

City Council Work Session Transcript – 05/18/2021

Title: City of Austin

Channel: 6 - COAUS

Recorded On: 5/18/2021 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 5/18/2021

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.

[10:48:06 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. I'm going to go ahead and convene stint work session today. It is Tuesday, may 18th, 2021. It is 10:47. We're having this meeting via video conference. We have a quorum that's present. Guys, on the work session we have three briefings to go through. We have the rescue plan briefing, the healthsouth briefing and then the encampment approach briefing. We're going to go ahead and start with those three things. We'll try to work in the pulled items, 13, 29, 60 and 62. We have a hard stop at 5:00. I'm not sure we go that long time. The mayor pro tem is not with us so we're going to hold the executive session

[10:49:07 AM]

until Thursday. And there are some events happening in the intervening period of time that might impact that conversation. So let's go ahead -- yes, councilmember kitchen. You're muted.

>> Kitchen: I just have a question about, you know, we've received a memo proposing some approaches to when the council meets on the dais again in person. I'm trying to understand when we'll have an opportunity to discuss that as a group. Do we know that? I haven't seen anything on an agenda, but I think it's important for us to have the opportunity to discuss that.

>> Mayor Adler: I'll set that and see if we can do it on Thursday. We can certainly do that on the message board.

>> I think we could, but I think it would be helpful if it's possible.

>> Mayor Adler: I think it's a good point. I don't know if there's anything on the agenda that lets us do that.

[10:50:08 AM]

So I'll check that but also make sure it's on the next agenda. It's kind of late as we get back into June and -- mid June, we're off for a month. I think we're planning on bringing us all back together then.

>> Kitchen: Yeah. And how they do that I think is something that since we'll be the people that will be interacting on the dais in certain ways we need to have a conversation about it. He.

>> Mayor Adler: I'll make sure it's set on the next available thing that we can, but in the meantime we'll poll the boards also. Yes, councilmember Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: Thank you, mayor. And thank you councilmember kitchen for raising this issue of how council returns into in-person meetings. I just wanted a clarification on the process because I know on the work session agenda we have a placeholder for council discussion and so would it be appropriate for us to have that conversation today

[10:51:10 AM]

under that conversation topic or does it have to be posted as an item in advance?

>> Mayor Adler: Let me ask the question. On executive session we have open meeting as a placeholder. Can we use that to discuss --

>> No. That needs to be a posted item.

>> Mayor Adler: Are we ready to do the presentations? Let's do them as they are in order, the American rescue plan, the briefing on healthsouth and then the encampment. Colleagues, shooting for noon break for an hour for lunch. Manager P.

>> Cronk: Mayor and council, we do have a full agenda with these three briefings today so we'll get right to it. The first briefing is on the American rescue plan framework. This is a continuation of a discussion we started on March 23rd with council

[10:52:11 AM]

and after passing the resolution staff has done a number of meetings and done considerable work since then so we want to provide this update today. With that I'll turn it over to our chief economic recovery officer, Veronica Briseno oh, lead us off -- who will lead us off. Veronica?

>> Good morning, mayor and council. Good to be here with you today. I believe we're looking at the next presentation which I am not prepared to give. As Spencer mentioned we are coming back to you

with our recommendations based on guidance for the American rescue plan act. As a little bit of background to bring everybody -- remind everybody, on March 25th council adopted a resolution that gave us direction to focus on three -- I'm sorry, four priority areas. Those priority areas

[10:53:13 AM]

included homelessness, early childhood care and education, workforce development and work programs, and food and housing insecurity. Council also directed us to identify immediate relief needs and public health expenses that should be considered for the funding. Next slide. As soon as that -- council also directed us to work with regional partners, including Travis county, because of the greatest overlap of residents within Travis county and to identify shared priorities, challenges and opportunities for joint investment and action. Since then we have met with Travis county administration and officials, the most recent taking place yesterday. We have also participated in meetings with the following central Texas jurisdictions. As you're aware, the city officials also participated in the summit to address unsheltered homelessness. We held an American rescue plan round table of the county and central Texas

[10:54:15 AM]

cities in April. City council had a special called joint meeting with Travis county commissioners also in April and we've also been monitoring Travis county's commissioners' court since specifically their court date on May 11th. We plan to continue to meet with local jurisdictions having that continued discussion at the round table. Our next meeting is in a couple of weeks. Next slide. I'm going to turn it over to our interim budget officer, Jerry Lange.

>> Good morning, mayor and council, Kerri Lange, interim budget officer. This side is discussing the guidelines that we received from the treasury up to this point on last Monday we did receive the interim guidelines the city's total allocation for the ARP funds is \$188.8 million. That is a little less than what we expected, about \$7.3 million less than what

[10:55:15 AM]

we originally discussed. The funds will be given to us in two tranches, the first amount coming this May so this month we should receive the first 94.2 million and then a year from now, May 2022, we'll receive the second set of funding. The eligible uses of funds that are listed in the guidelines include support for the public health response, also the addressing the negative impact -- economic impact, and several other areas about serving the hardest hit communities providing premium pay for essential employees and investing in infrastructure. Some of the things that are listed as ineligible uses are offsetting a

reduction in net tax revenue due to changes in law from March 20th through the last day of the fiscal year. And deposits into pension funds. Next slide next slide. So council has already taken some action on the use of some of the funds.

[10:56:17 AM]

A couple of weeks ago council approved the allocation of the funds to be received. \$44.3 million went to covid response, direct covid response. And then 500,000 went to the navigator program, which leaves the remaining balance for this first set of funds of 49.4 million and a total remaining funds of the total allocation of \$143.6 million. Next slide, please. Additional funding that we're receiving as a city that's coming to the city of Austin of course is the 22 million for the emergency rental assistance as well as 11 million for the assistance for residents experiencing homelessness. Next slide. Now I'll turn it back over to director Briseno for the next set of conversation.

[10:57:20 AM]

As staff looked at priorities once this resolution was passed we identified different leaders in our community that could help us identify ways that we could prioritize transformational action in these priority areas within the outlines of the resolution. So these next series of slides are going to go over at a high level what the asks were so that you are aware of what we learned as we went through this process. The first area that I have on here is homelessness and this total request came in at -- I'm sorry, this is an overview slide. Looking at the four policy areas of the overall ask within homelessness, if that request came in at \$515 million. Early childhood care came in at \$13.7 million. And I should note here this request was -- this request would be split -- it would be split between the county and the city so we're keeping that in mind.

[10:58:21 AM]

Jobs for working class austinians, the total request for workforce development came in at 32 million. Food and housing insecurity, the request we received was 103.6 million and included in housing and food insecurity, here we relied on our own city staff. We had a team of staff numbers not only in economic development, but also in our sustainability office and our health department. And immediate relief and public health expenses we identified \$68.5 million. Next slide. And I should mention as we receive these requests, these -- the folks that we worked with did provide a very thorough request. We provided that as late backup this morning so you do have county in their entirety.

-- The request in their entirety. With that in mind and in the interest of time I won't read through each line, but these slides highlight the areas where these entities

[10:59:23 AM]

believe that they could have transformational relative humidities with the arp funds. So at a high level for homelessness, the areas that they're focused are on core housing services, mental health, substance abuse and supported element services, capacity building and capital expense. Next slide. And early childhood care there's a series of requests in regard to the success by six program. But this overall request of 13.7 million would provide some transformational change in this policy area. Next slide. And workforce development, this is part of the work now program that workforce solutions had proposed to both the county and the city and that total request came in at \$32 million. And the request that we received as part of this,

[11:00:24 AM]

knowing the priority of assisting residents that are experiencing homelessness, there was a separate request of five million dollars identified specifically for individuals who are experiencing homelessness. Next slide. In regards for food insecurity, the overall request came in at \$23.6 million. The areas that the group broke it into regarded access to ongoing food access needs, to provide for food access needs in advance of future disasters. To plan for an equitable regional food system and increase food access, community resiliency and equitable transparency and strengthen individuals and households to purchase foods and that total is 103.6 million. In regards to immediate relief needs that staff identified, we looked at

[11:01:26 AM]

what is the community in need of in this time of responding to the pandemic and coming to economic recovery and resiliency. The first item we would recommend including is the colony park sustainable community health center. This is \$1.5 million to build a 41 health center in colony park. This is seen has a priority by the public health department for multiple years. There is not a health center located in colony park and colony park is a community that is most adversely and has been adversely impacted by the pandemic. We also recommend funding on our hot tax programs which include the cultural arts fund and live music fund. The total amount for that would be \$20 million for the next two years. We also are looking at the work that we've done this

[11:02:26 AM]

past year. We certainly see a need for financial relief to individuals and households, rise and/or rent programming, as well as continued assistance to businesses and non-profit organizations. We are estimating the need there would be at 20 million and 27 million. Next slide. So far transitioning to how we would recommend the allocation is broken up, as Kerri mentioned we have a total of \$143.6 million. For the priority areas that were identified, we recommend 84 consider million be allocated towards individuals experiencing homelessness. I would note on a previous slide there was 11 million identified from federal funds, specifically for homelessness. So this would be in addition to that. And I would also add four of the 84 million would specifically be for workforce development to

[11:03:27 AM]

reskill our community to increase our social service provider community to assist individuals who are experiencing homelessness. We recommend that this is something that we look at creatively in a way that we can provide some -- provide a strong pipeline of individuals that -- of talented individuals that can assist in this space and really help our neighbors who are experiencing homelessness get out of homelessness. Early childhood care, we recommend 6.9 million. This is half of the amount that was requested by the success by six organization. Jobs and workforce development we're recommending eight million dollars as a way to further those efforts on the rework now program R food insecurity we're recommending three million dollars to initiate those efforts. We realize this is an ongoing need but we thought this was a scart to some of the efforts that have been identified. And the immediate relief

[11:04:29 AM]

needs once we took into account those four priorities, the balance would be 22 -- took into the four priorities and the contingency, the remaining balance would be 22.9 million. On the next slide I'll go into how we recommend that we allocate those funds for immediate relief. We are recommending a contingency of 10%, this is through our work with the budget office. The budget office and our team agree on this and this would be at \$18.8 million so this is a total investment of \$143.6 million. Next slide. So this is breaking it down by fiscal year. And so as Kerri mentioned, we received the first tranche of funding this year. The remaining balance that we have is \$49.4 million after the allocations that we made at the last council meeting for public health. And then the second tranche

[11:05:30 AM]

is for 94.2 million so here we looked at how we could provide some assistance and what had timing issues. For example, in the immediate relief needs our contracting the two pots of money for our hot tax funds we're recommending an equal balance of 10 million each year. We're also recommending that

that 1.5 million for colony park is in this fiscal year because that is -- it's shovel ready and central health is ready to build a health facility there. Next slide. So in looking at that \$22.9 million we're recommending that it's allocated in this manner. The 1.5 for colony park, the 20 million for the hot programs and the rationale here is that our creative community was is significantly hit through

[11:06:30 AM]

covid and is really working hard to recover from this past year and few months. So we know that this will be funding that will help employ, continue to employ and sustain our creative community and our creative workers that are vital to our economy. And finally, we recommend the 1.4 be allocated towards individual relief, whether that be rise or rent or a nation of the two, but -- combination of the two, but we're thinking it's important to help folks at an individual level. Next slide. That concludes our presentation. We are open to it questions and here to hear your discussion.

[11:07:36 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember Casar and then councilmember kitchen.

>> Casar: I appreciate this check in on the temporary on it as we head to June. I want to first list out the things that I think are really strong and then my most significant remaining concern, but I appreciate that we are in the range of 80 million for homelessness and I think it's time we do our part for childcare and workforce development asks. And appreciate what we've done on food access and then to make the best ask we can. I think those seem to make the building blocks of what we passed in the resolution except for -- all that I really, really appreciate. I just want to make that really clear. The one exception for me is that the resolution listed homelessness, childcare, food insecurity, and housing

[11:08:38 AM]

insecurity as one of the priority areas. And while in your powerpoint you do list the money that's coming from the federal government specifically for rental assistance, I do worry that as the eviction moratoriums get faced out and the first round of phaseout is in June, I do worry that those federal dollars won't be enough to continue to stave off the eviction wave to extent that we want to. So that item of housing insecurity I still have concerns. I think we could address that either with some of the cash assistance as you've noted or with rental assistance or with a line that is flexible for addressing both. Some back of the nap continue math looks like we might need \$15 million a month for several months in the summer and even into the fall to be able to keep our evictions as low as they

[11:09:38 AM]

have been. And if we want to truly address homelessness and the other factors in our community, we can't have a bunch of people start losing their homes. We've done such a good job leading across the country, frankly. I think us and Minneapolis have kept the lowest amount of evictions in the country and we need to hold on to that for lots of good reasons. So I appreciate everything that is there. But -- I appreciate how much it sticks to the resolution, but I do think in the housing insecurity area only that 30.5 million or so in addition to the existing emergency grants is the one area where I have concern. We could address that with arp, with other city funds, we could continue having a conversation with the county about it, but to me it is the one glaring thing because there's almost nothing more basic than we need to do more than get people their public health needs met and also make sure

[11:10:39 AM]

that people who are currently housed don't lose their housing.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember pool. Can I ask the staff what the response was from Travis county in partnering with us for these spends, these contributions in these areas.

-- Go ahead, Kerri.

>> They are working on a similar track with their governing body. They are -- they're unsure -- I apologize. I'm getting feedback for some reason. They're working with their elected officials to identify how those funds will be allocated. So they didn't give us any specific direction. I believe they're presenting to commissioners' court today. We're having constant conversations to see if there is areas where there

[11:11:39 AM]

is overlap. There is interest in there is interest in partnering with us and we're certainly on the staff side willing to collaborate. We're working with the county elected officials to identify where those areas are that we want to prioritize.

>> Pool: You have shared these numbers with commissioners' court?

>> We haven't. Wanted to share it with council first, but we will share it. Fooled so I need to think --

>> Pool: So I need to think about that a little bit because the partnering within the region is really important and particularly on homelessness. As many of us have reiterated a number of times over the last little while. The city of Austin can't solve homelessness by itself. To the extent that we are putting additional monies into homelessness I think we

[11:12:40 AM]

need to be very willing to coordinate with surrounding counties for that approach otherwise people will look to us as the big bear in the room and zoom that as a big bear we also bring big funds and I don't think that's the case because we have significant other unfunded mandates and underfunded initiatives and programs within the city. For example, a conservation corps that my colleague, councilmember alter brought to the budget and passed -- gosh, was it just last year? Time is so elusive these days. It doesn't appear anywhere on this list, but that's a workforce development type program. Maybe it's just that it's underneath that title and we can't see it, but I had asked that that be highlighted and that that be funded specifically. Same with the creative sector. We do need to replace the funds that were not received with the loss of hot funds

[11:13:42 AM]

to the best ability that we have. And to continue to support the creative sector because they were left behind last year. And it's time to move them up the line to get attention. And I see good progress there. Food access, certainly childcare. The success by six program has been on my radar no probably 20, 25 years from the very time when I was on the board of my child's day care. Also I had requested additional input on our resilience officer that was in the community resilience initiative that I brought last year and of course the climate resilience initiative that I brought the year before. I think that we can shift some of the monies that are now tagged for homelessness over into fitting into these other underfunded categories and I urge that we carefully review that and analyze that and make sure that as we are

[11:14:43 AM]

talking about these numbers that we are taking into account other areas where we will be funding specifically homelessness because we are looking at significant funds from our general revenue as well this year. Soy cannot support the number that you've offered on that one line item and I do want to see additional monies for creative sector and the inclusion of conservation corps. And then I want to know where we're at with our rounding out jurisdiction so we can be more collaborative and land on some numbers that address the needs that cut across the entirety of our community. Thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I really appreciate the opportunity to have this conversation and appreciate our staff bringing forward this framework. I know you've done a lot of work talking with folks and

[11:15:45 AM]

thinking through this. There's always more than we can address. I do want to say is that I am comfortable with the package the way that you have presented it and the recommendations that you've presented. I hear councilmember Casar's concerns and am willing to work to see if there are some other places that we might be able to deal with rental assistance. I wonder if it is one of those things that could be addressed with contingency as well as perhaps some of our regular budget money because it is critical that we address victims but we're not entirely clear how much that will be an issue just yet. So I think maybe some further conversation about that. I think from my perspective the amount for homelessness is a minimum. I really feel that if we put

[11:16:47 AM]

this up and we can work with the county to put this amount or similar amount up and other entities, we have a chance to really make a systemic change in how we address homelessness. We have foot to get to a place -- we have got to get to a place where we have addressed homelessness as well as addressed what we've seen as a real surge in homelessness right now. So I respect everybody's perspective and I agree with councilmember pool that we really need this to be a regional approach, but I think that given the needs and the opportunity to address over treat years what are is a very ambitious plan and the kind of plan that we need to actually make us sustainable -- make a sustainable difference is 84 million. And I'm really not interested in reducing that

[11:17:51 AM]

amount. So let me ask a question then on the contingency. Can you help me understand is that contingency considered for something in particular or is it just an amount that's set aside in case we have unexpected needs? Explain to me the scope of the contingency.

