. I lived within two years of the walking distance of the candle wood suites. I think it's perfect for housing our homeless neighbors, that are multiple grocery stores nearby, dozens of fgers nearby, dps nearby, a clinic nearby all within walking distance. I'm sympathetic to my neighbors' safety and community concerns, but those are the concerns of the local police. If they are failing to address those concerns then the appropriate response is to adjust the police strategy rather than punishing our homeless neighbors. You can't punish the homeless for the crimes of the few rather than the guilt or innocence. This housing share the safety and security concerns of their neighbors, they are more likely to be victims of crime themselves. Homelessness is a citywide issue and every district, district 6 included, has to do its part to address it.

[4:08:47 PM]

Not in my backyard is not sound policy and the city council would do well to reject it. Please vote in favor of item 61. Thank you. Meagan Pegler.

>> Hi, I'm a resident of district 6. I'm calling to support 61. I also live in walking distance of the hotel, and I have heard the concerns of some of our currently housed neighbors and I don't think that fear is a good way to make policy decisions. Permanent supportive housing is proven to be an excellent solution to homelessness and I urge you all to vote in favor of this to recognize and offer dignity and respect to our neighbors who

[4:09:48 PM]

are currently experiencing homelessness. Thank you.

>> Sanjay.

>> My name is Sanjay. I manage the hotel that is in district 6 that is adjacent to candlewood suites. I oppose this proposal 61. The zoning for the candlewood suites is gr. The location is not intended to be permanent housing. Any other person or business would have to go through an official rezoning process. Will the city reach out to the adjacent businesses, neighbors and associations and agree to enforceable restrictive covenants. The city should give neighbors a remedy if the facility is operated in a way that violates the promises the council is now making about the use in

[4:10:51 PM]

operation. Why would the city council not agree to that unless they want to change the use of the property. Thank you for your time.

>> Scott Carson.

>> Hi, Scott Carson. I live in district 6. I live about 100 yards down from the hotel. In quoting national lampoon's Christmas vacation, sometimes things look good on paper but lose their luster when you see how it affects real folks. A healthy bottom line doesn't help if it hurts the ones you depend on. I oppose the purchase of this moment for a couple of reasons. The increase of crime, lack of nearby amenities, the added negative impact on the surrounding businesses that have been paying taxes for years and the lack of communication by the city not only to the community, but to the county and everyone involved. There are other places in our city to be of benefit. Take a look at a great example of community first. Read the new Los Angeles charity hope for the valley that are utilizing many homes at a fraction of the

[4:11:53 PM]

cost, either one houses people at a fraction of the cost than what you've proposed here. There is a vacant 40-acre tract of land by the airport that could hold 416 or 1600 homes. There are many locations like the 24 hour fitness on Parmer lane that's vacant. This place could hold 150 to 200 tiny homes. It's close to public transportation and away from residential communities and it won't affect the businesses around them.

>> Speaker, your time has expired.

>> Bianca Ramirez.

>> Hi. As a taxpayer resident of Williamson county whose property juts up directly against the candlewood suites I am against item 61. As ethnic minorities who worked our way out of poverty, we fear for our lives considering we've had an influx in homeless backpackers camping behind our fence, looking the in on our boys while they play

[4:12:54 PM]

outside, lighting fires and leaving excrement behind our lots. And break ins and trespassing has increased. They are hypothetical neighbors. If they did they would be against it too. Working with the homeless I have in the past is different than living right next to the homeless. By allowing individuals with severe mental health and substance abuse problems into our neighborhood, jeopardizing our safety. This rushed effort to solve your Travis county homeless tries R. Crisis has left residents betrayed leaving no impact studies on residents or small business owns. Can you guarantee this phs facility will

never be converted into a temporary homeless housing shelter? Close to 2800 residents in this area ask that you please purchase a hotel in a nonresidential area.

>> Thank you.

>> Marie chadry.

>> I'm the owner of the

[4:13:55 PM]

hotel in district 6. I am ooped to the city buying candlewood. I suggest that mayor Adler and the council contact community first successful homeless community and give Allen 9.5 million. He can build a lot of mini homes and help a lot more people. We want all homeless off the streets into homes. This is a much better solution for homeless and pecan park community. Second, has APD been asked for analysis of whether from a policing standpoint they believe this location is a good location for a ph project. Will the city provide a copy of APD's analysis. Will the city postpone a decision on purchasing the property until such a security analysis is conducted and provided to the public. Third, why were we not ever notified? Thank you.

[4:14:55 PM]

>> Sarah gourd.

>> I'm a homeowner in I am asking the council to support item 61. I really do appreciate the intent and it includes investment for house, however from my perspective as someone outside the council it's hard to believe that the promises were made in good faith. The the council has the opportunity last week to provide permanent supportive housing through item 61 and postponed it. And from my perspective outside it looks like it was postponed to have time to stoke outrage. If we're on the same page about protecting our homeless neighbors, let's please vote yes to purchase the candlewood suites. Thank you.

>> Andy Phillips.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can, go ahead.

>> Thank you very much. My name is Andy Phillips and I'm a resident of district 4 and a proud number of the

[4:15:56 PM]

democratic socialists of America. Thank you to councilmember Greg Casar, Vanessa Fuentes and, I'm so sorry, -- I'm blanking on the third councilmember's name. I I apologize for that. Thank you all of you for speaking against items 49. I would like to speak in favor of item 61. So sorry. I'd like to speak of item 61. I spoke in favor of buying the first hotel and am speaking in favor of buying the second hotel for the same reason. The only way to solve homelessness is through housing and this needs to happen sooner rather than later. Furthermore, item 489 is really not very good, especially in its current state. People experiencing homelessness are living where they need in order to be relatively safe. And they are doing so

[4:16:57 PM]

because living outside for extensive periods of time is not safe. So we are wasting time and resources that we could be spending on finding more permanent housing and --

>> Speaker, your time has expired.

>> Jolene wing.

>> Hello. I am against item 61. To have a group you cannot just by hurting another group. This location is so terrible. It is not zoned for affordable housing so there's no public transportation, no grocery, no health care. This location cannot house the homeless -- cannot help the homeless that much, however it will impact this local community a lot, especially destroy the adjacent businesslike the Hampton hotel and the restaurant. If the city did a study, please be aware that these two business are women

[4:17:57 PM]

owners and among minorities. You cannot discriminate them. Whatever reason, imagine if you were with your daughter, wife, mom, how would you feel? And I think it's a shame for the city manager to manage it like this. So your people, those on the

[indiscernible] Protest, that's wrong. Thank you.

>> Hovanky,.

>> I am calling from district 1, the housing homeless need azap. Living on the streets basically creates even further trauma, further danger and this definitely impacts their ability to rehabilitate and to find housing and jobs afterwards. But I also do hope that the

[4:18:59 PM]

council takes to heart the worries and reservations that other people have spoken about regarding providing resources for the homeless in that area, making sure that the hotel doesn't get turned into a homeless shelter and then also making sure that there's adequate security nearby to ensure the safety of the neighborhood and surrounding communities. Thank you.

>> Alicia saman.

>> My name is Alicia and I oppose item 61. The option here is location, location, location. This is a northwest Austin middle class, working class, family class community. 145 single-family homes next to candlewood suites. As residents we received little to no notice about the city's action to move

[4:19:59 PM]

forward with this decision which leaves us disheartened. I keep hearing how purchasing this location is good for the homeless, but not much good for the residents of pecan park and how it affects us. We have no confidence in the city's involvement in keeping their commitments and funds for services, security and care for this supported house, therefore leaving us, the property owners, with a project to deal with in the future. The city cannot monitor, oversee and control these tenants to the extent of them not paying their rent, integrate in with the community while mentally incapacitated, trashing the neighborhood and keeping pecan park neighbors safe from crime, drugs and pests which we're going through right now. Give the homeless their own affordable --

>> Speaker, your time has expired.

>> Rapasha hardy.

>> Hi. My name is rapasha and I

[4:21:00 PM]

oppose this hotel being purchased for permanent supportive housing. Mayor Adler and councilmembers, no disrespect. Which one of you shared a driving offense with permanent supportive housing. If you don't then you should not be doing it to this community either? Look at your current existing phs are in close proximity to schools, residents and businesses? We would like to know. The city has been talking to caritas and integral care for a month. Why it could not speak with the community and follow the due process. The city should also think about the message that it's sending its business owners and residents. Because this is happening to us it can happen to other neighborhoods. Whose neighborhood is next? Thank you.