>> So council member, our thought process on the contingency amount, which was I believe 20% of the second tranche of money that we'll be receiving in the year 2022 is just a recognition that we are in the midst of responding to a global pandemic. We don't know -- we don't have any 100% guarantees about the trajectory that is going to take. So we put funds aside should additional money be needed for the pandemic response, for the public health needs. If we get six months down the road and that doesn't happen, best case scenario, things are looking very good

[11:18:51 AM]

and it's clear that we're past the crisis, then we would -- it would be prudent at that time to release those dollars to other community priorities. Plus further down the road we've have a better sense of perhaps what the county and other regional partners are wanting to do with their allocation of funds and that may inform which direction we would want to push those contingencies if indeed mayor not needed for the public health response.

>> Kitchen: I'm trying to do the math in my head of the number of months. Are we thinking in terms of around the time we do the budget that we might have a better sense of contingency that is needed or are you thinking past that?

>> I think that's almost a question for Dr. Escott at the time, come August when council is taking action on the budget. If the numbers really look like they're down, if 90% of the population is vaccinated and he's telling us there's not much concern about a

[11:19:51 AM]

resurgence in the number of cases, I think that probably would really inform your decision come August when you're being asked to adopt the budget, how you might want to allocate those funds differently. Of course that could happen earlier or later than the budget. It doesn't have to be tied to the budget.

>> Kitchen: Okay. And when we say public health funds, that's public health [indiscernible], right, not impact on -- not the kind of impact that councilmember Casar is talking about? Because he's talking about the impacts of covid in terms of workforce as opposed to like paying for vaccinations and outreach and stuff like that.

>> It's really to maintain flexibility on the public health needs. That 44.3 million that council appropriated at your last meeting for public health needs, the prodages, the isofacs, the vaccine centers, if we need to continue those type of programs beyond the independent of this calendar

[11:20:52 AM]

year -- beyond the end of this fiscal year we will need additional funds. So we're just trying to maintain a conservative posture on that. Let's hope they're not needed, but if they are I think everyone will be happy they're said aside.

>> Kitchen: And then the other contingency funds, do they account for the potential for FEMA reimbursement? In other words, do we assume no FEMA reimbursement or do they assume some level of FEMA reimbursement.

>> They do assume FEMA reimbursement. We're still getting a lot of moving parts in terms of exactly what FEMA will reimburse. They have said they will now reimburse 100% of eligible expenses, but exactly what are eligible expenses and they do have caps on things. They'll pay 100% of admin

[11:21:53 AM]

costs, but those are capped at only 10%. So if we end up going past that, then FEMA won't reimburse them. But I think the total, if my memory is correct, the total amount that we were projecting for the public health needs was over \$80 million and FEMA reimbursing about 36 million and 44 million coming from the arp and that's a moving dynamic. That could shift and as we get new information we will absolutely keep you apprised.

>> Kitchen: Okay. I think there needs to be a contingency, of course. I'm just trying to understand the parameters of what we're assuming. Like I said before, I appreciate the recommendations from staff. I think it's a good balance. And I appreciate everything that's been included. So I'll just stop there.

>> Councilmember Kelly and then councilmember Fuentes.

>> Kelly: Thank you, councilmember pool and

[11:22:53 AM]

councilmember kitchen for your thoughts on homelessness spending. I would like to add to that a little bit and make sure that we include Williamson county as part of our regional partners because we do share part of Austin with Williamson county and I think it would be prudent to include them in those discussions. Thank you.

>> Fuentes: Thank you, staff, for today's presentation. I think it's a great starting point for how we allocate the arp funds. I would like to reaffirm my commitment to really prioritizing and spending a sizeable amount on our homelessness response effort. Now that we have a plan and a strategy, I think it would be truly transformative for our community to see this level of investment so I'm committed to that 84-million-dollar line item that you have here as part of your proposal. Also want to extend my gratitude for the food insecurity item. That was a need that we saw a significant need that we

[11:23:54 AM]

saw amid the pandemic and through the winter storm. Around as we've had these conversations about building community resilience, certainly makes sense that we have funding allocated so that we can have part of that transformational and resilience building work included. The early childhood education. I really appreciate the success by six initiative and their proposal and we worked closely with them to ensure we had del valle ISD included as part of their proposal. I would want to make sure is is that that remains with this funding allocation or at least ensure that we're working closely with Travis county to come together with that combined ask as well.

[11:24:56 AM]

We will be talking about that later today on item 60. And last but not least, also wanted to echo the sentiment shared by councilmember Casar around eviction prevention and wanting to see more funding allocated to that effort. Certainly our priority is something that we at the dais reaffirmed our commitment through the resilient atx resolution and addressing homelessness. We also have to ensure that we're doing everything to prevent it and with the moratorium being phased out it makes sense for us to have additional funding there in supporting our community so we'd love to see an increased amount around rental assistance and other programs that will really help our community out as we will face this eviction crisis here in the next few weeks and months.

[11:25:57 AM]

>> Manager and Kerri, I'm generally supportive of the framework as laid out. I think it's hitting the -- generally speaking, the intent of the resolution that was passed by the council. The homelessness dollars, the ask there was for the summit and I think it's really important that we get as close to 89 as we can get. That gets us to the 100 for homelessness. I think it's really important for us to send a signal not only to the governmental partners, because as councilmember pool said this is too big for us to do ourselves. I think that a lot of philanthropic community is also looking to see whether or not the public is going to make that measure of effort on this priority. So I like that. If there's a way to edge that up, I'd like that. I like that we're picking up the early childhood ask and hope that the county partners with us on that.

[11:26:59 AM]

The workforce development which is a plus the four for homelessness or 12 gets to us a large part of what the workforce development grant was. I like the fact that the food's in there. Food insecurity issue that we have also support trying to offset the hot relief for folks that need to be made whole that aren't covered by the programs that we've already done. On the contingency issue, my first look at that is it's probably high and we had talked about doing initially a contingency against the whole fund. I see that that's change and I support that change. We had talked about 20% contingency if that was applied against the 40 that would be about nine. If you applied the 20%

[11:27:59 AM]

contingency against the whole 80 even if the 40 was anticipated to come back, that would be 16 and change. So there are a couple of expenses that are contingent. This is a way of looking at it in a way that councilmember kitchen did. If the eviction issue hits us really hard, maybe that's looking at the kind of conserves of the future, the encampment can dollars that we're going to spend associated with I guess it's the third presentation or from here, I want to make sure is that isn't eating into the summit allocations that we have. The funds or reserves will be able to cover that independent of that amount. But generally speaking I think the numbers are real close. I look forward to conversations with Travis county and Williamson county as this gets closer and more

[11:29:02 AM]

refined as we lean into June when you come back. Councilmember Renteria.

>> Renteria: Yes, mayor. I'm also concerned about early childhood care. I'm wondering if it will be enough. With the governor doing away with the unemployment check of 300 a month on -- a week on top of what other people were getting, it's alarming that in June there won't be any other unemployment checks coming to people. That will put a lot of pressure on people to go out there and look for a job. Are we really prepared to address that issue on the childhood care. And I want to also make sure

[11:30:04 AM]

that the staff keeps a close eye on that to make sure that we're not going to be punishing parents, working parents that needs that and they can't afford the high dollar childcare that we have. So I really would like to make sure is that we are looking into that and keeping an eye on it to make sure that none of these working parents fall through the crack and we're not taking care of what we need to take care of because jobs we are the most important thing right now and important to pay for your rent and all that. So they're going to be in a very tight situation coming in the future.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo and then councilmember Ellis.

>> Tovo: I have some actual questions for staff and then -- so let me start there and then I can make some comments now or later.

[11:31:05 AM]

I think the general comment I'll make right now is that there's -- I think we're going to need a fair amount more conversation around this. And I am going to need a fair amount of details. I think that councilmember pool you identified one such question that is in my mind too. I would like to see us

invest in some of the programs that we have expressed an interest and a commitment to, including things such as the Austin conservation corps and it's not clear at this level of detail whether it's included within the workforce number or not. I am supportive absolutely of investing some substantial funding in homelessness. I am not sure what that number looks like. I am extremely interested generally in making sure that we are making decisions with this understanding of what our partner organizations are collaborating with us on. And I do not want the city

[11:32:06 AM]

to make it -- I think sometimes we make our funding decisions at a time different from some of our partner organizations, including our private funders, potential funders, and that isn't always the best way to do things. I am committed to have the city spend -- put some significant dollars towards homelessness, but we have been putting significant dollars towards homelessness and there are some partners who I would like to see also participate with us in that. So I really want to have those conversations, including our private partners. One of the real things I was excited about with regard to the summit, the community summit, is not that they were developing a plan, because we have a plan that we've been focused on, but that it did set some timeline expectations, but also that it holds the

[11:33:06 AM]

promise of really evolving and engaging private philanthropy in this initiative and I'm cang shuts to see is is that -- anxious to see that happen. I would like to get further down the road on that piece and again on our conversations with Travis county. So thank you, staff, for having those. Manager, I think my first question is what do you seize a timeline here. I think you thought we would have this on the council agenda for action as soon as the next meeting. Maybe I misunderstood that. Let me signal that I believe we need some more time on those -- on this front for all of the reasons that I just suggested and some that my colleagues have suggested. So if you could answer that and then I have a couple more things I wanted to say.

>> Cronk: Thank you, council member. That is what we discussed on the one on one and what I've conveyed to each of you in approximate the conversations that we would

[11:34:07 AM]

be presenting the framework, getting the feedback and putting it on for council consideration at the next meeting. That's just for council consideration and that would continue the discussion and allow you to have those -- the conversations about potential amendments and even a postponement if needed to further discussion this. We wanted to make sure is that there was opportunity for council to continue

this conversation and then hopefully settle on what that foreclosure would be. We were planning a and prepared to post this for the June 3rd meeting.

>> Tovo: To me that timeline is -- I'm happy to continue the conversation and believe we should continue the conversation on June 3rd. I certainly will not be ready to take action and I don't believe that we'll have this -- I believe we need more time to have those conversations with our Travis county partners. And I would like to get a sense of how we would begin to get more details about some of the items in this framework. Workforce is one, another I

[11:35:07 AM]

would like to talk about is cultural arts. I'll like to really understand in each one of these what is being contemplated in terms of transformational change St. That we're doing the same kind of cultural arts grants that we traditionally core or are we finding a way to really make those multi-beneficial in a way that we've talked about investing the American rescue plan dollars so perhaps those things are taking place at the cultural hearts programs and at schools and the artists are embedded within school communities so that we're serving a workforce goal, but also helping achieve some of the goals that were identified at the create Austin plan from long ago that some of the recommendations have never moved forward. So I am really interested in getting those level of details before I can commit to levels of funding. I have some questions about FEMA. I know there are others wanting to talk, so I'll pause there. But I do want to come back and talk about some of the FEMA funding. And just to signal also that

[11:36:09 AM]

I am also really interested in the question about evictions and what might be coming when the eviction moratorium lifts. So I have some questions for the housing staff on that front that I would like to ask today too, mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's keep going on these questions and then we'll have the housing folks come back. I have some questions about eviction too. Councilmember Ellis.

>> Ellis: Thank you, mayor. I am quite interested in it finding a way to fund the success by six recommendations. I think we all saw how devastating it was to our community not to have childcare and not to have some of those places up and running in a way to help our families who were trying to stay afloat. I would really like to see that fully funded. And then I did have a question about some of the money that is slated for homelessness response.

[11:37:10 AM]

It said that there was a portion of it, four million out of the on 84 million that's for workforce development. Would that be for programs like workforce first from the other one's foundation, would that kind of expand some of the things we're currently doing or would that be a different type of workforce development.

>> So we're looking at a different type of workforce development. We heard in working with Diana gray and the work she did with the summit, one of the priorities she identified in the summit was having a really strong workforce available to serve in social services, specifically working with experiencing homelessness and to have that workforce include a strong representation of people of color to President-Elect the community that they're assisting. So that's the vein that we were thinking of. We've had conversations with a more traditional workforce providers, but we would like

[11:38:10 AM]

to have some opportunity to be creative about what that would look like in terms of the entity that would do that. Maybe it's not somebody that we've worked with before. Maybe an existing entity has that capability. We would like time to delve deep into that and certainly working with Diana in that regard.

>> Ellis: That's very interesting. I think that's something I would want to look into further. And I agree with councilmember tovo to have been -- these slides are really good for the presentation and us trying to understand what these buckets might look like. I think I'm looking for a more detailed spreadsheet of being broken down and what the recommendation is right now and versus if we want to put anything else in, how much we would have to take out somewhere else. So I want to dig into some of these line items a little bit more explicitly so that I can understand where we

[11:39:11 AM]

have some wiggle room and where there may be big chunks that can make big differences and where there could be smaller boxes to move things around. I do appreciate putting all the information together because I know it's a lot, but I guess my main point is the early childhood education success by six is we really want to find a way to fully fund.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: Thank you. So I am pretty firmly aware, councilmember tovo and Ellis are, that we need more details. I do have some very specific concerns, but let me first ask some questions and get some clarification if I might. So we're getting the tranches in calendar years, but then you're placing the money in fiscal years. Voice concerned, for instance, by the breakdown

[11:40:12 AM]

for the early childhood with so little in the first year relative to the second year, relative to what we're putting in other buckets P but now you're suddenly using fiscal years. So can you provide some elaboration on the timing and how we should be reading that and then why you put only 1.3 for the childhood in fiscal year '21.

>> I don't know that I have the answer for the 1.3 specifically in regards to childcare. In regards to the timing of the funding, the first tranche we should receive here in the later part of may in 2021. We'll get that second allocation of funding in may of 2022, so during fiscal year 2022 is when we'll get

[11:41:14 AM]

that second tranche of money. So I think that picture is really just trying to manage the allocation and use of those funds to coincide with the funding being received by the federal government.

>> I am going to need a lot more detail of why that was provided. That way if we think about how childcare functions, even if you don't have older kids, being able to start your childcare in August or September has huge advantages for the school year, being able to set up, being able to be able to move forward with what your plan; there are a lot of costs that happen at that time of year. So I'm very concerned about that break down and whether that gets us the transformative investment that we need in childcare to get the quality and to do the piece that we need to do from the city to

[11:42:17 AM]

pray that care at other times. I'm also not sure if the 6.9 includes half of the actual total because I don't think it includes all of the pieces that were that were in the final proposal including it does not include the del valle piece. We've now on three or four other colleagues also mention this so I think it's an area that we need more work. It is an area that I am hopeful that we will be able to get some support from the county. We've been working very hard to try to talk with them and in that area. I am very aware of what it looks like when we are putting more money into one sector of the economy than we're putting into early childhood or the vast amount of difference that we're putting in to address some other issues relative to the children in our community. I also wanted -- a couple of

[11:43:18 AM]

folks have also mentioned the Austin civilian conservation corps. This is a program that we authorized about a year ago. It is a program that several of our departments, we have eight departments that are engaged in and allowing us to complete could have beenervation programs all over the city, including a

project that is underway in the onion creek area right now. Travis county has echoed that and in the process of creating their own program. And I don't see the funding in here. You had five million in your original and that was funded out of reserves. So help me understand in the scheme of the funding how you're thinking of this the civilian conservation corps funding. It does not seem to be in this proposal where you had five million before. Which in my view is a minimum. And was part of what we talked about for workforce when we did the prior resolution.

[11:44:20 AM]

>> Council member, we certainly recognize that it was part of our initial recommendation. With the priority areas that we were working with, we did our best to approach a plan, but we certainly are open to discussion. And I think we're now teeing it up to get that guidance from council so we appreciate the policy direction in that regard.