>> Amanda Weems.

>> Hi, y'all. My name is Amanda. I'm a homeowner in district 1 and I'm speaking in favor of item 61. You've already heard from many of your constituents on the moral urgency of purchasing housing for our

[4:22:01 PM]

neighbors so I'm going to speak to the political choices y'all are making around this issue. We take action like passing item 49 it appears that you are bowing to the pressure from the governor's office and newly elected councilwoman Kelly. Efforts to criminalize this will not face councilmembers from facing challengers in the next council race nor bring about a more just city. I told you last week that councilmember Kelly was being disingenuous when she suggested that she needed more time to educate her constituents about the planned supportive housing in her district. Instead of educating them she took the information y'all gave her to give out more disinformation and gather supporters against this proposal. The educational town hall she scheduled for Wednesday was clearly at the bottom of her priority's list. This is what you enabled for

[4:23:02 PM]

the sake of con general Alty. She is not your friend. She is --

>> Speaker, your time has expired.

>> Baldesh cadry.

>> I am from district 6. I own Hampton directly adjacent to candlewood. I'm here to oppose the purchase of candlewood. I feel that the city is doing a purchase in secret manner. When we submit a process to city, the city takes letters to all neighboring residents and businesses. But the transparency on

[indiscernible]. On pecan park, there is a lack of services and amenities. I don't want to see Austin

[4:24:05 PM]

regress around Williamson county and put it on hold for 180 days. Thank you.

>> Phil Perman. Phil Perman.

>> Can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can, go ahead.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can.

>> I want to say that compassion is not the issue. I offer food and clothing to the homeless and they didn't want it. They only wanted money. Also the item 2 the proposed purchase was done under the radar without any input from the neighborhood. When they listened to us finally they were very patronizing and 80 rooms did not make a dent in the problem. The homeless are not confined in the building so they will be walking the streets and we will still

[4:25:06 PM]

see syringes and we will be accosted while walking the sidewalks and to local businesses. A tremendous amount of trash did not disappear. 9.5 million in monies would be more effectively spent in purchasing property and placing these people in prefabricated housing that they can call home. Thank you.

>> Christina Gonzalez.

>> Good afternoon. I live in district 6 and would like to thank Mackenzie Kelly for accurately representing her constituents. I'm a woman of color who worked hard to purchase my first home in December. I looked for a neighborhood that I would feel safe walking my dogs and raising a family. I choose Anderson mill. I used to feel safe walking along great hills trail and underneath the overpass but this area has significantly changed since that time. My last apartment which touts itself has having premier units has seen an uptick in burglary and vandalization. After north by north west

[4:26:07 PM]

closed due to the pandemic, several homeless people moved into the parking lot directly from my unit and I witnessed them shooting up firsthand. National coalition of homeless estimates that many are addicted to drugs. This is a recipe for disaster and will greatly affect the safety and property values of all the businesses and let's residents in the area. Thank you.

>> Ana Perez.

>> I'm a resident of district 1. I'm calling in support of item 49. Our city committed to human solution for the problems of inequality when we decriminalized homelessness and defunded the police by 150 million last summer they are just the first step in building a community in which public safety is not a luxury for those who already have housing and gainful

[4:27:08 PM]

employment, but a human right we extend to everyone. We all want to see people off the street, but designating some areas as unsafe raises questions about enforcement mechanisms to make sure people are not camping there regardless of the intentions of the council resolution to connect people to housing. We're in the midst of a global pandemic that has already killed more than 400,000 people in the U.S. Our housing market is already unaffordable for working class Austinites on top of millions losing their jobs, being threatened by housing and security. How is providing them -- housing them in the area with public health is critical especially when the average age is 54 and 90% of these people have two or more chronic health conditions. I'm asking you to vote yes on item 61 and continue the work of making this a city for all people, not just those who can afford it.

>> Hamilton madden.

>> Good afternoon. My name is Hamilton madden and I'm calling in

[4:28:11 PM]

opposition. So far over the past three years the city has spent \$160 million to care for the homeless and to put that in perspective, community first could have built 4,000 tiny homes with those dollars. Now the city wants to spend \$40 million for 310 rooms or \$130,000 per room to house 12 percent of the population when community first could have built 1,000 homes and housed 40% of the population. And if you extrapolate this cost per room, the city is going to spend \$320 million to house the homelessness. This is just way over spending. If you look at the value that's -- the cost of the city's paying, \$40 million for \$13 million of appraised value. When the city pays three times the value for the property, what does that do? That makes the housing prices that much worse by increasing cost of living, increasing property taxes, increasing the values of properties. This is just bad dollars spent for an unproven

[4:29:12 PM]

program that will not be a quick fix since first move-ins won't even happen until fourth quarter of this year. The first hotel was --

>> Speaker, your time has expired.

>> [Calling speaker names].

>> My name is paris, district 6. I'm disheartened by the homeless situation in our wonderful city. I support housing for the homeless. I wanted the council to vote against item 49 as well as against 61. This is not contradictory, simple. Candlewood suites hotel will only house about 80 homeless, which is about three percent of the homeless population. We will need to buy 30 such hotels and I believe that's about five percent of the total hotel rooms in Austin.

[4:30:12 PM]

This would require many hundreds of thousands of dollars to address the homeless situation. I know the city council has been trying to work this issue for quite some time, but I suggest we take a more comprehensive view so we can scale to address 100% of the housing needs for our unhoused neighbors. There are many other successful programs in the city and around the country that have scaled to address these types of issues. Secondly, the decision to move forward with buying the candlewood suites has been rushed and there have been many unanswered questions. I believe we need to answer these questions prior to moving forward. I implore the councilmembers to postpone items --

>> Speaker, your time has expired.

>> Michael dance.

>> Yes, I'm Michael dance. I'm a homeowner in district 6 within walking distance of the candlewood suites. I have a junior at Westwood high school. I've got a son at Grissom.

[4:31:14 PM]

Everybody speaks to fear on this, what if the worst stuff happens. This is an opportunity to help people out. And by the way, any time you have to use "These people" in a reference, you're probably going wrong. Everybody needs to do their part. I'm happy lend my neighborhood, Anderson mill, to help with homelessness because if we don't do everything we can, it's not going away. Thank you.

>> Emily Edgerly.

>> Hi, my name is Emily. I am a resident of draft 3 and I have over a -- district 3 and I have a decade of experience in homelessness services and I'm a huge advocate of housing first and permanent supportive housing. And in support of 61. Not all individuals experiencing homelessness commit crimes, but the state of being unhoused causes the very fact of living to be criminalized. I want to really address this as a lot of opponents

[4:32:15 PM]

have brought it up. Evidence shows that criminal activity decreases once an individual becomes housed. We also know that the state of being unhoused creates criminal activity, increases substance abuse and ex-sack baits PTSD and mental health systems whose symptoms go into the very behavior that is alarming these community members. Furthermore, like for my experience an unhoused person's criminal record often due to these crimes of survival are a huge barrier to finding adequate housing. As a community we must account for the racial disparities in homelessness in our city. And look at Travis county. Black people am account for eight percent of our population but --

>> Speaker, your time has expired.

>> Nestor rubenano.

>> Hi. Although we saw the efforts

[4:33:15 PM]

to address the homeless crisis in the city, we really strongly believe the purchase of the candlewood suites for house first is an expensive and ineffective solution and would tremendously affect the surrounding community as well as the nearby businesses and our school children. I respectfully ask the council and the mayor to delay the hotel purchase decision for 180 days to be able to study the impact on the neighborhood businesses, schools and also to know what the plans are to prevent covid-19 spread. This was also requested by the Williamson county commissioners' court as well. So in addition to that, over 2,000 -- 3,000 persons have signed a change.org petition to stop the purchase of this hotel, which is very representative. It's not just the people living next to the hotel, but the whole community

[4:34:17 PM]

asking for this. So I ask again for the delay of 180 days. Thank you.

>> Bennett Burke.

>> Hi there. Can you hear me?

>> Yes, go ahead.