>> Alter: Okay. Well, I'm not going to support any package that doesn't have that funded in some substantial way. I'm just going to say that right now. I think the opportunities are immense and they're really important for collaboration with the county as well. I am -- you know, I want to echo a comment that councilmember tovo made with respect to the detail. We have an enormous opportunity as elected officials to deploy these

[11:45:20 AM]

funds to not just help our city survive the pandemic, but really to transform the trajectory of different communities. And I'm not seeing a whole lot transformation national in the way this is laid out. And I'm really concerned about putting such a large amount of money into homelessness with no guarantee, with no commitment from any other partners at this point in time. We can talk about having a plan, but let's be honest, what we are are a set of goals. I have not seen and maybe I'm missing it, but if it's there I need to see it. I don't see those commitments of funding from anybody else. And yes, we have to do everything we can to address homelessness, but it is not and shouldn't be only the sole responsibility of the city. And I am not comfortable moving forward with this

[11:46:21 AM]

with no plan. And to say that we have goals is not a plan. I'm going to need a lot more detail here and a lot more demonstration that we have partners who are stepping up wuss because if we just do that piece of it we won't have any chance of transforming the system. Where if we took 10 million of that and put into workforce development, we would be in a good position to really transform many lives and keep a lot of people from becoming homeless in the first place. I'm also not sure is is that the solutions

we have right now with respect to the creative sector really make the investments that set us up to be resilient two years from now if we don't have that money to keep going. And I can't tell from the level of detail we have, what we have in mind here. So I really hope that we are going to take some time to get this right and really think hard about how we're

[11:47:21 AM]

going to take advantage of this opportunity. In item 111 we set a goal of being transformational and I hope that's where we'll be at the end of this process. As a city we made some critical and innovative decisions throughout the pandemic and I know that amongst ourselves and our staff we have the ability to keep doing that. I don't think this proposal is there yet, at least not with the level of detail that we have or with the level of commitments we have for partners at this point in time. And I just think we need to demand better.

>> Mayor Adler: All right, councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I would like to say that I appreciate everyone's comments. Everyone has really good and

[11:48:22 AM]

valid points. I'd like to say that an additional level of detail will be helpful, but I'd also like to say that I don't want that to get in our way with showing true leadership. It is accurate and I believe needed for a level of helplessness with homelessness. I'm comfortable with the city saying we need this to be done. We're willing to put a substantial amount of dollars up. We want you guys to match it and show your commitment also. But we need to make a commitment also. And let me say that there is a plan and there is detail there. It's pretty straightforward in what the summit has put forth and it's aligned with what we have identified as

[11:49:25 AM]

our priorities and what we have been doing. And that is re-housing. It is clear that the -- as councilmember tovo has said, we've had a plan for a long time. What the summit has done is taken that to scale and putting information around each item of it, but the bottom line is we're talking about connecting people to housing and doing it more quickly and setting up a system which is what the workforce portion of this is about to make sure that we have sufficient numbers of social workers and navigators that do the work. So I guess I would just caution us to think in terms of -- I think details are helpful and important. I don't want to see us

[11:50:28 AM]

letting details get in the way of making a statement and demonstrating our leadership around homelessness. Because at the end of the day we need the whole community to step up, but at the end of the day we have to step up. And we have to step up in a smart way, in a way that focuses on connecting people to housing, which we have been doing, but not anywhere near the scale that it needs to happen at and not in as efficient and smart a way as we can do it. What we've seen with what has come out of the summit addresses the importance of workforce development, addresses the importance of quickly working with encampments and getting people housed and then doing that in a way that is sustainable. So again, I appreciate what everyone has said. I just urge us to spend some

[11:51:32 AM]

time with details, but let's not let details get in the way of what we need to be doing.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar.

>> Casar: In my earlier comments on the eviction front I didn't want it to be lost on some of the priority areas -- and how important some of the priority areas laid out by the staff are. I think it would be so transformational if we made that a call for everybody at the summit. Housing thousands more people in such a short period of time would not only be transformational here, but we would be a real model for how to tackle a crisis that has gone without sufficient resources for generations. I think that the success by six proposal is really strong and we've talked with United Way about how to make

[11:52:37 AM]

it more transformational. And if we put our part forward and move forward and vote in June to say we're going to do our -- not only our proportionate share, but based on staff's recommendation, more than our proportionate share of that funding, then we get our piece down and I think if the county also steps in and does their part and I've heard a lot of support from them for these priority areas then I think that would be really significant just like it would be in workforce development. But as councilmember kitchen said, what I do want to avoid is us taking too long for us to put forward our part and that then leaves other folks in the dark about whether we're going to do our part or not. So I feel comfortable sitting this thoroughly, working through the issues, but currently where I sit I think passing something some June makes sense so that we have -- so that we can commit to our piece and then other governmental partners

[11:53:37 AM]

and private philanthropy would be the folks that need to do -- just need to do theirs. So councilmember kitchen, I concur generally there with your comments with still the outstanding issue about how do we handle potential spikes in rental assistance applications if there is -- as the eviction stays out, because we do want to do that transformational change, but we also want to make sure that we take care of our folks on the most baseline level.

>> Mayor Adler: My sense is I think I agree with most of what everybody is saying. I look at this and it does seem transformational to me. The summit came out with taking the elements of the plan, as councilmember tovo

[11:54:38 AM]

said, that we have had reported to us in numerous reports over time. And laid out how you make that whole system come into play with a timeline and with calls over time and with costs and something we didn't have in that measure of detail. But it has not surfaced yet. So manager, I think it's really important to have this conversation in the detail of the total number and the numbers over that period of time and would urge you to get Diana and the other people involved in that to really get us that detail so that people can see that. And then I think that investors and that funders from other places are going to want to see that measure of detail as well. I think you need to get that out. I think it's clear that that's the cost to be able to develop and put in place the transformative it system that's needed. If we're the only people participating in this there is no system because our contribution level doesn't

[11:55:38 AM]

create the transformational system. Sew I am comfortable stepping forward and saying the city is ready to make this contribution, but it is ultimately consistent on everybody else participating in scale too in order to be able to actually create that system. You look at the numbers that are happening in cities around the country and the single biggest correlator to that is housing prices and housing prices continue to rise in Austin more than anywhere else. If we don't get a system in place to be able to handle and support people that are following in to homelessness, in six to eight years our city is going to be in a horrible, horrible place. So I think that level of commitment would give us that transformational place. I think we need that detail and I think we need to say

[11:56:39 AM]

as everyone is saying, this is bigger than just us. And we can lead by example, but we need partners. My understanding, councilmember Ellis, is that the six by six whole program is contemplated to be funded

like this. The childcare folks came to us with a thought was their transformational issue cost to be able to build that out and I agree that we need to fully fund that. My understanding is that the county is also willing to -- my understanding is that this proposal does that. Again, the -- and if it doesn't, then we need that detail, I see Alison shaking her head. I don't know at what point it falls off. Pre-I do know that for the very first time the money coming to the county is based on population just as it's based on population with the dollars that we're getting in the city and the dollars going to Williamson county based on population.

[11:57:40 AM]

And since these programs, childcare, the workforce development, serve this region, I would hope that each of us are contributing a portion to the population that we're supporting. So it's tough to know from this general powerpoint what the total number is that is between us and our partners is being put towards childcare but I think we need to realize that transformational issue, same with workforce development where there's a transformational program that workforce solutions has given us. Part of that was the homelessness issue. I would still keep the homelessness workforce development in workforce development because that's outside of the summit issue. But I join in something that I heard the commissioners saying in your discussion, director Briseno, that this is a real opportunity to

[11:58:41 AM]

increase capacity of the whole service provider community. That's a big part of this summit, the system dollars. And we don't have that capacity. Are and we recognize we're going to have to increase those people to be able to perform those services and that's a real opportunity for us in terms of capacity building in our city, which again I think would be real transformational. So I I guess maybe it's hard to tell from a powerpoint what level of detail exists or doesn't exist because we're all filling in gaps. But I think for me this can provide that framework and I don't know that we're that far apart in the discussions. I support as well funding in workforce development for the civilian corps that we have. I just can't tell when the county money is also put in where those dollars are.

[11:59:43 AM]

I think that to the degree that we're just shy in workforce development, we're just shy in childcare, early education, we have a capacity to be able to meet those numbers. Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: So mayor, I know we're at lunchtime and as I indicated, I had some more questions. To some extent it kind of depends on -- whether or not we spend more time today talking about this issue depends a lot on whether or not there's a substantial number of council members who want to approve

this at the June 3rd meeting. I think if there is we need to really allocate a whole lot more time today to asking those questions. I am going to need to ask them.

[12:00:44 PM]

>> I'm comfortable with you asking the questions

>> Tovo: I would like to get a sense of our colleagues

>> Sure

>> Tovo: We probably need to break and come back for it, is my sense of things

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Council member kitchen

>> Kitchen: I'm fine with breaking and coming back with more questions. I would like to work towards the June 3rd. I think people need to have their opportunity to have their questions answered and discussed but I'd like to work toward the June 3rd. If we don't do it until today, we don't have another mechanism to do it for two weeks and I suspect council member tovo will have her questions still. I don't know if we want to do it today or Thursday but I think it

[12:01:46 PM]

would be helpful to have more time for discussion.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's break and come back with additional questions. My concern with going past June 3rd is I think it's important for us to signal to the community we're willing to go to a certain level if the community is also willing to step up, and I think that's a -- so I don't know if that's true, that's a message we need to be able to send. Council member alter

>> I need to hear from your partners that they're willing to step up. I know you've been involved with the summit and other stuff but we need to hear from them to make our decision too. We've not all been equally able

[12:02:48 PM]

to participate in the summit or see the materials or even the plan. This is a not of money on top of a lot of money and it requires a lot of money to transform it. But this is -- you know, there needs to be more transparency here so that we understand that we are moving forward, not just the city alone but lock step with the community in a transformational way. Until we have some conformation of that or clarity on details, I don't believe the community broadly speaking is going to be content with that we're putting

as much money in. So the success of this program depends on it being truly transformational and communicating that more broadly, and I don't know what's keeping those details but I asked for

[12:03:49 PM]

those details, you know, back when we first got the report back on the summit and haven't seen any of them and haven't read something perhaps I wasn't supposed to read. The community doesn't have this either and we're talking a lot of money and a huge opportunity to be transformational. I'm there yet and I don't believe the community will be unless we can make the case for it. We need to be able to do that and some of those partners -- it's not enough to stay you put down these numbers on a piece of paper that none of us can see

>> Mayor Adler: Council member kitchen

>> Kitchen: We need to go over the details again. That information is available and it's available to the community but we often don't

[12:04:49 PM]

communicate it very well, and we don't communicate it in detail, so we need to have that conversation. I think there's a detail spread sheet that I think has been posted that shows different aspects of it but it would be helpful if we go over it. So perhaps we could spend some time on Thursday doing that, or maybe we need a special-called meeting to really dig into it. We could certainly do that, which would give everyone the time to really fully understand and also doing it in that kind of meeting can help with making it more understandable to the public. So perhaps we ought to be doing something like that, mayor

>> Mayor Adler: We certainly can -- have however much time as we need.

[12:05:52 PM]

Council member tovo

>> Tovo: Maybe we should do that today. I think to get back to the exchange earlier, I think the details are important. We have far more needs in our community now than we have funding so we are going to have to be able to explain to our community why we're investing these dollars in these programs rather than other programs, and so I think with regard to spending on homelessness, services and housing, we're going to need to have detailed conversations with the community and I think the success of the

private fund raising piece for it to be transformational depends on us having that detailed conversation. All you need to do is look at your e-mail to know many of our community are concerned about --

[12:06:52 PM]

they don't understand how we've invested the really substantial funds we have invested in homelessness and they are concerned about some decisions that the council has made over the last couple of years, and we absolutely have to approach this from a perspective of as much information to the public as possible so that we can earn the community's trust in our plan, in our investments -- past and future. So it is critically important that we have those conversations very clearly. As I said before, I am -- I know -- I mean, we have been having the conversation for multiple years now about how important that private participation is, how important that partner participation is and we really need to see. I would like to see some of those commitments here as we're having that broader

[12:07:54 PM]

conversation.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member alter

>> Mayor, I've had my hand up

>> Mayor Adler: You're frozen on my screen. That may be why I don't see you go ahead

>> Pool: I think conversation is necessarily. I want to be context with where we're going with our fiscal 2022 budget. I want to know how this spending will inform or what gaps may continue and what gaps might be filled in the fiscal '22 budget so to the extent that we can get some context sooner, I know that the city manager is -- the city manager is planning to give us the draft budget. We won't be making decisions informed with how we're going to be spending our budget for next year and these numbers have to

[12:08:55 PM]

align with that. The community has to understand how this builds on the work we've done in the past. And that sets us on a good -- in good posture for the future. The forecast that we had from the cfo said we will have some difficult financial years five years out given the tax cap on us. We have gotten significant input from the community asking us to be aware of that and to be diligent in our consideration of where they stand with regard to their meeting their tax obligations and the fact they've

been weathering the covid crisis as have other groups that maybe have already been supported by us for our programs. So that informs my reluctance to go for the number offered up for

[12:09:56 PM]

homelessness because that in context with the over 115 million we've put in in the last to three fiscal years and without knowing whether -- whether we have substantial partners is a huge question for me. So that informs my reluctance and I think I'm speaking for a significant number of people that -- of our residents so to the extent we can get a sense of where our budget will be, particularly with regard to some of the programs being highlighted through I think that would be helpful and it would help in our messaging to the public

>> Mayor Adler: Council member alter

>> I have a question for staff. Am I reading right that the 22.9

[12:10:58 PM]

million -- that is going into -- I guess there's -- that's 20 -- 20 million of that is the hotel occupancy tax pieces? So this means there's no relief to any small businesses? No relief to nonprofits? We've been increasingly hearing from nonprofits that they are, you know, in difficult situation to get through the next year. These are a lot of the groups even that service the homeless or other parts of the community that are still struggling. So again, they're just pieces here where the details all seem to have been, like, you know, framed around this \$84 million number that some of us don't know where that number is going and it leaves out so many groups that need to be fortified or need the resilience.

[12:11:59 PM]

We also don't see here kind of the investments that are coming in through venue support and other kinds of stuff. Again, I don't -- we need more sufficient information and detail to understand what we're investing in and details on how it would be transformative and who our partners are.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's break for lunch. It's 12:12. Let's come back at 1:15. We'll add to this conversation and pick up the next items. See you guys at 1:15.

[1:11:16 PM]

[Music].

[Music].

[1:23:24 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: We're going to go ahead and reconvene our meeting here on may 18th, 2021. It's 1:22. This is the city council work session continuation after our lunch break. We were in the process of discussing first briefing on the American rescue dollars. Kathie, I know you had plans for the housing folks.

>> Tovo: I have some about some of the issues too. So maybe I'll jump into some of those. So when I had my briefing with staff last week at a high level to talk about the American rescue plan, there were a couple of things -- I

[1:24:25 PM]

may be conflate floodgating a few different conversations -- conflating a few different conversations. Director Briseno maybe you can share with me, what was the contingency for our cares funding and how has that been spent? Has that been needed and has that been spent?

>> Council member, I believe the contingency for the cares act funding was for 20%. I would look to Diana and Ed to answer on how it was spent.

>> I can't really give you an easy answer to that. We can certainly do the work and lay it out. You remember, council, that we asked council to give us flexibility in how to use those funds to maximize the use with uncertainty about what FEMA would ream drs and what they wouldn't reimburse and what would be eligible under the can crown in a relief fund -- Corona relief fund and what would not be. I think we could do that in writing and certainly prior to June 3rd, lay out those

[1:25:27 PM]

details the best we can.

>> Tovo: Thanks, Ed. And thanks, director Briseno. Looking back at a q&a from one of our sessions and sorry I only printed out a few pages so I can't remember which date it was that we had these. I think it was our last meeting we asked for a detailed breakdown of the 44 million that had been allocated for a variety of needs, including congregate shelters, isolation facilities and others. I'm, so I know we've covered this a couple of times. I'm still not understanding what our expectations are with regard to FEMA reimbursement. In a variety of categories, but let me start with our prolodges and our isolation

facilities. Our non-congregate shelters are still listing zero percent estimated FEMA reimbursement. Is that a definite final decision and can you please help me understand that?

[1:26:29 PM]

>> Good afternoon, council members, Diana Thomas, interim chief deputy financial officer. We don't yet have an answer from FEMA on the coverage of the non-congregate shelters. We're still waiting on final guidance. The last information we received is they were not going to cover ours. We are still working with our delegation to get more information on that and hopefully get that decision -- it's not been delivered in a final form at this point so we are wait to go get that final information. So we're going off the assumption that they are going to decline in hopes that they change their mind on how they're going to proceed. With regard to the isolation facilities, we are getting coverage through FEMA for the isolation facilities and projecting that a majority of the costs there will be under FEMA with potentially some exclusions.

[1:27:31 PM]

>> Tovo: I see that estimated at 92%. On the q&a there's -- I'm a little confused about I think maybe there's some formatting issues. Perhaps it was just on my copy that I printed out. I'll go back to the original. I'm trying to figure out what the actual amounts are because the numbers ended up catty wampus. So I asked this question before and I want to make sure I'm remembering the answer. As I was just reading this morning I think or yesterday about some of the hotel prologue strategies and other places they are getting FEMA reimbursement. I was reading about one city that stopped doing it because it is a reimbursement and they can no longer put up the upfront cost of those hotel rooms to wait for a reimbursement, but they are receiving reimbursement and they could -- like how much they received of the total expenditure. Am I right in remembering that in one of our conversations you said that the FEMA decisions are

[1:28:31 PM]

regional and in one region those costs may be covered and in others those are not?