>> Hi. My name is Bennett Burke. I'm a student at UT and a proud member of the Austin ds. I'm calling to speak in support of item 61. And many people before me have stated the reason why it's necessary. So I want to take a moment to address something that UT students are often invoked in the discussion about homelessness, usually to dehumanize homeless people. And I want to challenge this. Homeless people are people. And some of the people who have spoken in opposition to item 61 have just employed absolutely disgusting language to describe our

[4:35:19 PM]

neighbors. These people are human beings who just have the misfortune of living in a capitalist system that denies them housing. And if we look back through recent history, housing homeless people fixes the issue. The issue is that they don't have houses so give them somewhere to live and the problems starting to away. So you should purchase this hotel. You should purchase a hotel in my district. You

should purchase hotels in every single district in Austin until there are no more homeless people because they've all been housed. These resources exist and we just need the political will and to change our attitudes about how we view our neighbors.

>> Speaker, your time has expired.

>> Please support item 61.

>> Prash hanoy.

>> I'm a resident of district 6. I oppose item number 61.

[4:36:19 PM]

While I deeply care for the issue of homelessness in my beloved city, it is extremely worrisome to find out that the city is taking shortcuts and recklessly spending our money without giving enough notice to the stakeholders. It's only recently that Round Rock ISD, the business owners and the residents of district 6 found out that the homeless are being sheltered to close to Westwood high school and Grisham middle school without giving us an opportunity to weigh in on the decision that heavily affects all those entities. There seems to be no good option for public transportation in the area, nor are there good job opportunities and health care options in the vicinity of the proposal to shelter the homeless. It is not clear if the city is looking to the root cause of the homeless crisis and how to better hab the homeless, including but not limited to those with mental health and addiction. Our city leaders need to work hard to find a well thought of solution instead of offering an easy and exorbitantly priced option with taxpayers' money. Thank you.

[4:37:25 PM]

>> Frida Chang.

>> Hello, my name is Frida Chen. I'm a business owner in district 6. I'm opposed to the purchase of candlewood suites for homeless housing. I'm a resident and business owner in this area for over 30 years. I have loved and given a lot to this community my entire life and career. I oppose this because the city has completely disregard for our businesses and safety of our business and residents. City also has complete disregard for the homeless population that they are trying to help because there's no public transportation, grocery store. You are hurting, not helping anyone. You all are elected officials. It is your duty to listen T your community businesses and residents. It is your duty to be transparent. It is a wrong area to buy the candlewood hotel.

[4:38:26 PM]

And if you use all your funding where will you get money if you buy all those hotels? What are you going to do after that? Thank you. I vote no. Thank you.

>> Michael Garamco.

>> Yes, thank you. My name is Michael and I'm a homeowner in district 8, page Ellis's district. And I wanted to voice support for item 61 obviously for supportive supportive. And these people who oppose the police budget and the housing and also oppose anything to restrict the camping -- to pull back the camping ban. These people haven't offered any solutions to anything. They just keep opposing, opposing, opposing to everything. And I think that my councilmember, even though I

[4:39:27 PM]

haven't gotten an answer back from various letters that we've written from our neighborhood organizing group in circle C that was organized around the black lives matter movement and we are fully in support of these purchases of housing and staying firm to my councilmember's previous positions in support of decriminalizing homelessness and making some sure that we are actually moving towards permanent supportive housing. I urge her to stay on that track and not to offer up an assumption of good faith.

>> Speaker, your time has expired.

>> Nancy Walsh.

>> Yes, can you hear me? Can you hear me?

>> Yes, we can.

>> Okay. This is Nancy Walsh and I'm in district 6. And I'm opposed to item 61. You I think that we have to remember that in 2019 the

[4:40:30 PM]

city council had a vote that basically legalized the street camping for anybody, I guess, but it happened to be that the homeless were the ones who came in. I think that what has happened is that there's an unintended consequence from the actions that we have done in years before and one of those is homeless camping on the street or anybody camping on the street. And I think that that's what we're seeing now, we've seen an increase in the number of homeless to the point now that we feel like we have to hide them. The city of Austin is the jewel in the crown of Texas. It is huge in tourist and information. It is the state capitol, people come here on and off. And I realize that the people on the city council do not want people to see homeless people. As much as they would like to help them, they are

hurting them. When they voted in 2019 to allow them to be on the streets, they harmed them. Now that they want to put them into the candlewood suites in a residential neighborhood, not only are they harming them, but they're harming the president let's who are

[4:41:30 PM]

there. We pay taxes, we take care. We are generous, we are kind, we are not out --

>> Speaker, your time has expired.

>> Chelsea Lewis.

>> Hi. I'm Chelsea from district 9. I'm testifying in favor of item 61. I called in last week for item 31 and 32 and today I'm imploring you once again to quickly end the purchase of the second hotel. Councilmember Kelly's postponement of the item last week was followed by a wave of news articles featuring pictures of white property owners who believe that the taxes they pay entitle them to keep no poverty in for their own comfort. I'm deeply disgusted by the callers opposing this item. The first one location or to quote a previous caller, location, location, location. If your neighborhood is so nice then why isn't it suitable for permanent housing? People keep talking about fear of crime and violence,

[4:42:31 PM]

but have yet to share the basis for this argument? If you're afraid of homeless people, guess what? House them and they won't be homeless. Please vote for item 61.

>> Jose papa.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> Yes, go ahead.

>> My name is Jose from district 7 and I would like to speak on item 61 because of the lack of community engagement and education. We recently submitted a petition for Texas bungalow which details similar concerns as candlewood hotels. I would like to preface that I am absolutely for finding solutions to the growing homelessness problem in this city. I volunteered at community first village, first village, at CD Doyle, a free community clinic that serves a lot of the homeless in the community downtown, however again I'm raising concerns about the lack of

[4:43:32 PM]

transparency and engagement with the community before as well as after the vote to purchase the Texas bungalows. Councilmember pool, you mentioned in the last city council meeting on the 27th that you performed extensive community education and outreach. I'm disappointed because the only voices I've heard so far on the topic are from the next door forum. I've also confirmed that the hoa board was not contacted before and still has yet to hear about the purchase. I'm asking for more transparency about a decision that directly affects an established family neighborhood.

>> Speaker%.

--

>> Speaker, your time has speaker, your time has expired.

>> Keith young.

>> Good afternoon, I'm Keith young and I'm a calling to speak in favor of item 61. Over the past five months a number of colleagues and friends and I had the eye-opening experience to work together, on

[4:44:33 PM]

initiatives such as the repeal of the camping ban and the outreach efforts as well as eating in parks together are crucial measures but we must recognize these measures as remedial. And the item 61 picks up before the aforementioned leaves off, getting our neighbors off the street and into stable housing where they can get back on their own feet. I have heard you during the previous discussion reaffirm a commitment to addressing the homelessness crisis in Austin. When we are serious saying that our neighbors should not have to live in dangerous and even degrading conditions then housing is the only path forward. You must keep people housed going forward and there's only one way out in Austin and that is housing. Mayor, city council, thank you% for your time.

>> Joanie Wang.

>> Hi, my name is Joanie Wong and I represent the high school parents who are concerned for

[4:45:34 PM]

their children's safety. We oppose, and if you do not live here in the neighborhood I don't think that you have the right to speak up for people who live there and spend our live there is and are worried about our children's safety. Number two, if it's not your own money, maybe you don't care -- you're not as careful. Lavishing \$12 million of the taxpayers' dollars on only 80 out of the total of 3,000 homeless population in Austin doesn't make any sense. I suggest that we work together with the state, which owns a five-acre land near south 183, away from the high density residential areas, businesses and schools, and build a large complex with a few hundred homeless units to accommodate more homeless people in need. Finally, the hotels are used as a covid hotel, which makes it

[4:46:36 PM]

unsafe to accommodate homeless people in the future. I want to thank you, councilwoman Kelly.

>> Speaker, your time has expired. Sharon blight.

>> Can you hear me?

>> Yes, go ahead.

>> This is Sharon.

>> Go ahead.

>> Sharon blight living in district 6. You can hear me?

>> Yes, go ahead.

>> Sharon blight living -- living in district 6. I'm opposed to item 61, but I have a few questions. Do people moving into the hotels already have two covid shots? Is this a requirement? And what physical barriers between free food and the neighborhoods has this been thought about? If the citizens break their lease what is the recourse besides giving them resources.

[4:47:38 PM]

And how about placing R.I.S for people to live in, and it's my escape out of Austin when our neighborhoods are trashed. Are the homeless too good to live in R.V.S in please do not vote for item 61, or delay the vote. Thank you very much.

>> Stephanie Goodman.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> Yes, go ahead much.

>> Hello?

>> Yes, go ahead.

>> Hi, my name is Stephanie Goodman and I live in district 6. I am speaking to oppose the candlewood hotel purchase. I also live on the park and it's less than a thousand feet from the doors of candlewood. H.E.B. Is one highly from the candlewood doors, to clarify that. And the stats that were presented by integral care, this is not like terrace springs. It doesn't have the same amenities and the density of the residential homes and schools eclipses what south Austin was.

[4:48:39 PM]

We have more schools, more hotels, restaurants and humans of neighbors on each side. Specifically though integral care say they have served 5,400 citizens and 55% have more than one disorders and 54% have a health condition, but only 38% needed a permanent housing solution. Integral can only allocate 50 to 75 units to P.S.H. If we did by their stats that only serves 2% to 4% of that 38%. The city says that there's 2,536 homeless if we go by your numbers those rooms only serve 5% of that 38%. What happens to the other 62 --

>> Speaker, your time has expired. Michael torres.

>> Hello, can you hear me?

>> Yes, go ahead.

>> I'm speaking in support of

[4:49:40 PM]

agenda items number 61 and my opposition on 49. Our communities are safer when individuals and families are have resources that they need and to move forward, especially in Austin where it's being gentrified. Overpolicing does not do any benefit for our unhoused neighbors. And the cycles... And one step away from experiencing homelessness be. By implementing the housing first model it gives a sense of security and meeting a basic need. Item 49 it states that the initiative is to house with resources but it does the exact opposite. When they return to get belongings from their tents in the campsites their stuff will be gone. And the second problem issue with this is that it separates our unhoused folks from their friends who are a family of choice. This housing crisis is still present, providing no solutions.

[4:50:40 PM]

Thank you.

>> Robert Barnes.

>> Yes, this is Bob Barnes. Can you hear me?

>> Yes. Go ahead.

>> Can you hear me? Thank you. I'm president of I.B.C. Bank, and I'm here to speak against this ordinance or this item, item 61. The two adjacent hotels, the Hampton inn and the Homewood suites are homed by a family and several members have already spoken today. And I.B.C. Is a lender on the two hotels. My main concern here is for the family. If you have ever inspected the site you will see that

all three hotels, the Hampton inn and the Homewood suites and the candlewood suites have a common interest. It's adjacent and 20 feet away from candlewood suites. If council approves, then my fear is that it could be a death sentence for these hotels. In the middle of a pandemic when

[4:51:42 PM]

most hotels are barely making it, and I ask that the council reconsider and give more time for community input. And the very big tragic situation here is that council in the city has not been transparent and has not engaged the community. This was a surprise for everyone. And I think that it's a real disappointment and I support housing for the homeless. But not a shotgun approach where you can buy hotels without any concern for the local community. Thank you.

>> Mayor, may I ask the previous speaker a question?

>> We've already disconnected the speaker, but we can call him back.

>> No, that's okay. Thank you.

>> Miles Brandon.

>> Good afternoon, I'm reverend miles Brandon, with the episcopal church and a clergy

[4:52:42 PM]

leader in inner faith. We include parts of district 6 and many of our congregants live throughout the district. And I'm speaking for agenda item 61 and in support of purchasing the hotel on pecan park. As transitioning housing for our unhoused friends and neighbors. Regardless where you speak on ordinances impacting our homeless population, we believe that real lasting solutions that embrace our unhoused neighbors in ways that provide dignity, respect and grace, that actually have the possibility of impacting real progress and transformation in the lives of our unhoused neighbors and the community as a whole are of the utmost importance. We want it with the purchase and ability of safe and dignified transitional and permanent housing for those experiencing homelessness. You can see this is a helpful step in this direction. Further, we desire the opportunity to work with council and envisioning a bold and

[4:53:43 PM]

robust actionable plan for addressing homelessness in our community. That builds up the suffering with housing insecurity and those who are housed. We believe that --

>> Speaker, your time has expired. Sonica savoie. Sonica savoie. We will call that speaker back. Jen marguelius.

>> Thank you, I'm asking for your support of item 61 to purchase the second hotel for crucial knee needed permanent supportive housing in Austin. This is the kind of investment in housing and services that we need, providing dignified solutions for our community's most vulnerable members. Permanent supportive housing in

[4:54:43 PM]

the community gets people off the streets and connects folks with services and will make the community safer. There's nowhere that unhoused people can be put. Since people have moved out of the shadows to camping in public, our unhoused neighbors and those of us who are housed live in the same city and the same neighborhoods and segregation is not the answer. Vote yes on item 61. I also want to voice my support for item 62, making anti-displacement funds available to local development corporations to provide more affordable housing in vulnerable gentrified neighborhoods like in blackland. And I'm disappointed on your vote for item 49, the council will have to watch to ensure that this is not implemented in ways that have human rights violations. You can ensure that the community will call for public safety and equal justice. We'll be watching, thank you.

>> Sonica savoie.

>> This is sonica.

[4:55:44 PM]

You can hear me now?

>> Yes, go ahead.

>> Okay. Yeah, I'm calling in to voice support for item 61. A common question that comes up is how people are prioritized for housing. And the answer is the people who go into permanent supportive housing are the people who are most likely to die if they don't receive it. As somebody noted earlier the average age of someone entering this housing is 54 years old. And average person entering it is having a 90% chance of having two or more chronic health disorders. If you believe that 54 -- disabled 54 year Olds are going to have a crime wave across your neighborhood, I think that the problem might be with you, and not with them. This is essentially a retirement community. The largest studies, permanent supportive housing have found zero -- once again 0% increase in crime within 2,000 feet of a facility. Meanwhile, seeing increases -- not decreases -- but increases

[4:56:45 PM]

in property value in every site measured in New York City and Denver. So the business owner calling in to have the chance of maybe having their property value go up slightly, and no risk of crime, because people age out of violent crime. 54 year Olds don't go on murder sprees, especially when they're disabled. Meanwhile --

>> Speaker, your time has expired. Tom Henry.

>> Yes, thank you. Good afternoon, mayor Adler and council members. I'm calling with respect to item 61. I urge you to consider offering additional time for the constituents of district 6. Council member Kelly and the taxpayers of Austin to further to understand the specifics of the safety implications for residents and business owners who will be impacted by this purchase. It is also important to note that the purchase of this property has been done so under a perceived veil of secrecy at a

[4:57:45 PM]

time when trust in our civic representation is spread thin. With the respect to the overall plan of our homeless brothers sisters, we seem to be getting the cart before the horse, when on this same day the "Heal" initiative is also on the agenda for consideration it. Appears that a clear plan of adequately lifting our unhoused neighbors to a path of better life does not exist at this time. It is with my sincerest empathy and both for our housed and unhoused neighbors that the path to -- is transparent and well defined before investing millions of dollars in properties without a clear purpose. Thank you for your time.

>> Zach maculca.

>> Hey there. My name is Zach maculca. And I'm a member of the Austin B.S.A. And I live in district 5 and I'm in support of item 61

[4:58:45 PM]

here. While it's important to have community buy-in, the anxiety of a few small business owners and amplified and egged on by the Travis and Williamson county G.O.P. Do not outweigh the need to address members of our community and to move forward on a solution towards stable housing for those that do not have it. Council member Kelly's goal is clearly to work with these organizations and actively campaigning against any solution at all in her district. And not to get feedback from the community issues. And it's going to help people that desperately need it and hopefully we all now see clearly that these are bad-faith games from council member Kelly. Thank you for your time. Bye.

>> Jordan Middlebrooks.

>> Hello, are you all able to hear me?

>> We can hear you, go ahead.