>> That is absolutely correct. We are seeing? Some regions where FEMA has authorized the non-congregate stealth Hering, but in -- sheltering, but in our region they originally told us no.

>> Tovo: I find that to be outrageous. I'm sure you share that sentiments well. I hope this is a major priority of our governmental liaison team to communicate with our government officials how outrageous it is that a certain health intervention would be covered in one part of the country and covered at on zero in another part of the country. That doesn't make any sense. So I guess the same is

true of the eating apart together and the caregiver meals. In regard to the caregiver meals that was an economic intervention. Have we received anything back from FEMA about why

[1:29:31 PM]

that is not an expense they're interested in covering? That was-- we can quantify the number of jobs that were saved or that were retained or created through that program.

>> This is an area where I am not an expert, council member, so I would need to defer to experts. But my understanding is that FEMA is not geared towards the economic development side of things so that's not the focus.

>> Tovo: I'm sorry, my apologies. That is something that we were expecting cares funding to support so that's my mistake. It's really the eating apart together is what we had anticipated there would be a FEMA reimbursement for because it was part of the crisis response. Do we know why they're not supporting that or that we'll get zero reimbursement?

>> My remembering is that we did not want to limit the recipients of the meals and

[1:30:32 PM]

that is the reason we chose to use alternate funding and not submit those requests on to FEMA.

>> Tovo: So in that case it's not a FEMA decision, it's that if we -- because of the program guidelines or other kinds of circumstances we did not submit and we did not intend to.

>> That's correct.

>> Tovo: Okay. The reason I'm asking those questions is because in part I'm trying to understand what categories of need my still exist as we move into our conversations about how to potentially shift things around with regard to the proposed American rescue plan spending. So I'm going to shift gears and ask the question that I had with regard to eviction and housing and this is in regard to our housing staff. I think many of us on the dais and certainly many in the community are super concerned about what happens when the eviction moratorium

[1:31:36 PM]

expires. Have you had any discussions with groups in our community to have any data about how many tenants have continued to pay their rent through some of the programs that the city or others have offered during this period of time?

>> We've had some conversations. Good afternoon, Rosie Truelove, director of the housing and planning department. We've had some conversations and accordingly we have modified our rent program to allow for folks that are -- for landlords who have tenants who are five months or more behind to be able to indicate that and get a prioritization for assistance in that capacity. But I don't have any substantive numbers for what the need is. I can tell you that we had -- for rent 3.0 we had

[1:32:38 PM]

23 million. To date we have allocated about 29% of that. We're provided about \$10 million of that rental assistance. We've paid about 894 months of rent with an average of \$564 per household. We pay on average 4.88 months of rent and we anticipate spending through the rental indication, which remember was last year's allocation of emergency rental assistance not the funds that came from the American rescue plan. But we anticipate spending that \$24 million in the July-August time frame that would set us up for the American rescue plan dollars next.

>> I'm sure you captured that information for us in that Mexican-American on now or response. If so could you point us to which one it was in --

>> That's the latest information, council member, and I'm happy to send is

[1:33:39 PM]

that out or to point you to the dashboard where that information is reflected. That's the latest from my staff here.

>> Tovo: I know that you project all the rest of it will be spent by July.

>> Some time July-August time frame, yes.

>> That's an extraordinary number of months that have been able to be funded. I know it was in the 8,000. I didn't capture the detail, but got the scale of it and it was huge. I think that's a tremendous support for families in our community.

>> Tovo: I don't know if you have an answer to this, but I guess I would call on our answer in the community such as the apartment sex and others to help us get a scale of what others in the community who are potentially behind in their rent and may be facing

[1:34:40 PM]

eviction when the moratorium expires if there's not some support that they receive for rental.

>> Tovo: Another question on a different topic related to the --

>> Alter: Can I ask something on that topic? If that would be okay. Sorry to interrupt you. Is there a separate arpa money for that? I don't see that in -- in the 24 million in arpa in the staff proposal.

>> So there's a couple of different aspects there. In the American rescue plan as a whole there was a separate emergency rental assistance allocation to the city that is going to be about \$20 million.

[1:35:42 PM]

From the work that director Briseno and her team put together they are recommending potentially a little bit of additional beyond the 20 million to either go through with rent or with a program like rise, but that is separate from the 20 million that comes as far as from rental emergency assistance. So it's not part of the bucket that's local government assistance, the emergency rental is separate and apart from this.

>> Alter: It would be really helpful, maybe you've already done this. I don't know where we have all these other buckets of what's coming in. We need to make sure we are addressing the needs of our community and the opportunities to transform. But there are a lot of different streams, fortunately, but it is a little bit challenging to follow them what we have so far. So it would be great if we would be able to see that so for instance that extra \$11 million for homelessness, like how we

[1:36:44 PM]

track all of that stuff, some of which we know we're getting and some of which we may potentially be getting. We need a mechanism so that we can see that as we're making a decision so that we can weigh where it is that our community is otherwise not going to get an investment.

>> I know in the presentation given today these two dollar amounts were called out separate and apart from the 20 million for emergency rental assistance and the approximately \$11 million for homelessness were called out separate and apart from the larger. But I agree that there's a lot of different funding sources and it's complex to. >>

>> Alter: It sounds like it was called out in the presentation and approximate would like to see this today. I think it would be helpful to have that -- have that

[1:37:44 PM]

clarity and I want to underscore councilmember tovo's request to actually get data on what's going on with the rental. The last we had spoken with above, they were -- above, they were hearing that we were

having a pretty normal response to rents in terms of what was being so just challenged to understand the demand absent the data. Obviously there are people in our community that are hurting, but want to be as targeted as we can be with our aid so that we help the folks that need it the most and really will benefit the most and will need that data. You said you had

[1:39:00 PM]

--

>> With the new capability for five months or more behind in rent, that is relatively new, but I don't have any data on that yet, but that's been in place for just a handful of weeks. It's not something that we're you we're expecting of the eviction moratorium ending.

>> And how has that been communicated?

>> We have a team of folks that have been working to get that information out. I can get you information on that if you like. But because it is new it is probably still in the process of being communicated because -- we made that change to the actual explanation portal in the last week or so.

>> I appreciate that change and trying to understand if the overwhelming demand that we know that something is out of whack or to the

[1:40:00 PM]

extent that we have any picture or no one is applying or some of that would be helpful to have.

>> As soon as we have it we will be sure to communicate that.

>> Alter: Thank you, councilmember tovo for letting me interrupt you.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar, do you want to follow up with the rent question?

>> Casar: Just for a baseline of folks watching, in June when somebody is more than five months behind, then a landlord and if the city or county don't respond within 60 days then evictions could begin. So I anticipate -- would anticipate that in June we might see a significant jump in the usage of the portal that councilmember alter and director truelove just described since that's when people would start being required to apply if they wanted to start that process. And director truelove, correct me if I'm wrong, I

[1:41:00 PM]

think the number is somewhere in the six to eight-million-dollar range that we would need to pay if we wanted to make sure is that in June there weren't people getting evicted that have had their applications in for the last while so there's a six to eight-million-dollar cost there. And the question that I think we're all grappling with is in mid or late June are we going to see a significant ramp up because folks are now -- now have potential for evicting their tenants, but they're required to apply to us and we're going to see a surge and how much of a surge will the city and county happen. So some back of the napkin math my sense is if there isn't a big surge then us and the county using the existing funds we could make it through the end of summer but if there is a significant surge that we may not be able to. And then the concern is if the moratorium ramps down and if we want to ramp the

[1:42:01 PM]

moratorium down from five months behind to two or three months that might be a bigger bump. I think we're going to learn so much probably at the end of June or beginning of July that part of my caution here is for us to build in a little cushion so that we are planning for a worse -- not the worst case scenario, but a tougher scenario rather than the optimistic scenario. But I hope that that's helpful and director true live, correct me if I'm wrong.

>> No. I think that your estimates sound reasonable. Right now we're paying an average of 4.88 months of rent with an average of -- just back of the napkin just use that as part of our estimates. I'm not trying to do your math here. This is when I know I'm over my skis.

[1:43:07 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: The way we structured it as the landlords to reach out for support, you opened up that porthole and if we as a council look into the rule or the procedure that the landlord needs to apply and they reach out then they can proceed. We want to make sure is if there are landlords that reach out that are not scooped up and put into the program since we're trying to incent that behavior.

>> Yeah. Basically the promise of this is that we're going to keep evictions really low. We just next slide the money to keep them at that bare minimum level.

>> Mayor Adler: Right. Any other question that we have? And when we're doing it no one really knows the number of people that are behind in rent and what the status is in conversations we've all been having. I have with the conversations I've had with the apartment associations that no one knows that number and the only way to find out is setting up a program kind of like we have

[1:44:09 PM]

which opens the door a little bit and to -- let's respond to see what kind of response there is. Leslie.

>> Pool: A question for staff about notice from hud with regard to home foreclosures. Is there any movement with banks foreclosing on home loans that maybe we're not able -- the owners weren't able to keep pace with them similar to those who weren't able to pay rent?

>> I don't have any information about that at any fingertips. I could look into that to see if they have put anything out about that. That would be a position to help homeowners on what we have for emergency rental assistance to help renters.

[1:45:09 PM]

We don't have any details about that yet. I can poke around on that one to see if I can find it.

>> Pool: That would be great because we're not doing anything to help homeowners and I would imagine that some of them may be having stressors in their lives as renters may as well. So yes, rose six whatever you can find out would be good and if you have suggestions about whether that is a category that we should be paying attention to then I think probably now would be a good time to kind of tee that up.

>> And we will see some federal assistance coming through that will be funneled through state to -- for folks to apply for including organizations like ours to apply to be able to provide that assistance to our citizens, we just haven't gotten any details about that. That was a component of the American rescue act.

>> And we got the guidance from the feds on the small business loans for some venues to get some relief.

[1:46:13 PM]

We offered administrative type assistance to those folks if they wanted to contact the city for assistance in applying for the sba loans. Will they do the same thing for any homeowners in Austin who may be needing some assistance in filing for that relief.

>> Whether we know more about it.

>> Pool: So I think it's important to extent that these are parallel situations that we don't leave anybody off the list of consideration. So yeah, maybe next time we get together it would be good or if you could follow up with a memo on how homeowners will be addressed. It may be that foreclosed closures are not -- foreclosures are not significant, and we don't know that, but it's an important piece of information.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: Thank you. If I do think there are ways to

[1:47:14 PM]

know what's going on. One way is this program. It's hard to address this if we don't have

[indiscernible]. I know there have been organizations who have come forward and said this is a concern for landlords and so we either need on people to be applying to the program or they will have to show us some data. I know that there are people who are struggling with their rent, but again, even going back as early as may of last year there still has been no evidence that we are at a level of nonpayment that is different than normal. And we need to know that if that is true.

-- And I know that we don't -- can't fund that data on our own, but I'm not sure that staffing up to help beyond what we've already set up without having that information is necessarily the most useful

[1:48:14 PM]

use of additional resources beyond the help that we're getting from that. I would just really like to have more data on that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Kathie, do you want to continue? Ann, did you have a question first?

>> Kitchen: I have a question on the subject of rental assistance. I can wait for Kathie unless she's going to change subjects.

>> Tovo: I'm going to change subjects.

>> Kitchen: So I should go ahead? Okay. On the rental assistance, one important piece about the rental assistances, we're talking about it in terms of evictions and I think we're talking about it in terms of preventing a surge of evictions, which I think is an important

[1:49:17 PM]

component to our homelessness strategy because for a system of addressing homelessness prevention end of it is key as well as the other pieces along the prevention -- along the way. So my question is and I think we probably don't have the answer at this point, but the 84 million or so that we're talking about for homelessness, do we have that -- we probably don't have that broken down yet. I mean, I know that we have -- I know that we're

[indiscernible] To the full amount that's needed for homelessness. The 84 million, is that part of the staff's recommendation, has that been broken down yet?

[1:50:19 PM]

>> Council member, it has not been broken down yet. We are in the process of going through all the recommendations and strategizing on the best way to look for funding or to identify funding for each of them. It's underway, but it's not broken down yet.

>> Kitchen: Okay, that's fine. The only reason I mention that is that I think that the rental assistance is important to think of from the perspective of preventing or addressing -- that is a better word, addressing any surge that we might have in evictions because of the impact that it has on -- well, as we know the impact that it has on people in any amount on the streets. I think we need to think about it from that perspective.

>> Mayor Adler: That's good. Kathie?

>> Tovo: Thanks so much. I had a question about workforce. I'm trying to figure out what page that's on.

[1:51:21 PM]

Let's see. So the workforce investments that staff are recommending appear to be work now, work now and public sector academy? First could you explain what the public sector academy is, please, director Briseno?

>> Yes, one second. I'm pulling up my backup documentation.

>> Tovo: Could you remind us is some of this in more detail in the original proposal that you had presented to council?

>> No. The detail was sent out as late backup this morning so the detail was received by the entities that we reached out to and they each put together a pretty robust proposal. So you are receiving details today.

>> Tovo: Thank you.

>> So the public sector

[1:52:25 PM]

academy, this is -- if I recall correctly, it was modeled I believe after Boston. It's an idea where you create a pipeline for Austin residents to enter careers in city and county agencies. It's looking for local jobs for local people. So the estimate for that component is two million dollars.

[Overlapping speakers]. There is more in-depth in the package and I'm happy to go through that. The concept is you're building a pipeline for public service employees so looking at -- to look at individuals that are looking at rescaling to -- reskilling to serve as public servants.

>> Tovo: Thank you. I'll take a look at that backup, including the model that -- or the city that it's modeled after. I wanted to talk a little bit about work now. I was really interested to read recently -- I appreciate workforce solutions for providing us with information on a regular basis about the work that they're doing and in

[1:53:25 PM]

conversation with them over email they were able to provide me with a number of individuals who were experiencing homelessness who they've served over the last several years, not as a particular program, but in the course of their work. And it was not insignificant. It was over 600 individuals, I believe, in the last several years. They're already doing great work in that. I certainly appreciate and support continuing investment in that area. Are these both programs that you anticipate will be run through workforce solutions or what -- I guess I could also look at the detail that you've provided in today's packet for the work now, but let me look at that separate and outside of this meeting. What I do want to talk about here today is the conversation, the example that you offered earlier. So I had brought up this idea in our health and human services meeting about creating a work track that would help train individuals

[1:54:28 PM]

to be [indiscernible] For the reasons you identified, the summit and other work in the community has identified a need for case managers and navigators and we have a circuit of them in Austin. It's a multi-beneficial program that we're investing in workforce training for individuals who need jobs, but also identifying meet and an identified need and occupation within our city. I doesn't realize that you were having conversations on that. My conversation and I have been having conversations both with capital idea trying to get their interest in developing such a job training program and have also been sending out queries to those who do this work asking for information about some of those threshold questions that capital idea asked us. What are the wages that one can expect, what is the level of training, what's the career trajectory, so I wanted to ask you kind of

[1:55:29 PM]

how far iconic along you are or the staff are in their conversations around that. Is there a willingness to create such a career path and were you able to get some of the information that I know we'll be seeking about job training -- about wages and career ladders and some of the other questions that I know need

to be answered for individuals who you're encouraging and recruiting as well as for the job training programs and who will be delivering those services? Are you working with a range, is capital idea one of them?

>> So council member, we did not take too deep of a dive knowing this is a priority. We're certainly open to who we work with. We know that there are entities in our city that could provide the service. There are also potentially entities that haven't worked in this area that could scale up. As I mentioned earlier, it's a direction the council

[1:56:30 PM]

would like to go in. I would like for us to have a creative conversation about what that looks like because we haven't done this before as a city. We're looking to city council for guidance on that.

>> Tovo: Great. I will ask my staff to loop you into some of the emails that we've had flying back and forth, so you're aware of what some of the questions that you're being asked have been and what the additional information is that others have requested. I can pause there for a minute and some of my colleagues may have other questions. I think I have some about a different issue.

>> Mayor Adler: Kathie, I want to follow up on your last point. As you are investigating that it would be a priority for me as well. Commissioner Travillion has long been an advocate of this kind of capacity in approximate the community and to the degree you can, bring him into that conversation with the county as well.