>> All right, perfect. My name is Jordan Middlebrooks and I live in district 1. I do want to thank those today

[4:59:47 PM]

on city council who voted last week for the purchase of the first hotel and I'm here to support item 61. I am disappointed in the vote for item 49 and I do not support language loopholes to criminalize homelessness. Nor will I support a candidate in the future proceedings that use constituents' tax dollars to criminalize homelessness. We all know that the way to address homelessness is to provide permanent housing and services in the proximity of said housing. Providing this housing negates the words that we use to describe unhoused and homeless people. Through scientific research and case studies,

it's proven that permanent housing reduces chronic homelessness and it's known to reduce the taxpayer costs associated to health care, because there's less emergency room visits that cannot be paid, which then go to the tax payer and reduce tax payers cost to associated to police activity because permanent housing is known to reduce criminal activity. And this is all because permanent housing addresses basic human needs. And not to mention provides human rights to these people. (unaudiable) (Staff: speaker your time has expired..

[5:01:28 PM}

Grace Hanson...Hi, my name is Grace Hanson and I am a member of CSA and a resident of District 5 calling to support item 61. Item 61 will create vital housing and supportive services for residents yet so many continue to fight false claims about safety and complain about costs and suggest other locations. First of all for the record there are bus lines such as Walmart and thrift stores and an ergent care clinic, near the hotel sight. Also let's house people on that second lot too. I love that idea. Let's help people all over the City. Second I am disgusted that a City wealthy as Austin that we would even have to have this conversation

whether or not we are going to provide a roof over their head. Council member Kelly you had this postponed last week and your colleagues gave you that delay in order for you and educate your constituents and gather their thoughts. I find it disingenuous that you asked for this delay and yet scheduled the D6 town hall meeting for 6:30 p.m. yesterday after the deadline to register for testimony on this item had closed. So I am urging you on vote on item 61 and house people thank you.

{Brooke Holland} [Council member: Harper-Madison] Just a moment. Mayor. I am getting word our feed is up. The ATXN feed is up. [Mayor Adler: Just saw at least on the web. Staff can we check this? (Staff: Were checking Mayor thank you.

[5:02:26 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Speakers, hang on here for a second. How many do we have left in the queue?

>> We have five left, mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. We have left 60, 61, 62, 59 and executive session.

>> Mayor, I just heard from two constituents that we're back on, but we'll wait for confirmation.

[5:03:28 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, great, thank you. I'm also hearing that we're back on.

>> The atxn feed should be good.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's go to the next speaker.

>> Can you hear me?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Yes rktz go ahead.

>> I am Brooke Holland. Hello, my name is Brooke Holland and I'm a resident of circle fee and I testified today in support of item 61, and the purchase of a hotel for homeless housing. I spoke last week sharing my story of advocacy and directed a to our homeless. I am disappointed by the vote delay on a hotel in district 6. I urge you to move forward today without further delay on the purchase of this hotel. Our homeless community deserves better than games being played by our council members while their lives are very literally on the line. Thank you.

[5:04:37 PM]

>> Nathan grahams.

>> Hi, I'm Nathan grahams, and I'm a resident of district 6, before I was priced out of the area with high rent. We've heard a lot of arguments and I would like to ask a question to congress member Kelly -- council member Kelly -- who according to your biography that is posted, you claim to be a Christian. So

you have a sacred charge as a council member to speak for the voiceless. To speak for the destitute and the poor. Instead, you took your week to speak for business interests, to speak for bankers, to speak for people who have never had insecure housing in their lives and do not expect such in the future. I would ask how on Earth can you in good conscience have done this? I ask how you could deny housing

[5:05:41 PM]

to people who may die without it? How you could stir up such fears and resentments against these people who don't even have a home. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

>> Reqa Mann.

>> Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm from the district 6 and I'm opposed to 61. And for me the area is much better for the people to live outside of this district. Candlewood hotel is not a good location for a city housing. There's a lack of transportation, jobs and medical support. Putting people who already have unfortunate lives in this location is like putting them into a prison. Secondly, the (indiscernible) And no transparency.

[5:06:43 PM]

And in town hall it's for the public, and they call for only single unit to rent. Much better apartment in the market. It's obviously that this project is not using taxpayer dollars wisely. And it's hard to believe that this project is going to house people in need. Re-evaluate. Thank you.

>> Anar Patel.

>> Hi, can you hear me?

>> Yes, go ahead.

>> Hi, I am anar Patel and I'm a homeowner in district 6 and I'm opposed to item 61. You know, I empathize with homeless people. People like us, so I'm not saying don't help them, but to find the permanent housing. But this location that is right in the middle of a neighborhood in a residential area, it

[5:07:45 PM]

doesn't make sense to me. Putting them in an area where there's no transportation and no access to good health care and no access to jobs and no access to the grocery store that is really close by, I'm not sure how it helps them. And the public safety that it raises and the concerns that are raised cannot be ignored. There are houses right next to the hotel, and the high school and it's right next door. And an

elementary school within a few miles. And kids playing in neighborhoods next to the hotel and the neighbors walking on the sidewalk, how is their safety ensured? Why didn't they include us in this discussion? You know, the city has not been transparent at all with the community about this purchase and it seems that it's just being rushed. For these reasons I request that the council listen to the community members like us and delay this purchase. Thank you for your time.

>> Charles cross.

>> Yeah, can you hear me?

>> Yes, go ahead.

>> Okay. Okay, yeah, my name is Charles

[5:08:47 PM]

cross. I'm from district 6. And I am opposed placing the -- or buying the candlewood suites hotel here. The reason isn't because I don't want house the homeless, which apparently is what everybody outside of district 6 thinks. They think that we're not for helping the homeless. And that could be the farthest from the truth. We want this program to succeed. If you buy these hotels in the wrong neighborhood, you're going to just give the program a black eye. Now I went on Google search and I checked to see what the other homeless hotels, including the one on Ben white that was cancelled, and all of those were in much different neighborhoods than ours. We have the strong feeling that a community impact study hasn't been done, and that you just are kind of haphazardly buying whatever hotel, and in most

[5:09:49 PM]

cases it seems to be okay, but in this neighborhood you're just way too close to fine dining establishments, business-class hotels just feet away.

>> Speaker, your time has expired.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Brian Tom.

>> Thank you, mayor and thank you council members. Brian tonto. And I live near district 6, not technically in front of it. But I wanted to talk to you here, and I appreciate your time, is that, you know, I have the utmost empathy for how to approach this. And number one, I think that everyone that I know and myself especially, I have tremendous empathy for our homeless population. It is so essential that we do provide both transitional as well as the more permanent housing opportunities for the homeless population in Austin. Of course, that has to be part of a comprehensive plan that really addresses how we're going

[5:10:49 PM]

to lift these folks out of the circumstance that they're in and to do it in a reasonable amount of time, setting goals and achieving those goals, and having a master plan with every step that tracks to it. We're not there and I think that we all appreciate it. And I think that I also have empathy for the residents nearby. What you are hearing is simply a lack of heads up and the lack of transparency that happened here. That's not going to suit, you know, this plan going forward. I think that even the report last year that was issued by your folks that you hired said that there was a poor job being done at basically communicating the strategy. I think that you've got to step back and to do a better job, frankly, of communicating your homeless strategy.

>> Speaker, your time has expired.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Henry morghan.

>> Hi, my name is hank and I'm a former district 9 resident and currently earning my master's degree and I'm also formerly an

[5:11:50 PM]

unhoused person. I moved to New York City at one point in my life to become a teacher I and I started working two part-time jobs as a para-professional and I signed what I thought was a lease and I was incorrect. And that's how I found myself struggling to find housing for about six months. And we're people too. And I understand why that a soup line will help but soup doesn't build houses. And I have moved on with my life but this trauma of living on the streets lives with you for a long time and the things that you have to do to survive are really difficult. But I want you to know that we are neighbors and members of your community and we do vote. So keep that in mind and please support this project. Thank you.

>> Mayor and council that concludes all of the speakers.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. Let's go ahead and handle this item. Is there a motion to approve

[5:12:52 PM]

item 61? Council member Kelly moves adoption of item 61.

>> No, no, no, sorry. I wanted to make a motion to postpone 61.

>> Mayor Adler: Let the motion come and then make a motion to postpone. Motion to approve motion 61? Seconded by Renteria. We will discuss the motion and give you a chance to make the motion to postpone. Mayor pro tem, you made a motion and you can speak first if you would like.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you, mayor, I appreciate it. So I think we're all well aware that this has been a difficult subject and a relatively easy yes for me on this item. I think that just like the purchase item in district 7 last

[5:13:53 PM]

week, this can't just be equal. And I keep hearing that, you know, that -- well, I heard multiple callers refer to the area not being an appropriate place. But to date, many other parts of town have been the appropriate place. And I don't see any reason why this area can't also be an appropriate place to house people who need it. And that's where we go from talking about it being equal to it being equitable. Equity is all about ensuring that each person has the right

[5:14:54 PM]

tools they need to succeed. Some people living in our margins have specific needs. They really aren't addressed by a regular lease or ownership. Supportive permanent housing that we're creating here with this system, or with this item, it meets those needs in a way that is safe, that is compassionate, and that is effective. Each of the residents who move into their homes here will receive supportive services that are tailored for their needs. And, you know, nearly half -- I'm sorry -- nearly all of the individuals who will reside here will be individuals living with disabilities. And so my expectation and supporting the post point are phonement of this -- postponement is that it will be used to find solutions for homelessness. It's easier said than done and I don't think that anyone here would argue that. Stoking fears and misinformation has no place in this conversation though.

[5:15:54 PM]

No matter which -- I hate to even say it -- no matter which side you stand on. There shouldn't be sides to conversations about humanity. But, you know, it sure has shaken out that way. As I said before, district 1 is home to a myriad of housing facilities for our neighbors who would otherwise be on the street. Each one is a badge of honor as far as I'm concerned. It's been one of my great pleasures as a council member to visit a bunch of them and to meet people who work at them, to meet people who thrive because of them. Austin is a big city now. We've got big problems that require big solutions that are well thought out and intentional. We can't just think, you know, with the old playbook and I think in a lot of ways that

is what we find ourselves doing here. The unwanted services, the unwanted people at certain parts of town attitude is not the Austin way, and it's not the values that we hold dear.

[5:16:55 PM]

And it's certainly not the path forward. I think that we have to unite as the one Austin that we claim to be and tackle trouble in every single corner of our city. And this item in my opinion is a big step in that direction. And I just would like to add a few other things, both for my colleagues and for folks who are listening, folks who called in. Again, I really appreciate all of the participation from our constituents. It's very helpful. This hotel will be converted into permanent housing for individuals who were formerly unhoused. I heard people say "Shelter," and I heard people talk about what some of their fears are. But I'd like to just talk about what's reality and, you know, the reality is that when this property is converted it will provide rental units and provide supportive services that are designed specifically for the individual who resides in that rental unit. It is not a shelter, which is a short-term solution, to folks

[5:17:57 PM]

without housing. Instead, this development will provide a long-term permanent solution. The fair housing act protects the future of residents. Nearly all of the individuals who reside in the rental units here are individuals with disabilities. Federal law protects individuals with disabilities from discrimination, which includes applying different terms or conditions to their housing simply because an individual is disabled. This proposed development will be a residential multifamily development. So it must be treated like any other residential multifamily development. The law does not allow housing providers, including the city, to treat residents different simply because they experienced homelessness. Ultimately, the city will operate the property like any other multifamily residential property without regard to the fact that the individuals who will live there experienced

[5:18:59 PM]

homelessness in the past. And I'd like to put some emphasis on the past. People keep saying the homeless, the homeless. When we make this move, when we do what needs to be done, what we waited just one week to offer the opportunity for more folks to be able to be educated about the terminology, permanent supportive housing. We recognized that some of this terminology is new. The hope is that we would all move forward recognizing that this is the path forward, because those folks that we keep describing as homeless, they won't be anymore. Once we approve this item and we're able to open it up, then we can tell them welcome home. And that title of homelessness will no longer be accurate.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Council member Kelly making a motion to postpone?

>> Kelly: Yes. To make a motion to postpone.

[5:19:59 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: A second to this motion?

>> Kelly: That's okay, can I give my remarks?

>> Mayor Adler: There is no second to the motion to postpone. So we're not going to consider postponing. We're back to the debate on the motion to approve or not approve item number 61. And you can address that.

>> Kelly: Okay. So just to clarify -- sorry -- I can speak now?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, you can speak now, but the motion to postpone failed for lack of a second. So now you can speak on the merits of item number 61.

>> Kelly: Okay, thank you. I'd like to thank my fellow council members who joined me in my request last week to postpone the passage of this item for seven days. Initiatives by the city involving big issues require hearings, town halls and multilingual and varied platform outreach, including to schools, county governments and stakeholders and a communication

[5:21:01 PM]

process that usually spans weeks. This item didn't get that, but that's okay. The homeless issue is huge here in Austin, very clearly. Just this morning, sadly, a fatal accident on 35 caused a diesel spill that drenched an overpass. This is no place for people to live. We do need permanent supportive housing in the community. But I cannot support this permanent supportive housing because of the outcries from the community about it being not in the right location. My office, with the support of city staff, quickly arranged one zoom town hall held just last night. Clearly, inadequate, given the stakes here. This process, this purchase, and the hotel strategy is one that deserves a lot more thought and transparency. And as a community and a city, we need to acknowledge that we helped to create an environment where there's strife between the housed and the unhoused communities. In part by pushing through untested and partial solutions to homelessness issues. The good news is that we can take on the responsibility to improve that relationship by

[5:22:01 PM]

building trust. I want to note that in the back-up information the Anderson unlimited district and the state senator's office with the additional back-up information from local business owner and former mayor Maxwell, are available for you all to read. I hope that you get a chance to read their thoughts. And you can consider those when you talk about passing this item. I want to ensure that we all know here that I am not against permanent supportive housing. In fact, knowing that this item is going to likely pass today, I want to make sure that we use this location as a shining light and a great example of what we can do for our unhoused communities. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. I'm supportive of this motion to

-- to approve this item. I'm happy moving forward with the motel strategy. I'm very supportive that we move for that first couple.

[5:23:04 PM]

At the end of last year and the end of last year and I hope that we can pick up and accelerate the effort. I know that the covid has slowed us down. But I think that from a cost basis that this is so much less expensive than what the cost is of meeting the challenge of homelessness with people that don't have homes. I do want to acknowledge the letter that we've gotten from the senator raising the issue of lack of communication, as well as the same issue in a phone call that I had with commissioner long who also called and we've also received a letter from a judge and I had the opportunity today to speak with him. I don't know how it is that we could do better providing some notice of disclosure to others, certainly, other elected officials in a way that still

[5:24:06 PM]

preserves the confidentiality of the real estate negotiations. I saw this as something that our staff was taking a look at and I encouraged that. If there's a better way for to us do this, I would like for us to find it. Because I think that the concern that was raised is a legitimate one. I also believe that the confidentiality and the interest with respect to real estate transactions is also a valid concern. So if there's a way for us to figure out a way that accomplishes both of those purposes, I would like to find it. But I also -- and I also want to acknowledge that what I think that has been a real constructive handling of this issue over the last week by our new -- our new colleague. Council member Kelly. I have watched you speak to your constituents. I have seen you address what you were calling a significant

[5:25:08 PM]

misunderstanding that happened with many people with respect to what it was that we were facing. I appreciated the opportunity to -- to be with you last night as one of the observers and watchers on the

zoom call that you had. I appreciated the opportunity to speak to our constituents in the city of Austin up in Williamson county and other places. I think you have handled it in a really constructive way and there will be disagreements to the positions that we take. And I want you to know that I appreciate that. I support this, and I think it's really important as the mayor pro tem indicated, to recognize that this is an apartment complex. This is a hotel that has been converted into an apartment complex. And in that respect, it is no different than the apartment complex that is now marketing itself -- what is it -- the hedge apartments in Austin, Texas. Right now being marketed as an apartment complex, but it used

[5:26:09 PM]

to be the Austin suites hotel that was purchased and it is being now made into an apartment complex. Our strategy for helping to house people experiencing homelessness has at its core trying to find places for people to live and on a permanent basis in hotels or apartment complexes. Oftentimes we do that with vouchers. That's how we were able to get to effective zero homelessness with veterans to use vouchers from the federal government to place people in apartment complexes just like this. And in all parts of our city. And that's what this is -- it is just that it's a lot less expensive and a lot more efficient to be able to do it in hotels this way. And, quite frankly, the vouchers are rare and there's not enough of them to go around. But this is very different from