[1:57:34 PM]

Historically we have participated and attributed with that kind of workforce development element. And Kathie when you looked at that page on workforce development, there were those three programs that you identified. There's also the four million dollars or something like that, I think, that was just an expansion of we work, but also associated with people experiencing homelessness. My sense is it probably needs to be in the workforce development component because that's what they've been doing. The last thing I would say and you know this too that of that 650 people that entered into the programs the success rate getting people jobs is like 65%. So not only is it hitting a lot people, but it's also really affecting them. Councilmember Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: Thank you. My question is around the community navigators that we funded or that we voted on last week or a couple of

[1:58:34 PM]

weeks ago as part of the first ranch tranche of funds that we dedicated to aph for covid response. How has that been going? I know there are a couple of programs currently open right now that certainly need additional support in getting the word out.

>> Council member, when you approved the item, we've been working and having conversations with potential partners that can provide that assistance. I'm going to look to David Gray from the EdD team to see if he has a more current update than I did. David, do you have additional information on the navigator status?

>> Hi. Council member. Nice to see you. We are currently assembling our internal project teams to proceed with the navigator program. We've actually assembled that internal team. We're now having the conversations with our finance staff around those

[1:59:38 PM]

contracts like the community navigators and making sure that we're able to rapidly proceed with that program. We do recognize that there's a lot of things happening at the federal level with different federal assistance programs and so we are trying to create the navigator program quickly, but also in a way that's really responsive to changes that are happening at the federal level with respect to the programs that the SBA and other federal agencies are administering. And we're also trying to stand up a navigator program in a way that's responsive to the needs of our local community both on the business side as well as our creative professionals, our arts organizations, including the arts and non-profits and others who are part of our creative ecosystem.

>> Fuentes: I want to emphasize the urgency in that. The restaurant revitalization fund is on a first come, first serve and

[2:00:39 PM]

they're prioritizing minority owned businesses first. So I really want to make sure that we're doing right by our community by establishing the navigators quickly as possible so that we can proceed that support as quickly as possible. But thank you for your work on it. The other question I have is related to the food insecurity funding. I know that council member Tovo you mentioned a few of the -- the eat initiative and the caregiver meals, but I was wondering are any other food related, food insecurity related items would that fall under the first 44 million that we dedicated on aph as part of last council member's allocation or would this the proposal for food insecurity, which the proposal has it at three million, that would be in addition to what is in the first allocation.

[2:01:44 PM]

>> I apologize. I know it was discussed and I don't remember where we landed. Kerri, do you recall?

>> Yes. So the first allocation did include some funding for the eat and the Austin caregivers program. And I believe that was in the first allocation given out a few weeks ago.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Alison and then Kathie?

>> Alter: Thank you, councilmember Fuentes, for bringing this up. I was looking at the backup we got this morning and our numbers don't line up with what we're asking for for food insecurity. It looks like there's many

[2:02:44 PM]

millions more for what we're offering. So where do I see in writing what we're getting for our money and which piece that we're paying for because it's not particularly helpful to write a blank check to some group or whatever without knowing what that is. Which I don't think is what you're proposing, but where do we get those details when we have we have a I don't know how many million proposal and then allocating some of that.

>> Council member, where those three million dollars hasn't all been outlined just yet? We're getting today at presenting to you a framework and really looking at buckets of funding within the priorities that were identified in the resolution. When we are able to get council's direction on the framework we will absolutely flesh that out and staff will be working on what that looks like in those buckets of money. The purpose of our framework was to really get your guidance on the overall

[2:03:47 PM]

priorities and how much we should allocate to each priority. In terms of the amount and regarding food, there is a request that is much larger, there's no doubt. We approached this with the remaining balance that we had after we made the allocations to public health. And then looking at the priorities in the resolution. And knowing that with the four priorities, homelessness listed as -- homelessness was listed as the first priority. So that was on our brains as we were going through this recommendation with limited funds. There's no doubt the need is much greater.

>> Alter: I'm going to throw it out for folks there is a lot in this material. I would hope that we can try and make a decision before we break for the summer certainly, but I am not comfortable with let's throw X million into a bucket and

[2:04:47 PM]

say that we've made thoughtful [indiscernible] About how to use this money in a transformational way. And I don't control the agenda so I would throw that out there for folks who are responsible for the agenda and what's going on there. We have a lot of other things that are really important to cover. ING so I don't want to keep asking questions right now. Some of which might not be able to get answered without taking up time on the dais, but there's a lot to be asked here and a lot that seems to be missing in my view.

>> Mayor Adler: Ann.

>> Kitchen: Two different things. It would help me to understand the -- I hear what you're saying, councilmember alter. So I think we need just a path to understand what would get you there because I really think that -- I wouldn't want to end up on our June 1st agenda, for example, and still not have questions answered.

[2:05:49 PM]

And not knowing what the path is. So I think it's really important to understand what you'd like to see so our staff can supply it. I think what I'm hearing -- maybe there's a difference here that I want to just address if I'm writing it right. I heard director Briseno talk in terms of waiting until the council had approved the actual framework and then developing the kind of details. But I hear you asking for the details now. So I think we need to figure that out somehow. If we want as a group to know the details now that's fine, then we need to make sure that that's understood so work is done as part of the recommends in time for us to consider a framework on the third or so. But if we're -- but I don't want to continue saying I want more details and I'm going to give you details after you decide the framework.

[2:06:49 PM]

We just need to align those two things, if I heard them differently. So did I hear you correctly, director, that you're thinking that you need direction from the council first on the buckets and then you will come up with the detail? And councilmember alter were you saying you can't do that, that you need the detail first? Am I hearing a difference in approach?

>> Council member, I did say that we would need the guidance on those priorities and how much is allocated. That being said we are-- I think we can work towards the details. I don't think we're talking about a lot of time between the two. We can work towards those details, it's just I know that from the staff perspective we -- having the allocation in mind helps identify what's prioritized in those requests.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, I understand that from my

[2:07:51 PM]

perspective. Now I'm understanding what councilmember alter is feeling like she would like to see? Do you before we vote on the buckets, which is fine? If you like that? I'm not sure what you're asking.

>> Alter: I don't really feel like I have as much detail as we normally get in a budget about what we spend money on. We're talking about \$84 million for homelessness with a stated need of 500 million. And so we coulding funding any piece of that 500 million for all I know. And were given. So we definitely -- I don't need to know who the contractor is, per se, or that level, but I do need to understand more than what I have at this point and sings I just have these very broad buckets I don't know how far down -
- I don't know how far

[2:08:53 PM]

down we can get the investments is to be transformational and we have some of these proposals in my view there are pieces that are missing from this conversation that are not transformational. For me taking off the civilian conservation corps is a non-starter for me. I think that we're not putting any money into businesses few non-profit support. What we're doing in the creative arts if I understand it is just replacing hot money. There's nothing transformational about that. And I just -- I need to understand that connection between getting us to resilience and this money. We are beyond the survival mode and I can see that connection even if I don't have every detail of how every dollar is going to be spent for me to be confident that we are making the right choices as a city when we

[2:09:53 PM]

have this major opportunity. We just got this this morning and, you know, perhaps all the background has all of that information, but I don't have that at this point in time. So it just seems to me like it is going to require work to get from here to that part where I'm comfortable.

>> Kitchen: Okay, thank you. That helps me understand better. I am -- because I'm really wanting us to get the information we need so we can work towards that first part of June, preferably the P. Let me ask an additional question. 3rd. So the workforce, the workforce development, so the eight million that is recommended at this point, is that -- I think you might be saying, director, that we don't -- that recommendation doesn't include any particular areas or to what extent -- I'm sorry you mentioned that to us before. I'm just trying to remember now. To what extent do you know

[2:10:55 PM]

what would be recommended as part of that eight million.

>> The eight million we were looking to contribute to the workforce solutions proposal, however we're really -- all of this is starting as a discussion point so that we can get the guidance from council a in terms of other directions you would like to go in.

>> Kitchen: Okay. Go ahead.

>> I was going to add the proposal that was presented was presented in a way that it could be scaled down. So there's different components for different amounts. Again, in fleshing that out we could see exactly what that looks like based on the amount that council wants to allocate.

>> So if we wanted to stay with eight million, but then consider the civilian conservation corps as a piece of it, we could adjust within that eight million. Is that what I'm hearing?

>> Absolutely. We can propose this entire framework with the idea that council could adjust as

[2:11:56 PM]

council wishes to. So that could absolutely come from the eight million dollars.

>> And the civilian conservation corps, help me, I'm sorry, I'm not as familiar with exactly where it is in its development because it's something that was begun, I don't know, maybe a year ago or some time last year or something. Is it operational now? To what extent has it been operational and what aspects of it do we want to be sure and fund that would be transformational?

>> Maybe we should get that information.

>> We can provide details to you. We stood it up and it is underway. I can provide additional information to council on the success of the program.

>> Alter: If I might address, there is a whole plan for scaling the program. To date we have essentially used money that have been in the pots of different departments and while we

[2:12:56 PM]

were supposed to put two million of fresh money into it, we were told there was two million of fresh money in the budget. It was all money -- ultimately all money used from other departments who are now doing workforce development, but you can't scale it without additional money to be able to do the kinds of programs that would provide the best workforce development and the biggest bang from a climate conservation perspective. There is opportunity to coordinate and collaborate. The commissioners' court is also interested in doing it. The more we can do on both sides the better bang you he get for your buck on scaling that program. And now is a really critical time because over time you

may be able to secure additional funding that can help it last over time. We have a model for carrying into the conservation corps

[2:13:57 PM]

that has proven helpful as I understand it for city St. But there is a proposal that's in the works that would be nine million over two years that would get us to what we would most like to be able to do. But we've already begun work on projects in onion creek. We have the art project that's under the Lamar bridge was partially done by the civilian conservation corps. We have folks who have gone through green jobs program, but there's a lot to be done to scale it to do the kinds of things. We have a lot of departments interested, Austin resource recovery, etcetera. We have to be able to put the infrastructure in and to be able too scale it out beyond just departments finding pieces of money. And you will recall originally I believe they had five million and the original.

>> Kitchen: I would like to understand and I can get

[2:14:57 PM]

this offline if we don't have the information right now. The extent to which there are synergies between that program and the program for residents experiencing homelessness. Because, you know, the program for residents experiencing homelessness is all about just helping connect people experiencing homelessness to jobs, which is a piece along the way. And it would seem that at least some number of those individuals would be appropriate folks to plug in to the civilian conservation corps. So I don't know if that's happening now or not. I can ask that question offline. I'd like to understand that.

>> I don't have the figures on that. I just -- do want to say when we put forward -- my priorities are

[2:15:57 PM]

work force development and child care so putting together this conservation corps and the rework now program is not a solution. It is work force development that prevents people from becoming homeless in the first place. We have to do that and the prevention as well and we get more out of the prevention than we do out of the other steps in the long run and really changing someone's trajectory. I would not want to -- it's the work training that really up scales somebody and gets them in a different place they were before the pandemic and that's why also for me the child care is also important, which I think there is broad agreement.

[2:16:58 PM]

We need to make sure we're funding that on the right scale, the right time frame and we're penny wise and pound foolish if we put it off until next year. Folks can't get back to work if they don't have the child care opportunities that are created there, and so we have to look at the broader spectrum and I couldn't agree more with what you said earlier. The prevention matters but the work force and child care preventions to me are part of that and are really important to helping people have the quality of life they aspire to

>> I appreciate that. That helps me understand and I agree those are very important areas. I'll say one last thing. I think the funding for arts and music is critical. It is also prevention.

[2:18:02 PM]

It is also work force development, keeping folks whole in terms of the dollars available and help our artists and musicians. The problem is that all these programs are important, so we have to think about a balance, but I don't think we can say that the arts funding -- arts and music funding is not transformational or is not -- is not aligned with what we've been saying in terms of -- you know, in terms of prevention or in terms of jobs. So we have to think how we can best reach the balance. I understand and share your concerns. I think those are really good, solid programs and they're important in priorities.

>> If I could respond, you know, when I talk about absolutely we need to make investments in the creative sector but what's on here or

[2:19:03 PM]

even in the item before us, I don't understand what we're investing in and what that gets us. I don't know that simply putting more money into those things is really the most critical thing we could be doing to support that sector where we are now but I don't know what it's funding and I don't think it's funding it at any of the levels you're aspiring to either. So, you know, when you look at what they've put in the buckets -- so we have to understand what we're supposedly getting and not just take it because it's a line on a diagram because there's so much that that could be interpreted as. So I share your commitment to wanting to invest in that sector, but I don't know if just doing what we've always done is the best use of that money to meet the need of that sector

>> I hear what you're saying --

[2:20:06 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: One second. Let's give other people a chance --

>> I need to respond. You allowed council member alter. It's by way of explanation. It sounds like more explanation is needed and we'll work on that. It's to make these artists whole. That's what it's for

>> Mayor Adler: Kathie?

>> I have several questions. Since we're on this subject I'll start there and go back to the others. I want to ask the staff to address the question council member alter talked about well. Since number 60 -- I don't know if you want to talk about this now or later but I want to know from the staff. I want to -- we are getting e-mail about restoring funding and I'm not understanding exactly what that -- the context but I understand what the

[2:21:07 PM]

investment in cultural arts from the rescue plan money is transformational. I think that should be criteria for a lot of investments and I want to give you opportunity to talk about that. Is it really an immediate relief that we're providing funding that we need to give people to pay their bills or different kinds of investments? One of the things we've talked about -- we're losing music and theater venues because they're losing their leases as the market values of these properties go up. We've talked about -- whether the economic development corporation could purchase some of these properties. Is any of this funding contemplated to do that -- where

[2:22:09 PM]

we are providing a sustainable path because we could keep the rents low, which would be more than just an immediate response

>> The proposal we put before you is to provide immediate relief to make the contracts we have in place whole. The \$10 million -- there's a projected deficit in the hot tax revenue because of the year we've had. This is to continue on funding our contracts, preservation fund, and live music venue fund at levels prior to the pandemic. We have heard from the creative community that without the funding they cannot pay their own bills and have concerns about housing and so forth. So that was our thought behind it. Certainly -- we have limited

[2:23:11 PM]

funds in terms of what we can recommend

>> Thanks. Again, this kind of gets into item number 60. I don't want to repeat things we'll talk about there, but are they in a second year of the contract? Are these individuals currently under contract and this is the second year and you will not be able to pay out on the second year because of the reduced hot funding from this year or is this -- are their contracts at an end but they would not be able to be renewed at a similar level? Does that make sense?

>> It does. I believe we're looking at the contracts in place for the fiscal year. We're looking -- and please correct me if I'm wrong. It is looking -- we're developing a plan for what to do for the next two years in terms

[2:24:13 PM]

of how we contract with the institutions we've contracted with many years but this is looking at allocating the funds we allocated previously.

>> Tovo: We can take it up to the context of 60. That is really what I'm struggling to understand. Like, are we making good on the contracts already in place or are we preparing ourselves against a reduction in funding for future contracts? Understanding, you know, that many of our contractees have received funding from the city year after year so it is an expectation and a substantial portion probably of their budget. But I need to be able to distinguish what we're doing -- are we guarding against future reductions or fully compensating? And to get back to work force development -- I think part of the challenge here is that there's a little bit of -- I think we need to give some thought to how and what we

[2:25:15 PM]

approve when we take this up because just to get back -- and I share, council member alter, your concerns. I am also in that same place where I need to see the details, so part of it -- part of the challenge is on workforce development -- homelessness is another one. We would approve \$8 million which I'm sure is needed. The detail for it is not general. It is about specific programs. And so for me, you know, I need to understand what we're investing in. So when we go to make that decision, are we just -- are we making a decision about investing \$8 million in work force development and we can spend more time talking about what that looks like or are we investing in the branded programs in work force solutions. You talked -- I thought I heard

[2:26:17 PM]

you say there could be other providers of this kind of workforce training as well, but the detailed information is really about workforce solution programs and they do a great job too. We may want to invest in capital foundation. I'm looking at the public sector academy, which sounds wonderful. I've

always loved when I got to meet some of the high school students that come up and tour city hall and participate in the day or couple-day long program. We have several of these groups that come to city hall and -- I love those kinds of programs but I have to ask should we be addressing in public sector academy knowing many cities, including our own, have had hiring freezes. I'm not sure if that's where we want to invest our workforce

[2:27:21 PM]

training dollars right now. That example -- we have a question before us, colleagues, I think, about what level of detail we are approving, we're giving the go-ahead when we take that decision. But it's a back and forth. I want to know -- because the details matter too -- you know, if it's the public sector academy I may want to shift some F that just for right now, understanding that is a super important, neat-sounding program. With one page of detail I'm not able to commit a \$2 million expenditures on it. I mean, so it's a slash comment -- it's a comment slash question, I guess. But not one we necessarily need to answer today.

[2:28:26 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: My sense on that is to degree we're -- we are filling in buckets. We're identifying proportions and priorities. What it seems to me -- you guys correct me here. It appears as if -- we took a level -- went to people in the areas and said what would change look like, they gave proposals. If the county was participating -- the county -- on pro rata -- on a similar population level, it would indicate a form for workforce -- we had 8 and we're 45 to their 50 per cent. We're a million as opposed to a million-three. And none of these numbers are guaranteed, as I understand it. It's a way of looking at it. You're looking at a workforce

[2:29:27 PM]

development contribution that is in a 17-millionish range. What I've heard the county is a desire to join in and invest but we don't know. It appears at least what the person in the industry said would help us find the transformational change. That's how I'm looking at it at this point. I'm looking at it that way and in last in terms of the particular program but I think that's an important conversation to have prior to June, whether we're ready to make that or not make that or keep that money in a broad, transformational change at that scale. That's how I'm looking at it. I could be looking at it different than everybody else has the county indicate

[2:30:33 PM]

investing in workforce areas

>> We have heard through work force solutions in meetings with the county officials -- there appears to be interest as well but they haven't made a direct recommendation

>> Mayor Adler: It appears the same on child care. We reached out to experts or they came to us and said this is the level of trans -- the level of change. You have a bucket that exceeds the amount for the -- I think. I don't know. Looked to me like roughly it contained the bucket that was sufficient to be able to do the transformative plan in child care. So that generally seems

[2:31:34 PM]

appropriate to me

>> The county did -- commissioners did have a conversation on community engagement and their approach to looking at the approval of funds, and we'll send the presentation to council via e-mail or actually we'll put it as back-up to our presentation so it's accessible. In the presentation they broke their priorities into track one and track two. One being things through cares. I would assume that's going to be a track one priority as a result. Track two is other priorities they have not funded -- they did not fund through the cares act. But we'll share that presentation with the group.

>> Mayor Adler: When they did the cares act before they only received enough money for people outside of the city and now they have money for the additional million people inside the city. But I think that -- I mean,

[2:32:35 PM]

that -- I'm not sure but for my vote I need to know exactly what the program is, as much as I at this point need to know relative scale and priority. I don't think that means we're just writing a blank check because I would still expect staff to come back and say this is what we need to do and I look at money for music and arts the same way. I have the same questions -- it doesn't indicate any particular program or -- there's a need here and I come to it also from looking at, you know, to the degree we can do transformative stuff we should, absent an need for relief which is what we said

[2:33:37 PM]

in the resolution we passed a couple of months ago

>> I want to go back to council member Fuentes' point where I think one part of getting the basic detail is for some of the Austin public health spending to be a little more detailed because, for example, my assumption is we're doing more than 3 million in food and security based on staff recommendation because some of that would be in aph. It could be helpful for the next presentation. You don't have to drill down to every \$10,000 but to give us a sense of how much food and security money we're doing other things because some of that is packaged into that bigger chunk. And I think that there is a middle ground to what you said, mayor, where in some cases I think as a council we would say here is the overall large amount and some cases we might give the

[2:34:39 PM]

large amount and list two details -- if there's a program or two we give the additional direction. My second point was to -- something that council member alter raised about the March memo. That looked at reserves as a way of funding some of the individual assistance for people struggling to pay the bills and some of the workforce, so I would ask that the next presentation take a look at what we can pull from reserves and what we cannot because that might make up some of the difference we have laid out here. I recall in the March memo there was 20 million dedicated to rise in rents to help people struggling. To the question of transformative change, obviously we want to focus on that but if it's making some organizations whole and make sure places don't lose their places to live, I think that's a responsibility as

[2:35:41 PM]

well. Last thing I scribbled down -- I said we have 60 days to respond. We actually have 45 days under the order but I think we can make that deadline. I just made a mistake in the number of days.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member kitchen brought up the possibility of having another special called meeting outside of today's meeting. I don't know what everybody's schedule is next week. Maybe another work session devoted to getting into these conversations might be helpful. We'll check into the calendars and have the city manager's office see if there's interest in that Kathie?

>> Tovo: I did not mention one priority I think we should find funding in this framework for. That is resilience work.

[2:36:41 PM]

I'm not sure if there are other funding streams that would be made available that would be applicable. I'm going to be looking at this -- if not I'm going to look at this to see where we might shift some of the funding around to help support some of the food access

>> On the work session, if we do that, which I think would be helpful, I was hoping we would spend most of the time on the homeless issues because I think people are interested in more detail about both what components are of the summit approach as well as -- you know, breaking that down from a -- you know, from a bucket level from the funding as well as what would be thinking to include in the proposed 84 million. I think that may take a bit of time to go through, so we could

[2:37:45 PM]

use that time to answer questions about other things too but I would want us to spend most of the time and first I would want us to address the homeless funding because I know people have a lot of questions about that

>> Mayor Adler: I would add if we were coming back I would want staff to take a look at the larger total funding issues that several council members have raised, not that you have to come back with commitments from all the possible partners but at least to be able the talk about that, what that approach is or what that process is or any additional conversations or indications that exist because, again, I think we all recognize that in order to be able to really create the system that we need, we can't do it alone. We can contribute really substantially if others are going to contribute really substantially -- private sector, philanthropy, and all. But just to have that part of

[2:38:46 PM]

the conversation as well I think would be helpful if it's okay, we'll go to the next presentation so we can get those other two in.

>> Tovo: In recognition of the time and knowing we have pulled items, I want to make a suggestion. I requested designated camping which I think we need to have today but I requested a health south, which while important is less time sensitive. I'm not sure if we are posted to talk about it on Thursday but perhaps that's one we can post for -- I really appreciate the staff memo we got last night. I'm not sure how many people had an opportunity to read it. I did but that might be another reason to take a little more time and talk about it on 6/3

>> Mayor Adler: Kathie, I appreciate that. That makes sense to me.

[2:39:47 PM]

We can't talk about it on Thursday. We're not noticed to do that but, manager, if it works if

(indiscernible) On 6/1 and we can pick it back up then. Is that okay? All right. So then let's go then to the encampment presentation and then. We have a hard stop at 5:00.

>> Thank you. We're waiting for some people to get moved over. One second.

[2:41:00 PM]

Looks like they have joined us. So thank you, mayor and council, this is now the B 3 presentation in reference to resolution passed at the last council meeting relating to individuals experiencing homelessness and potential sanction encampments. We have a memo. I'm going to turn it over to assistant city manager

>> Good afternoon. We wanted to share with you as we walk through this presentation -- this is an initial assessment. This is also subject to change because over time there are so many things that we need to continue to kind of mull over, but also have the feedback from you individually, and we also are wanting to hear from each

[2:42:05 PM]

council drith.

-- From each council district. This is a starting place for us. No recommendations have been made. One of the things we want to walk through is we want to share the process of how we came to the place with the initial locations, and we definitely use the resolution and the criteria there to be able to put this information together, but we also looked at best practice information as well to include that in this process. Lastly, we had several folks from several departments that came together to either provide the information of city properties as you're going to see as we go through this process, but we also had folks that went out to these locations

[2:43:05 PM]

and really kind of took a kind of second look at the locations as well. So it's definitely a team process. Lastly, not listed on the slide is director smites is going to assist us with this process as well. So we're excited about all the folks that are going to be presenting this information. We feel like it's very comprehensive. At this time I'll turn over to Diana gray, homeless strategy officer

>> Thank you. Good afternoon. I will start the presentation really just by giving a general overview of some of the experiences of other communities that have established sanctioned encampments -- really pieces and

[2:44:08 PM]

elements of those encampments that they have considered critical to their effective operation and then in some cases just a few considerations that we will want to keep in mind as we go forward. We have done substantially more sort of background research than is represented in the presentation today but that will certainly be on going as we move through the planning process and come to different decision points about how we want to proceed to the degree we do and what our operations will look like. So I'll move on to the next slide. And the next slide. So just as background, of course just about two weeks ago or a little less than two weeks ago, council adopted the resolution

[2:45:08 PM]

directing city manager and staff to give feedback and information on the possibility of establishing sanctioned encampments and just as a reminder, the direction in that memo was for staff to come back a total of three times to council with feedback. I think, you know, that was -- allowed us to come back to you quickly but also to phase that work to some degree. Today is the first of those reports -- or the memo that went out Friday was. Then we are coming back June 1st with more granular data and planning around work in Austin. For July 1st have been asked to provide some additional information, background, and cost data of what it might look like to operate a site with -- as -- excuse me -- as the

[2:46:09 PM]

resolution terms them, tiny homes or individual shelters of some sort. Next slide, please. This is just a visual that I think is useful. It's not to suggest that this is exactly what we would be looking at. There are some pieces that I think our fire chief would object to in terms of the proximity of the tents together based on what they're recommending to us but one of the things we're discussing in terms of an encampment site would be uniformity of the shelter that is utilized so we have a little better control over what materials are present on the site and the upkeep of the site in general let's go to the next site -- excuse me.

[2:47:10 PM]

Slide. I apologize. As I see this I realize the print is a little small. But when we think about establishing a designated site for legal camping, we certainly want to ensure that fundamental access to clean water,

electricity, and hygiene resources are there, both as a general public health approach and of course in terms of the well being of the folks that are there. We are -- although this is not a

-- there are instances in other cities of having some contagious disease, et cetera. Water and electricity. Hygiene, including restrooms and hand washing stations, as well as typically showers.

[2:48:12 PM]

We may have some sites in which those facilities are existing but I think the presumption is in many of the sites that we talk about today would need we would bring in mobile units for some of those resources. Making allowances for trash, pick-up for other kinds of waste collection is critical. Having sufficient lighting for the overall area, and then really thinking about handling of food and other items carefully so that we essentially are not encouraging the attraction of pests of any sort in addition to those very fundamental pieces, we would -- some of the amenities or services we would be thinking about would be laundry facilities, storage space. We know some people will come with more than will fit within their sent space or have items

[2:49:16 PM]

they wish to secure in a more robust manner than just in a tent. Most sanction encampment sites do meal distribution and really therefore have some control over the high general and safety of the food as well as the clean-up on site. We would anticipate that folks coming out of existing, unsheltered situations -- quite of a few of them will have pets and that will be a decision to be made as we move forward when we consider a particular site. And then of course we will be looking at the access to the rest of the city -- to amenities and services and transportation is critical there. In the case of one community, for example, there is not substantial access to transportation there but my understanding is that cap metro

[2:50:17 PM]

did work with them to provide that access. So not committing capital metro on their behalf but there may be ways to solve some of the challenges when we come into contact with a site we think could be viable. Typically we'll need to staff the site, both with general operation staff and most providers have recommended 24-hour security of some sort. And then, in addition to the operational folks -- staff members who are keeping the trains running, having services on site that meet basic needs but continue focus on housing so these are not places for folks to stay long term but we are

[2:51:20 PM]

moving them into permanent housing. This will be critical, I think if we want to utilize the spaces as temporary spaces through which multiple folks could use a tent, for example, or a structure over the course of a year with the idea they are becoming rehoused I spoke a little to the individual shelters or provided tent shelters as one approach that some localities have taken. Perhaps the biggest challenge that we hear from our partners is that very often sanction encampments have set up as temporary, but they tend to be quite difficult to demobilize. We want to think through our time line on a particular site.

[2:52:21 PM]

There may be intended uses for O location we discuss today that would necessitate demobilizing an encampment there in the midterm so that it would not be available long term, and obviously if we continue to have very substantial need for shelter over time, it, you know, as a community we may need to consider a more permanent shelter structure. With that, I will turn it over to director Kim mcneily with parks and recreation department who will talk you through the process of assessing the properties that staff looked at as potential sites for the encampments

>> Next slide, please. I don't believe -- thank you very much. I'm Kimberly from parks and

[2:53:21 PM]

recreation department, serving as director. Please know that right now staff reviewed approximately 70 city-owned properties and those were a combination of parkland that was identified by park and recreation staff as possibilities along with properties that were considered surplus but does not mean they're not being listed for something and that list was received from the real estate office. Each of those properties -- many of those properties are not owned by the parks and recreation department but are owned by a variety of departments including public works, Austin water, Austin energy is not listed, Austin water shed protection was part of this. There's also some considerations for pieces of land that were

[2:54:23 PM]

sliver Eric -- that were slivers. It was considered part of the surplus. The initial round was preliminary and based on analysis that was very base. If we could go to the next slide. The basic things we took a look at with regard to these properties included the length of use. We were hoping we would be able to use the property for two years and we're analyzing whether that's appropriate or whether that's in the

list of properties that have been brought forward. We need at least two acres of property for approximately 50 people. If you doubled that, four acres for approximately a hundred people. We were looking for access or had been looking at access for

[2:55:24 PM]

transportation. Bus line easily accessible by individuals -- that's a taking a little time to delve into the mobility options. Is there access to grocery stores or other resources in the area. Is there proximity to a school or other child care facilities? Is that something we want to consider as a consideration? What kind of land environmental concerns we have. Is it in the flood plane? We worked with the fire department to determine the risk and how close a fire hydrant might be. With 70 properties, while it might be easy to remove some because they weren't large enough or they were in the flood plane, not every property has had a full analysis. We've also been working with the law department and treasury department to see if there's

[2:56:25 PM]

risk associated with the use of those properties based on how they were acquired or purchased. I have been contacted with each of the council offices and if you haven't received a phone call from one of the team members you will in the near future to also be understanding what your thoughts are about properties that may be in your district. There is an intention for us once we are able to do a full analysis of the properties to be able to bring forward properties that seem the most appropriate and do some community engagement associated with the use of that. We also want to ensure that we are working with our real estate department to see if there are public or private owned properties. While this first assessment was 70 city owned properties we're working to identify properties not city owned, perhaps owned by other governmental entities or perhaps partner properties that

[2:57:26 PM]

may be willing to assist in this endeavor. And we have -- we need more time to work on the complete feasibility. So if you go to the next slide, the next two slides, if you start with the first one you'll see there are 45 pieces of property listed. Those 45 different pieces of property are listed because of the 70 -- I'm sorry. There's 35 pieces of property not listed -- I'm sorry -- 25 pieces of property not listed because they were in the flood plane and prone to flooding or they were too small for us to consider. They didn't meet the base criteria. All other properties are listed because they're under a certain -- a review process. You'll see some of them have specific addresses and some of them were in the system as - larger pieces of property that didn't have a specific address because that's how each department referred to them, so

[2:58:28 PM]

I'm still working through the details of if we were even going to consider this piece of property by way of example -- colony park. Colony parkland is associated with the colony park neighborhood. Catellas neighborhood plan. It's on the list but there is a lot of research that needs to be done to see if this is an appropriate property to consider but it is part of the system where we know we own property that is not being used. It doesn't mean it's appropriate for this use but we didn't move anything necessarily from the list. We know there are properties that are preserves or part of environmentally sensitive areas that will be eliminated after we go through a more intensive look at the properties. If you go to the second page you'll see these are the other

[2:59:29 PM]

pieces of property that are listed. Again, it's the same process. We need to take a look at those pieces of property, like circle C park. Circle C park is a pretty big park and putting a single address on that park was difficult for us. Also, there's only portions of a particular area that might be able to be used. That's how circle C was in the system. It's not the neighborhood. It happens to be a part of the circle C distribute park but we have it written down in kind of short form. I want to emphasize just to make sure that everybody is clear that nothing has been selected at this particular point in time. Everything is being evaluated on the base criteria. Also, I'm open to feedback about other criteria that might be of interest to the council offices.

[3:00:31 PM]

I'd also like to say that there's more review that has to be done via our development services department and our permitting department. We would have to take a look at this a little more closely. If a piece of land was selected there may need to be mitigation. It may have to be cleared. There might have to be certain things brought in via infrastructure to make them workable and we have to evaluate the costs of making the pieces of property ready. There's much evaluation that needs to be done. This was the first blush and first review. I'd also like to put in a plug for the public works department and for the fire department for all the assistance they've given me in the first review of these properties. And with that said, I think it's time to turn it over to our public safety team who will likely be talking to you about

[3:01:31 PM]

the fire department review and some of their code considerations.