[5:27:09 PM]

a shelter. I say that hesitantly because we're going to also have to find places to put shelters in this city. But as regards to this particular one, it is -- it's an apartment complex. And we have put apartment complexes in different places. This is an appropriate place for an apartment complex. And allowing people who in the past have experienced homelessness, to be able to be there is consistent with what this city does all over the city in apartment complexes. I want to call out and congratulate Jason Fleishman and he was highlighted in the atxn article here recently. It's someone in our city who was experiencing homelessness and ended up in one of our protective lodges associated with covid. But was helped off the streets, put into a place where he was able to stabilize his life, get

[5:28:09 PM]

access to services. And he now is employed and just signed a lease for his own apartment last Tuesday. These are the kind of experiences that we see. When we use those vouchers and we place people in apartments all over our city, they receive wraparound services, many times administered by a lot of the service organizations that exist in this city. One of them is peratops. It has a 90% success rate of people that they work with in apartment complexes or in hotels, helping to ensure that -- I think the statistic is

two years later they're still sustained and not back on the -- not back on the streets. This particular property will be managed by them. And they will help with folks

[5:29:09 PM]

lives and I agree with the council member Kelly, that we need to make sure that it's done in a way that is also positive to the community as you would want from any new multifamily project. I support this because it's important for our city. Council member kitchen. And then --

>> Kitchen: I just wanted to say that I too am supporting this. Thank you for the prior comments, and thank you, mayor Adler, for pointing out what you have with regards to this location. This will be operated as an apartment complex. By a trusted leaders in our community with ceratos. And it is amenities and services

[5:30:12 PM]

for residents. And the mayor pro tem gave a good and thorough description of that. So I would add my voice to the mayor's in asking that our staff as we move forward with -- with these purchases, motels and hotels, I would just ask our strategy officer and our staff to think through ways in which we can actually have community conversations. You know, in the context of the types of confidentiality that we have to have with purchases. I think that it really helps to talk with community members. The other thing that I would add to that request is how is it that we can offer assurance to people that we will, in fact, use this location -- this and other locations -- for the purposes stated. In other words, we will be using this for an apartment complex. What assurance can we provide

[5:31:13 PM]

neighboring properties that is indeed what it will be used for into the future? So I think that it's really important. And it's a legitimate question on local business' parts to ask what can they point to to provide assurance that this is what the use will be into the future. So I think that we should think about that also. I want to also just add that I supported the delay for one week because I respect the request of council member Kelly in providing her an opportunity to talk with her constituents. And I appreciate her efforts in that area. So, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member Ellis.

>> Ellis: Thank you, mayor. I will also be supporting this item. There was someone who spoke earlier today to us that said this wasn't enough units to really make a dent. And even though he may have

[5:32:13 PM]

meant it a different way, I also agree with that. There's many dents that need to be made in the need for more housing. And purchasing the hotels is one step at a time. I think that it will make a difference. I think that every single roof that can be provided to a person, whether it is the city providing that, or whether a non-profit partner providing that, helps to get each individual off the street in a place that is much more safe from the elements and provides a true path to long-term housing. So I look forward to supporting this and I think that the time to act is now.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member Casar.

>> Casar: Thank you, mayor. I just appreciate that we are voting for this today, buying how teles and turning it into housing is how to get hundreds of people out of tents and into housing. While I support building supportive housing, this strategy of converting hotels

[5:33:15 PM]

can get us the speed that the community expects, and no matter how much folks talk about the fact that this costs us some money upfront, we've seen study after study that getting people into permanent supportive housing saves us tens of thousands of dollars per person if we're pulling people off the streets. The hotels as you have mentioned will not only be homes but will provide key services and that's only possible because of the critical work that we have done around the budget and in passing bonds. I also heard some folks today say why can't we make this more like community first? And I love community first. But we'll all remember that when community first was being proposed, many people opposed multiple plans that was put forward. And then it turned out that the community first was and is a great asset for our city. And I think that's what is possible in Austin when we work together. And we all have to work together across districts. We've purchased hotels in three

[5:34:15 PM]

districts. This would be the fourth. With one included in my district. So I think that that work city-wide is what is going to be able to get this done and to be able to have us pull hundreds of people off the streets and into housing quickly.

>> Mayor Adler: Anyone else before we take a vote? Let's take a vote. Those in favor of item 61, please raise your hand. Those opposed? Council member Kelly voted no. The others voting aye. It passes, 10-1. All right, let's go on to handle esd17, this is item number 60. Is there a motion on this item number 60? Council member pool.

>> Pool: Yeah, I will move to approve.

>> Mayor Adler: A second to approve item 60. Council member Kelly makes the

[5:35:17 PM]

motion. Discussion? Council member Kelly, you pulled this.

>> Kelly: I did, because it's my understanding that last night the pleugerville city council was to vote it down. We shouldn't suppress the vote of the people. If another jurisdiction votes no, we should support in my opinion the petitioners, especially the people affected by it. And so I would hope that you all would consider that as well.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anymore discussion before we take a vote? Let's take a vote. Those in favor of approving item number 60, which is approving the petition, please raise your hand. Those opposed? I see no one in opposition. Passes unanimously on the dais. Let's take up item number 62. Is there a motion to approve

[5:36:23 PM]

this I.F.C.? Who brought this I.F.C.?

>> Mayor, I'm the sponsor but council member kitchen may wanted to clear up any confusion or things listed in testimony. So I'm happy to speak on it but maybe I'll defer to council member kitchen.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member kitchen makes the motion on item number 62.

>> I'm sorry -- that's fine.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there a second? Any discussion on item number 62? You have pulled, council member kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I wanted to clarify because there were questions by speakers. You know, the sponsor -- sponsor member Casar and I discussed this and we included language to make it clear that the city manager would consult with the project connect community advisory committee once it's

[5:37:23 PM]

formed. And also would -- you know, would -- when the next available tools and strategies are created by the community and the equity assessment tool are ready to be deployed, then those will be considered also in the use of the \$23 million. This is simply an effort to make sure, since -- that we do

not lose the opportunity to use the \$23 million for project connect while the equity assessment tool is being developed. As well as while the C.A.C. Is being developed. So I wanted to make that clear. The other thing to understand is that it specifies that the funds will be used for 100% of affordable housing. I mean, it's to be used for -- with community development organizations, that's what they do is affordable housing. As well as for affordable housing providers. So it's not a multiuse -- it's not a strategy for a private

[5:38:23 PM]

sector purchase of buildings where you have a mix of -- of affordable housing with market-rate housing. So I just wanted -- I thought that it was important to make those clarifications for folks.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member alter.

>> Alter: I thought that we're not getting red lines and I wanted to ask if people think that it's possible and I know that it's not easy to do but if we can get red line versions it's super helpful. So I wanted to ask Mr. Casar if you could highlight the difference. I found something on -- including cooperatives and it's a change from version 2 but I I didn't want to miss something else that was changed.

[5:39:23 PM]

I'm supportive of it, I wanted to get a sense of what else had changed.

>> Casar: I assumed that it was sent out, so I apologize and I try to do that best I can. Yes, that line is the only difference. It is that tenant rights folks who wanted to make sure that they're working with partners that had a good track record or that were cooperatives to these dollars that are being spent to preserve the existing apartments or existing homeownership opportunities. The two buckets are the smaller -- working with the smaller C.D.C.S and the larger apartment acquisitions. And potentially -- what that notes is potentially having tenants coming together to buy their own apartments back.

>> Alter: Thank you. This something that we saw over multiple, and I didn't mean to single you out. It would help us to be more productive if we could try to do that. I don't know V how to do it

[5:40:25 PM]

myself but I know that the staff do and it's just a good practice if we can.

>> Casar: 100%, I took it in that spirit.

>> Alter: Thank you.

>> Casar: Mayor, you're on mute.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Further discussion? You were just telling me -- further discussion?