>> Good afternoon, mayor, council members. We're happy to talk to you about our partnership in this, looking after our community, all the folks that reside in your community. On behalf of chief baker --

>> Mayor, I'm sorry. I can't quite hear him

>> Can you hear me now

>> That's better

>> Good afternoon. On behalf of chief baker, we're happy to be partners in this process to find solutions to take care of our community members. What we're looking at is how for all the folks that reside in your community to do so safely, and that is being mindful of the sort of wild fire or fires that could damage infrastructure,

[3:02:32 PM]

whether it be a building or bridge or something along those lines. The next couple of slides our fire Marshall put together things from adopted city code and ordinances that provide direction on that. If we could move to the next slide and the one after that. There we go. This slide and the next. Apologize for the small print on there -- there are a number of items there that provide direction, things such as there's no camping by city ordinance allowed in any high wild fire risk areas. We've also got if there are going to be fires they're not within 25 feet of combustibles. If things are going to be set up in parks what sort of proximity you need for fire hydrants and trucks to be able to get in and put any fire that may exist in

[3:03:33 PM]

areas. There are other items without going into each of them specifically. Our goal is to make sure folks are residing safely and that there's no unintended consequences that result in a fire that would get beyond what it was contained in or that we would be able to put it out quickly on the occasion that something may occur in a tent. So with that, if you'd like to move to the next slide, again, this is a continuation of the codes that our fire Marshall put together to give some direction and guidance along with helping them -- the group to look at the different locations and see which location would be in a high wild fire risk area. Ultimately chief baker's concern and focus is that we don't have folks residing in high wild fire risk areas or in the woods in

[3:04:34 PM]

general. The safety and unintended consequence of any fire is negative and the damage that it could cause but we help find safe places for folks to reside as they're working through the different programs the city has to offer to ideally get back to a more desired position for them as far as housing goes. With that, those are our slides. I've got in the room with me our fire Marshall if there are questions for us. Otherwise, I'll hand it back over.

>> I have a question. Mayor? Or Kimberly?

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead

>> Yeah. Thanks. Thank you. Did you apply those criteria against this list?

[3:05:36 PM]

>> I'm aware of the criteria and still working through the list so it has not been applied to every piece of property. I'm still culling through all the properties that at least meet the size and are not in the flood plain but I haven't been able to apply it to every piece of property. I'm working on it but it's not done yet

>> Thank you, director. Appreciate it.

>> Mayor Adler: Can we move the slide?

>> I just want to confirm -- thank you, director. So I know and I'm sure others know what wild fire risk is their area and I can tell you it

[3:06:39 PM]

is in my area. Just because it's on this list doesn't mean that the assessment has been done so although the flood risk areas have been taken off, if I'm understanding correctly, the wild fire risk areas have not been taken off. I would urge you to do that as soon as possible. I think there's -- I expect to hear quite a bit concern that the area -- about the area in my neighborhood --

>> If I might add that's sage advice and there are pieces of property that I'm sure individuals within the community are aware may be a particular -- maybe a particular preserve or habitat for animals that also -- species, not just animals, that also make it not suitable for this purpose and we're still

[3:07:41 PM]

applying that criteria. That's sage advice and I want to make sure everybody else knows there are other criterias that have not been applied yet

>> Thank you. The Mary Moore sea Wright park is one of those. The wild fire risk being one of those. I want to put that on the record so there's not any misunderstanding from people who may see this list

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor, before we answer more questions we had a couple of concluding slides. I don't know if Diana was going to wrap up the presentation, but that's a great point. We take some of these sites off the list - we're asking for the call to action about adding sites and we'll follow up with each of you individually to look at other potential sites in your district. Those may not be city-owned properties but maybe you have a relationship with a private landowner or we can start with

[3:08:44 PM]

conversation with -- we look forward to the other additional steps of looking at other properties we have not considered because they're not part of our city-owned portfolio at this time. If Diana wants to conclude -- you can probably talk through the last few slides before we turn it over for more questions

>> Mayor Adler: Diana?

>> Yes. I think that largely the -- what remains was a discussion of next steps that we talked about a little at the beginning, which is that we would be coming back to council June 1st with further information. Of course during that time we will be looking at some of the options that the city manager just referred to in terms of potentially private properties of entities that may be interested in partnering with the city or other jurisdictions where they have property that could be suitable.

[3:09:44 PM]

And, you know, I think it is important to acknowledge parallel to this work we are continuing to push forward to advance the availability of permanent housing resources in our community and will not lose sight of that work while we work to potentially provide this crisis response.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you for the presentations. Let's continue with questions.

>> Thank you, mayor. I want to make a correction on this. It's the pavilion at the park. The other, don't bother looking at that.

[3:10:44 PM]

That's ever green cemetery. I know you didn't want to put a camp site on a cemetery. Anyway, that's all my response

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Council member Fuentes

>> Fuentes: Thank you. First, thank you staff of doing this work. I do have questions around, you know, what will be the process of selecting one. Are you selecting one or two? One thing I noticed on this list of potential sites is the omission of the word "Park" from several of the proposals. So I wanted to see -- was that intentional to leave out, for example, onion creek metro park. I could list several others. I think one thing we've learned from the past few years, is that there is a significant amount of

[3:11:45 PM]

mistrust in the city's response to how we address homelessness. So I think it's important we're as transparent and clear as possible. If we are considering park land we need to make sure we communicate those are potential sites. It doesn't sit well with me that we have sites listed that we're not being as transparent as we can be. If someone can speak to that, that was just -- or perhaps I'm missing something too

>> I'll speak to that. This was a preliminary list. There's no intention to be deceitful in any way, shape, or form. My understanding of the park system -- obviously I know what I'm trying to think about and when you think about onion creek metro park, that's a pretty big space but that entire park is not necessarily appropriate -- the northern part of the park is part of the buy-out area and that would not be appropriate. So perhaps we're only looking

[3:12:46 PM]

at -- we might only consider another portion of the park but we don't have a specific address that we're ready to nail down or that we're ready to communicate and so we were being as broad as possible, but it was not an intention in any way, shape, or form to be deceitful. It's on the list because it could be a possible action but the actual space that may or may not be appropriate has not been fully vetted with all of the criteria and the wild fire and the flood -- you know, and the flood and species. So it was intentionally vague but not meant to deceive and I can certainly make those corrections for the future so that people do not feel as though there is missing information. I'm happy to do that

>> Thank you, director. If you could share with us why park land is being considered and the criteria for why so many park-land locations have been

[3:13:48 PM]

narrowed down on this list

>> Well, I think that -- first of all, there's not -- when you look at the surplus land that's available via the real estate office, many of those pieces of property were not going to meet the size criteria or were in the flood plain. Based upon the resolution, at least the way I interpreted it, that there was a direction from council to consider park land, so it is included as part of the initial analysis. It doesn't mean those spaces will end up being brought forward as recommendations but I interpreted the -- and I think my colleagues, although I won't speak for them -- I'm only speaking for myself -- that park land was to be part of the consideration. I believe the resolution without reading it to you -- I believe it specifically says spaces designated by park and recreation department are available for camping. That's not the exact quote but

[3:14:49 PM]

that would give the expectation that park land would be considered. That it would at least be considered

>> Okay. Thank are.

>> Okay. Thank you. I think I was next.

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah, go ahead, Paige.

>> Ellis: I think there was a little bit of confusion going on, just because the park spaces, the locations for camping was not explicitly allowed. Now I know the property is written into ordinance, so I think there was just a lot of confusion where it was no camping in park spaces. I don't know that council has taken an official position that it should be in park spaces. I'm noticing some of the locations in my location like circle C metro park, those are locations where they have youth sports going on oftentimes. So I want to know a little bit more about the conversation -- I know there were considerations for proximity to schools, but I'm trying to understand a

[3:15:50 PM]

little more about youth sports, because, you know, even though we have a lot of green space in district 8, we have don't have a lot of youth sport activity are that aren't on a school property or something like that. Can you speak a little to how you're considering that -- that overlap?

>> Yeah. Thank you very much for asking the question. So another part of the criteria in the second round is a consideration of restricted access or restricting public access. So by way of example, there was something in 2019 that was sent out that talked about perhaps using recreation centers as an option or an opportunity for temporary shelter, and it was put out based upon a council resolution. And those would be entities that had restricted access to the public because they began to be used for a very specific purpose. And at that particular point in time, the council office has decided that those probably were in the choices

[3:16:50 PM]

that needed to be made. So in this second round, right, in the second round of review, I've taken note that that was something -- that was some council direction that was provided before. I've at least taken note of ideas that the council members gave me in 2017, and it will be a criteria that's applied in this next round. And I'll make sure -- it doesn't mean that it might not be something that council might not want to consider, but certainly as a challenge or an opportunity, but if we were going to put things in an opportunity category or a challenge category, a challenge to picking a particular piece of property that has a little of youth sports or other kinds of activities where youth are playing, or even adults are playing, and now the public access is restricted, that would be certainly something that I would think council might want to take into consideration. And that will be noted as a challenge to that particular property.

>> Ellis: I appreciate that background. I wasn't aware of that work in 2017.

[3:17:50 PM]

I'd love to get refreshed on it, just understanding are we talking about weather shelters or are we talking something that could potentially be a longer term conversation. Other considerations I have --

>> Go ahead -- I was just going to say, it's public information. I'll send you the link to the report.

>> Ellis: Perfect. And other considerations that I have are, you know, wanting to be mindful of the high wildfire risk areas, just knowing, you know, there could be some inadvertent issues, you know, with folks trying to warm up dinner and be high wildfire risk areas. So I really want to see how that list evolves as those assessments are made. And I also want to make sure that we're able to find, is a good combination of access to groceries, access to transportation. You know, we've got a number of bus routes in district 8, but it's only four, if I'm

[3:18:52 PM]

correct. It's really as far south, almost to hays county, to me would create a lot of transportation barriers. There are folks in my district I've met during the time count that are currently camping near where they work, so I want to make sure that we're not moving them further from -- one of the only consistent things that they have, which is maybe work and the gym so they can kind of go about their daily lives, even though they're currently camping. And so I'm right now not confident about the ones that are on this list right now, but I hope that we can get our heads together and I'll also reach out to, you know, maybe some private folks that might be interested. You know, we've got a good resource

network in district 8 of people who are compassionate about assisting folks. And so I don't -- I'm not -- I don't know that those spots on the list today are going to be the rice ones

-- the rightones for the district but I'm committed to finding

[3:19:54 PM]

them, so we're not diswebb disconnecting people from transportation. So we want to be able to check all the boxes so I look forward to working with you all on that.

>> Thank you, council member.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. I don't remember who was next.

>> You were next

[indiscernible] --

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead.

>> Thank you. I'd like to thank staff for all the hard work you've put into identifying potential camping locations. I understand it's no easy task but I'm hearing from my staff the locations in the backup, and I'm sure my colleagues are as well, some concern about negative feedback, about the unknowns related to these sites and the concern they're not 100% final yet. I want to make that clear, that these are just under consideration. And I'm looking forward to working with the city manager and/or Williamson and Travis county partners to move forward on this regional issue to make sure we strive for the best possible outcome for all involved. It's with that in mind that I would like to request staff no are a further breakdown of each parcel

[3:20:55 PM]

mentioned so that we can understand the advantages and challenges of each proposed location. And I want to make sure that we're mindful to bring Williamson county into any concessions about utilization of land in their county. That way we can help collaborate further. So with that said, my real question here is about homeless camping in public spaces. It's my understanding that that's currently against the municipal code for this city, chapter 9-4, article 2, specifically discusses no camping or homeless shelters in parks. Can you speak to how this might be allowed in parks events ordinance? Is it the same thought process similar to what council member Ellis mention -- the work done in 2017? And would we need to amend or change the ordinance in order to make that work?

>> That's really a question that we would need to explore a little bit further with our law department, but at first blush, based upon my understanding, that a -- camping is a reasonable use of a park space.

[3:21:56 PM]

Right? So -- but I hear what you're saying because this is -- this is camping for a specific population. So we're working with the law department to make sure that we determine how we would make that happen. But at this particular point in time, a park could have a camping location because it's a reasonable use or an expected use of a park space. And the parks & recreation director, through the processes of developing the land or designating the space for camping, is able to do that. But I understand there's a nuance to your question, in that this camping is specific to a particular population, and so I'm working with the law department on that question, as we speak. Right? So we'll have to apply that as another consideration. And, yes, ma'am, it may -- it may mean that we would have to consider a [indiscernible], but I'm not able to yet give you that recommendation at this particular point in time.

[3:22:57 PM]

And I also am not an attorney so I don't want to pretend that I know everything.

>> Right. And thank you for that. It's specifically in the municipal code mentions homeless shelters, including temporary living conditions for individuals who lacked a fixed residence and social services. I want to make sure we get that clarity from the law department and all council is made aware of that before we consider moving forward with that as a recommendation. Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member alter.

>> Alter: Again, just to reiterate what was said before, this list has not been gone through for high wildfire areas. That is a criteria that we'll use moving forward. Now, you mentioned there were 25 that were not listed because they were floodplain. The two properties that are listed in my district are right along the water.

[3:23:57 PM]

I'm not exactly sure how they could not be in the floodplain. So maybe we can have some conversations about that, and certainly there would be risks to water supply and other stuff for those two areas. And so I look forward to having those conversations about what might be appropriate in understanding the criteria and what's been applied or not. I wanted to ask if there are -- you know, we often purchase land as a parks department that's not yet developed into a park, or we get it dedicated or we somehow come in control of it. But it's not areas that are currently used by the community, not programmed, not preserve area. Are there parks on this list that fall into that kind of sweet spot for a park, where

[3:24:58 PM]

it's not actively being used as a park or preserve?

>> Yeah. There's a couple of items that are -- or a couple of park spaces on the list that are not fully developed. And so while we have not, again -- I want to emphasize, not fully vetted and we're not 100% sure if they would be appropriate, we know that you, as a council, just passed both Walter E. Long and the John transfer, Jr. Plans, while they are named parks, not all of that park is developed. There's a lot of space that still requires investment. We've not yet, as a city, been able -- I'm sorry, as a department -- been able to bring forward a vision plan for barn road district park. So that is a park that the park and recreation department currently owns that does not have a vision plan for it yet. And there's nothing that has been brought forward to council for consideration. There's also a piece of

[3:25:58 PM]

property out on Johnny Morris road called the walnut creek sports complex. And that particular park has some tennis courts, but the rest of the park, approximately 200 acres, is not developed at this particular point in time. I will say that I know, because that's a park, right, I know that there is some of the space that might be in a floodplain or not appropriate for development, but those are examples because you specifically asked the question, those are examples of pieces of land that the parks & recreation department owns that are parkland that are not fully developed.

>> Alter: Thank you. I think it's, you know, important to understand that not every park that's on this list has the same level of use and is at the same stage of its development and access, and that would be something that we would want to, you know, keep in mind as we are making some of these potential choices. I also want to underscore that we are not -- we have nowhere committed, a, that we're doing any of these, or B, that we're doing ten of

[3:26:59 PM]

them. We're trying to understand whether it is a step in our solutions to homelessness and for our ability to implement property as the voters have indicated. I also wanted to get a little bit more information -- there are two properties on north 35. I just wanted to get a sense of what properties -- I think it was 7211 and 7309. It looks kind of like they're on the same block. Is that the Home Depot property and then whatever is next to it?

>> Yes, ma'am. They're commonly referred to as the Home Depot property and the Chrysler property. And again, preliminarily, I know that there was a solicitation that has been -- that is under -- is in process right now, so I know that there will eventually be development there. I've been in contact with my

colleagues in EdD, who I believe are responsible for that particular solicitation. We have not had in-depth

[3:28:00 PM]

conversations about whether this could be appropriate or not appropriate, nor have we checked with the law department as to whether naming a piece of property that's in the midst of a solicitation, if there's any legal risks there. So it's a piece of property that was given to me by the real estate office as a surplus piece of property. But it has not been -- there has not been further layers of investigation put on top of -- we obviously know that it's not a high fire risk because it's not around wildfires, it's not around many -- much brush area, but we haven't applied any other criteria to determine its suitability.

>> Alter: Thank you. I think that just underscores that this is a very preliminary list that has had, you know, 25 out of the 70 knocked out, but is still, you know, just the first step to see whether we could identify a city-owned property that we might want to pursue as designated

[3:29:02 PM]

camping, or more than one, but again, no decision has been made that that is the appropriate -- what we ask for in the resolution was information so that we could make that decision and determine whether it was a piece of the solutions that we needed to be able to put forward as we transition to implement property. Thank you for your clarifications.

>> Yeah. And, council member, just to underscore what you said, when we talk a little bit about opportunities and challenges, sure, any given piece of property to be brought forward, I believe it's my responsibility, to the best of my ability, along with my colleagues, to inform you as a council what the opportunities are and what the challenges are so you can have a full consideration of that piece of property. So depending upon the outcome or the information that I receive from the law department, that might, you know, be listed as a challenge, or it might say this is just not even an appropriate property to bring forward, but I'm not there yet.

[3:30:02 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Council member tovo.