>> No, no, -- I just -- for whatever reason my mute button if just sticks for a minute. But thank you for calling on me. I was definitely raising my hand to speak on the item. It's pretty exciting because I'm always down to support any item that supports our transit system. And I am especially down to do that on February 4th. Today is the 108th birthday of Rosa parks. A towering figure of the civil rights movement and the personification of expanding equality and equity in public transit. I truly believe that equity and

[5:41:29 PM]

displacement considerations are what sealed the deal for so many voters last November. Austin is leading the way here which really makes me proud. I know that other cities will look to us and what it was that we were able to accomplish as the template nationwide. And that makes me very, very proud of my hometown. Now is the time to literally to start putting our money where our mouth is though. World-class transit isn't so exciting when all of the people who depend on it can't live anywhere near it. So I really appreciate that this is the kind of consideration that we're taking. The equity assessment in the neighborhood level strategies, I think that will be a huge part of preventing that. And so will the financial muscle that now we're able to flex for now. I'm super excited to lend my support for this item. In fact, my one regret is that things were just flying so fast this week that I never really got a chance to ask to slap my name on as a co-sponsor and I

[5:42:30 PM]

hope that the sponsor will consider that. And if it's not too late. And I think that is it. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: The record can note you as a sponsor as well.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Yep. Needless to say that I support this too. I appreciate you bringing the direction that we had for the community. I'm pleased that the Austin transit partnership, the A.T.P., also voted to put aside the \$23 million for the initial funding coming in for this purpose to be directed by the city. And I like the areas that was in the initial -- what the initial funds can be used for. And the areas that they can be spent in and how they can be deployed either immediately or subsequently consistent with the

[5:43:33 PM]

later work as it comes into play in time. So it's something that I support. I read the resolution carefully and I support it. Council member Casar.

>> Casar: Thanks, mayor. I appreciate all of the comments that everyone has made and I appreciate the voters taking action to pass mass transit and austinites need an affordable city, not just one or the other. So with this resolution we will kick off the first \$23 million in spending to preserve people's homes of the \$300 million. I want to appreciate all of my co-sponsors and I want to note council member kitchen's persistent work on this issue, starting with the resolution a way back. But everyone is really had a strong push to get the dollars packaged into the final product. And really I appreciate council member harper-madison willing to add her name here at the end, of

[5:44:34 PM]

course, we couldn't have done without you either. And I want to also recognize the mayor's leadership on project connect. So many of us worked so hard on this, and everybody worked really hard on the campaign trail. But we know that no elected official worked as hard as you. And this isn't just a comprehensive transit plan, but it's one that includes this critical displacement component. And so I just wanted to credit so much of your work getting the community trust to get this across the finish line.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. By the way, I do have my fingers crossed -- I was listening to the new secretary of transportation who was confirmed a couple days ago speaking to a group, and they brought up this \$300 million component of Austin project connect as an example of the kinds of things that he supported in doing transportation planning in the country. You ready to take a vote?

[5:45:35 PM]

All right, those in favor of this item number 62, please raise your hand. Those opposed? Unanimous on the dais. It passes. And that gets us to item 59, the zoning case, the vineyard Christian fellowship. Council member Kelly, you pulled this one?

>> Kelly: Yes, I did, mayor. I have a couple questions and then I have some remarks regarding it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Is there a motion to approve this item, 62? Why don't you make your comments first and see what you're going to say.

>> Kelly: Okay. Well, my first question is can staff speak to how this proposal is only partially supported by the imagine Austin plan?

>> Sure. Council member Kelly, this is Jerry with the housing and planning department. With regard to the -- I'm sorry, I may have to scroll down a little bit -- for the comprehensive planning section

[5:46:36 PM]

of it, the staff did determine that the -- it does meet the connectivity demands. However, sidewalks are not admitted on Lawrence road, but did note the lack of public transportation in the area. And it also noted that the schools are about within a half mile of the property, which does have a residential component. And so, therefore, that they were going -- only able to offer a partial recommendation. Mostly with the pedestrian and transit connectivity.

>> Kelly: Correct.

>> The staff is recommending it overall.

>> Kelly: Okay. What point in this process does the traffic study been done, or has one been done already?

>> It did not require a traffic analysis, that is reassessed if they file a site plan for the actual use. As you know, I think that right now the proposed use is for a -- well, half of the property is rezoned for multifamily two and the other half for moleu.

[5:47:38 PM]

And to expand the daycare within the church. And then to add up possibly up to 83 units which would be the max. So they would reassess at that time to see if there's a need for a traffic study and there's a threshold is 300 trips and 83 apartments would not get there. But they would take the second look at that when an actual site plan came in. And I would note that the applicant required when they did a plat back in 2008 I believe that it was, they gave up 17 feet of additional right-of-way on Morris road for its possible future expansion.

>> Kelly: Thank you. Can you just clarify on something, because when I spoke to Mr. Mathias he said 89 units and you said 83, correct?

>> We make a rough estimate but we don't know until they file a site plan and have a lot more detail than at the time of zoning. So they need to look at the trees and the ponds, etc. And the parking lot. All of those kinds of things. So we don't exactly know how much units will come in when they come out with the site plan

[5:48:40 PM]

but between 85 to 90.

>> Kelly: That's all of my questions and now I have remarks.

>> Mayor Adler: You want to make a motion to approve the staff recommendation?

>> Kelly: I do not.

>> Mayor Adler: I make the motion to approve the recommendations? Council member Renteria second itself. Council member Kelly do you want to make comments?

>> Kelly: I do. I read through the public remarks from the public hearing feedback and the points were very persuasive. I'm very familiar with this area which has seen tremendous growth. I grew up here. And it has existing traffic and safety concerns and some very important green space. We've had speeding in school Zones for years. And the deer park middle school is where I went to school. I grew up there, I went to the schools there and kids from all ages walk to and from school and have to cross Anderson mill to get to their school. On weekends there's minimal traffic, and it's a lovely spot if you're ever able to escape and to see somewhere, it's a

[5:49:41 PM]

nice drive to change the zoning to accommodate a large 89-unit condominium project with prices from \$425,000 to \$550,000 is astonishing to me. Directly across the street are duplexes with homes with families struggling to get by. After listening to input from the community and I learned this is firmly opposed by the neighborhood. As much as I wish prosperity on the vineyard community there's got to be ways caught compromising on something that benefits the wider community here. Perhaps we could do a real happy compromise with less units with the large amount of condos proposed there. I really can't support this.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Further discussion on this item 59? It's been moved and seconded. Council member alter.

>> Alter: Can you just clarify what ratings --

>> Sure, council member. The case is ready for all three readings.

[5:50:42 PM]

>> Alter: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: That was a consent approval? Second vote, those in favor of item 59, please raise your hand. Those opposed? Council member Kelly voting no and the others voting aye. It passes.

>> Thank you, mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you, Jerry. I think that those are all of the things that -- and thanks for hanging on this meeting so long, Jerry, we usually get you out of here more quickly. Sorry. Colleagues, I think that

those are all of the business items that we have, so you can accept the discussions in executive session. It's 10 to 6:00. Do you want to go into executive session now or take a dinner break? Mayor pro tem?

>> Harper-madison: I would respectfully request a dinner break. I won't get to eat but I will get to feed my children.

[5:51:42 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Manager, is that okay with the staff? All right. So then we'll reconvene at -- it's reconvening at 7:00.

>> Can I ask if -- because I wasn't expecting that we're having a dinner break so I am wondering if you need a full hour or if a half-hour is enough to get done sooner. If nobody else is -- we can work around it. I wanted to check before.

>> Mayor Adler: We will convene at 7:00. Or 6:30. I will ask for a show of hands. Who would like to get back together at 6:30? All right, 6:30 it is.

>> Kitchen: I have a question. So this is our last item, correct? I think you just said that.

>> Mayor Adler: That is correct. We will not come back out into

[5:52:43 PM]

the big general meeting except for me to close out the meeting. Already, city council is now going into closed session to take up two items. We'll meet there in executive session at 6:30. Pursuant to 551071 and 551072 of the real estate code we'll have items related to item 57. And the government code we'll discuss the legal matters related to the may 2021 election. Without objection, here at 5:53, we'll go into executive session. We'll see you there at 6:30.

[8:40:10 PM]

Mayor Adler: We are out of closed session. In closed session we discussed real estate matters related to item: 57 and legal matters related to item: 56. That's all of our business the time is 8:40 p.m. on February 4, 2021 City Council meeting virtually all our work is done and we are adjourned. Thank you very much.