>> Tovo: Thank you, mayor. I have questions about kind of our current topic, which is about locations and criteria, and then I have some questions about the memo and some of the costs. So I'll start with the first bunch and then see if my colleagues have other questions on that topic, but just know that I have some questions I'd like to get to. First of all, I just want to say a huge thank-you to our staff. This

was a big lift and you did it very quickly and provided us with a lot of information, and so thank you for taking that task and really working hard on responding to it. I know that this is going to be a challenge. We all knew this was going to be a challenging consideration, and it will continue to be so, but I really appreciate those of you who are not setting some of the policies in the city that may prompt different kinds of responses, but are very much part of the solution creation. And so thank you for your leadership and for

[3:31:03 PM]

identifying these properties. Having said that, I think we've gotten dozens of emails just today alone, expressing concerns about parkland. So I know there are many concerns about some of the properties that people see on this list. And certainly, you know, understand those concerns and thank people for engaging. I want to echo something several of our colleagues -- several of my colleagues have said and just tell a very brief anecdote. We were contacted a couple weeks ago by a constituent, council member Renteria, in your district, actually, who may have written to the whole council or may just have written to a few of us, but expressing concerns about parkland, because that had come up right after we passed the resolution. And I wrote back to that individual and said, you know, I appreciate your feedback. Do you have suggestions about where you might suggest? And she wrote back and said, no, but I'm going to look. And has, over the last couple weeks, sent on multiple suggestions. And so I just want to really reiterate to our community,

[3:32:03 PM]

please help us with this. You know. We have people who are engaged in this topic throughout the whole city. Please look around at your own communities and help us identify other -- other sites that should be taken into consideration here. We have some good criteria that the staff have developed. I'm going to talk about a couple other criteria and ask for feedback about best practices that Diana, you and director Mcneely and others have learned from other cities, but I think we, as a -- if our public can help with us this task, I think that would be very beneficial. I, too, am pretty interested in looking at what some of those opportunities might be outside of parkland. I think -- I understand the reason why -- we have a lot of parkland and we have it in a lot of places, and if we put amenities in place in some of those, they will - they will last for a period longer than our designated

[3:33:05 PM]

encampments. Right? This might serve as an amenity for future generations of park users. So I understand -- I understand the -- I understand, and you're right when we said city-owned land, certainly parkland falls into that category. But I would invite my colleagues, too, to -- in addition, the public, but

my colleagues, too, to take a look at some of the city-owned parcels or parcels owned by private folks, to see what other sites might fill the bill that are in addition to the ones that are on our list. So as I understood, back to the criteria, as I understood the criteria that you've spelled out at this point, the universe includes sites that have not been -- you have not yet screened for other uses. So there are certainly sites on here that are very well utilized as parks. So at this point, that is not one of -- that's not a criterion that was used for

[3:34:07 PM]

screening. Is that accurate?

>> That's accurate. It's in the a criteria that was used for screening as in this purpose, but I can assure you that it would be part of a secondary -- a secondary screening where I would be communicating to the council offices the restricted access -- the public would have restricted access, should that piece of property be selected. So -- yes.

>> Tovo: Great. And it is very similar; you cited the resolution, which I also sponsored, to look at possibly using our rec centers. I think, council member Ellison, in answer to your question, it was not storm related. We recognized at that point in 2017 that we had a real lack of emergency shelter and needed to do something as a community and started that conversation by looking at whether our rec centers could be used, if we treated homelessness like the crisis that it is and responded in a way that we do to emergency crises, you know,

[3:35:08 PM]

could we get to a place of equilibrium by using some of our facilities. And as director Mcneeley said, the real trade-off of taking facilities well used and taking them out of use for a period of time, but also staffing them, it takes, as we really all know now, it takes such a tremendous effort from our city staff, a 24-hour effort, staffing in the state of emergency, that it just wasn't something we could take on at that point. But I think that is -- it is a comparable kind of conversation around some of those sites that are very well-utilized. There are a couple facilities on here that are a facility plus a parking area. So, for example, the Austin rec center, I think there's another rec center, maybe the northwest rec center is also on here. Can you help us understand, was the concept that the facility and the parking area, or is it the parking area, or is it just again at that top level, that is a site that meets the initial

[3:36:10 PM]

criteria?

>> At the very top level, it was -- because of the 2017 memo that had put out, I didn't want any councilmembers to think that I had forgotten about something that we had -- work that we had previously done. So at the very preliminary -- at the very preliminary level, it was on the list, and it was inclusive of those things that we have previously reviewed. Also, like I said, I realized the response that I had received from council, so in the secondary review, I would also hope to remind everybody what the decision-making process was back then and why these particular properties were not selected. So that's the recreation centers. When you think about the Austin regular arresting center and the parking lot, the one thing that I do need to just -- so everybody realizes, that parking lot is a shared multiuse space between Austin community college, Austin ISD, and the parks & recreation department.

[3:37:10 PM]

And so using that someplace exclusively without physically going inside -- you know, if we wanted to put it on the list, sure, but there would be challenges that I would note in there about the agreements that we have with regards to that particular place. So it was not intended to even mean the parking lot there, it was just to make sure that the councilmembers who sponsor the 2017 resolution realize that I hadn't forgotten about it.

>> Tovo: Thanks very much for that explanation. I know that's something I've already gotten a question about today, so I appreciate you addressing it. I'd like to talk a little bit about best practices and what some of the best practices are at this stage that you've -- that you've identified at this stage of your research. And I understand that producing what you did produce may have -- was the focus, and so maybe that's a conversation for another day.

[3:38:10 PM]

But I wanted to invite you to talk about it. But I also want to say, in addition -- you know, it's going to be a challenging conversation to identify some potential sites, though I still believe strongly we need to because we have to have those alternative spots for people to go as we respond to the passage of proposition B. I do want to say, especially since we had a really good presentation from our fire department, and I appreciate their collaboration on this, it is so important, and city manager, you and I over the last year, more than a year, have had an opportunity off the dais to have this conversation, sometimes with some of my colleagues. I've also had it with your staff. We are -- I think it is critically important that we set some very close standards for what is allowed at our designated camping areas, if that's a direction we move in, and I would urge you to please make sure that those same -- same items that were

[3:39:10 PM]

identified just a few minutes ago by the fire department are currently being enforced. I know again, you and I have had conversations, many of us have had conversations with you off the dais. It is -- having now had a second fire at an encampment in my district, I just feel it necessary to publicly say, please, we have propane containers at encampments along the hike and bike trail. There are generators. There is a generator at one of the shoal creek camps. We really need -- I think we would -- we really must enforce safety measures at the existing public encampments, and we must build confidence with the public that if we set up designated camping areas, we will enforce some of those very basic safety measures that -- you know, even back when we were having the public camping conversation around the ordinance, we had a conversation on council about whether those measures needed to be made -- needed to be articulated, and the answer was, no, these are

[3:40:12 PM]

just basic safety measures that are in place; they don't need to be articulated. They have not been enforced in many cases. So I think that's really critical to be said. And, again, I think if we are moving forward, as I believe we need to, on a path to creating designated camping areas -- not necessarily on any of the properties on this list, but somewhere -- we really need to of a very clear set of expectations for what will be allowed and what will not be allowed in terms of safety. So having said that I just wanted to invite our staff, are there -- I know you mentioned one, which is that it's very hard to close these, and so to me, a best practice -- turning that into a best practice would probably be having a very clear timeline at the outset of when these sites will open and when these sites will close, and that will give all of our community something to focus on in terms of fundraising and really focusing on housing those individuals in that area. Some of the others you've noted basic -- basic services. Are there other best

[3:41:13 PM]

practices that -- or other cities that you believe have done these very well and successfully that you would point the community's attention to or ours as councilmembers?

>> So I think that, you know, we are looking at what other communities have done, and I want to recognize, first of all, that cities, as you have, I think, pointed out, explicitly, council member, communities don't do this as an ideal solution. They do this, you know, when the situation sort of requires it in one way or another, given alternatives. And so there are absolutely challenges associated with it. I do agree with you that sort of being really clear about what the guidelines are in terms of maintaining health and safety has to be really our priority. There are some different approaches that I think we can discuss.

[3:42:13 PM]

So -- and none of them, I think, leap out as best practices. But around, you know, are these open encampments? Are they walkup? Is it regional? There are a number of ways of strategies or approaches we could take. I would not say that there are strong best practices in this field, but what we will be endeavoring to do, and we're already, you know, gathering, is all of the lessons that have been learned in other communities. You know, in San Francisco, for example, they have done -- you know, have reduced unsheltered and unauthorized camping within areas where they have established encampments that served that particular geographic region. I don't know how practical that is in our community, and I think it raises some real questions about

[3:43:17 PM]

fairness. But, you know, we'll be looking more closely at the operations in those communities and having conversations with them as well, as we come up with, as I said, the decision points where we need to make a choice.

>> Mayor Adler: Further questions on this? Council member pool, council member Fuentes, council member kitchen.

>> Pool: I have a question, director Mcneeley, about the rec centers and existing programming or, you know, before-times programming, for example at northwest rec, what plans would staff have if we were to move forward with northwest rec as a site, the parking area, is it inside? Is it both? And if it is inside, what about the displacement of the programming, primarily

[3:44:17 PM]

for youth, but not solely for youth, that currently --

>> So, council member, that would be a challenge. Right? Obviously, this council, it would be -- if they chose that to be a location, or any recreation center to be a location, my advice or my response to you would be that that would severely restrict public access, which would mean that there would be a number of programs that would not be able to happen if we decided to use a regular arresting center for a temporary shelter. And certainly that's a policy decision that could be decided by the council, but I would absolutely want to let you know how that would impact programming. And so to your point, that would absolutely impact the ability to run after-school summer camp programming, any of the programs that happen out of recreation centers. And if this council were to determine that the homelessness issue was

[3:45:18 PM]

something that was going to be resolved in the manner, then we would work to relocate those programs in other locations, although I don't know that we would be successful in running the same quality or the same number in alternative locations. But that's always a possibility, and based upon your direction, we would be flexible and we would make decisions to best serve the public at your direction. But I would definitely be giving you the recommendation of the number of individuals that would be displaced, should that be the choice that the council -- the council decided to make.

>> Pool: I remember the discussion when we saw the list back in '17 with the different rec centers and stuff, and I think that the same reluctance that existed then, and really good fundamental questions from the public, would be the same that we would be facing here today.

[3:46:18 PM]

And so I don't actually see a path forward for the rec centers.

>> And I would proactively just -- sorry to interrupt you, but proactively, I had

-- had erred the council in 2017 so I would try to include that information, as a reminder that this was the discussion in 2017.

>> Pool: Right. And so after I came out of the call that I had -- I guess it was yesterday, with the potential sites in district 7, I offered up to staff that my team has already been in conversation with some of our partners in district 7. And they may, in fact, be the places that get the additional look. I recognize that you were primarily looking -- or similarly looking at city-owned land, and these would be not city-owned areas but my team will be

[3:47:20 PM]

exploring partnerships with the community on potential campsites because, you know, I'm committed to trying to find a way to make this work. But the sites that you've designated in district 7, none of them meet that criteria. They just won't work. I don't see them as primarily being temporary to the extent that you can then return them to the state that they were in before designating them as campsites. And this is one of the -- saying that camping can occur on parkland. And I can see where you might have -- where you interpreted the language in the resolution to include literal parks, but I think if I was reading it, and I've been talking -- if I had talked with you about it, I think I would say, well, I think maybe that the intention there is land that the parks department has, but that isn't necessarily park, public parkland, which is how it was looked at, for example, public works or

[3:48:20 PM]

Austin energy, we weren't looking at Boston energy headquarters for a homelessness site, or the garage attached to Austin energy headquarters. Right? But that same parallel construction was not used with regard to the public parks. And they are public. And they are not designated for certain -- for camping, primarily because we don't see the use of that land in that fashion. So they're day parks and they're mostly closed at night. So I did want to just mention that my team is actively connecting up with folks in district 7, like I mentioned to staff yesterday. We will initiate those conversations and then turn any contact over to staff so that you guys can work your magic.

>> Thank you.

>> Pool: And again, the key here is our opportunity to approach this in a regional

[3:49:22 PM]

way. It's a regional challenge, and we have to have regional solutions. And to the extent that we are in Williamson county, I think we're now in three counties; right? Aren't we also, the city of Austin a little bit in hays county? So we should be including not just Travis county and Williamson county commissioners, but also our friends in hays county and Caldwell county, frankly, just to really expand that conversation and move together, forward. And also so that we can show that the city of Austin cannot and should not be seen as able to carry this burden solely, solely on our shoulder. So thanks to the staff for all of the work, and I will labor to convince my district 7 residents that that list is not a done deal. But I think we're going to need some messaging coming from our communications staff in order to help lift

[3:50:22 PM]

that presumption. Because that's how it's been interpreted, and that's no surprise. So --

>> I will work on that communications with our communications staff, and I welcome any leads. Thank you.

>> Pool: Yeah. That's great. That's great. To the extent we all have the same baseline information, that will help us carry a coordinated message forward. Thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member kitchen, then council member Fuentes.

>> Kitchen: I wanted to ask about -- a question related to information that was on the memo, I believe, and that had to do with cost. The reason I want to ask that is I want to ask the relationship between that and the size. You know, we've all talked about how difficult it is to find a place that's appropriate for temporary camping. And I am wondering if you

[3:51:26 PM]

all had thought about places that are smaller in terms of the number of tents or shelters they might accommodate, or might even be places that -- churches, for example, might have available. But I remember, from looking at the memo, that part of the reason I expect might be -- for looking at larger sizes is because of the synergies and the kinds of things that you need to put up in terms of infrastructure. But I think that there might be some relationship between the difficulty in finding a place and the size we're looking for. So can you just talk to us about what y'all's thinking was there and whether you think it might be appropriate to look at places that are smaller, that might take 25 people, for example, instead of 50 people, and just help us understand your thinking on that? And also whether you think that we're not there yet and

[3:52:28 PM]

that that might be something that we might have to consider later. Just tell me what your thinking is on that.

>> Yeah. So preliminarily, the reason why I went with 50 or more was because of economies of scale. If you had less than 50, and you had 25, you would likely probably need approximately the same number of showers and laundry, the way that the laundry facilities come. So the costs for 25 people are not very -- are not significantly less than the costs for 50 people. However, the costs for 50 people are approximately anywhere between -- between 800 and -- I'm sorry -- 700 and \$500,000 less as it is no are a hundred people. So those are all very preliminary costs. Please, I hope that you won't grill me on the exactness of that. But the reason why we went with 50 is because anything less than 50, it almost felt as though, when you talk about economies of scale, you'd be spending the same amount of money as you

[3:53:29 PM]

would -- as you would for about 50 people. And then secondly, a lot of very small pieces of properties that were eliminated originally, less than two acres, were really -- I'm not saying that this isn't an option, but not for this particular project, were really lots that were in between already residential housing units, so they were already little lots that we owned, but there was a house and another house on either side of that, and it didn't seem as though that would be conducive to putting an encampment or few tents over there, plus all the services that needed to be provided. However, that doesn't mean that those pieces of land should be excluded for other kinds of creative ways to help people, but that's not -- that was not what I was asked to do in this particular project. So that hopefully gives you a little bit of an understanding.

>> Kitchen: Yes. That makes sense. However, what I'm thinking, though, is as you work with councilmembers, there may be opportunities to share costs or to reduce those costs.

[3:54:31 PM]

Costs were actually pretty high, I thought, and understandable, but they are pretty high for this kind of temporary investment, and the thing that we have to be careful of is keeping our focus on more permanent housing and not diverting a lot of funding to temporary encampments like this. So I'm thinking that there may be opportunities with churches or other nonprofits or other entities that may have locations, you know, that may actually have a shower or restroom facilities on site, that would -- that would provide a lower cost in terms of, you know, putting up temporary shelters. So I'm sure -- you need to remain focused on the task that you have in front of you, but I'm thinking that for others who may be looking around in your districts, or just to nonprofits and churches in the community who may be thinking about this, again, they need to be

[3:55:33 PM]

appropriately located and, you know, not in areas that would -- you know, would be problem for neighborhoods or things like that. But I'm just thinking that we might need to think more broadly, at the end of the day, to be able to actually locate some sites at a less costly amount.

>> Council member, with that advice, I can certainly -- I wrote that information down, and certainly when I'm doing some of the review, that might be an opportunity that I could add to the list. I can't guarantee it for every property, but it'll be on the top of mine when I'm reviewing this included second review.

>> So my questions are the June 2nd memo that the staff will report back with, will that have -- what is the next step? Will you all recommend -- we could stand up 10

[3:56:33 PM]

encampments or sanctioned camping sites in all 10 of our districts, because then we would also have to identify the 10-plus million dollars to go with running those sanctioned campsites. So are we -- for expectations with my community, the June 2nd memo, will that recommend one sanctioned camping area, or two, or as many that meet the criteria that you all are currently looking for? And then also, if you can clarify whether the floodplain list -- if that has already been assessed on the proposed list that we're looking at today, or is that analysis still being done?

>> So I'll answer the last question first. The areas that -- there have been properties that are eliminated because they were clearly all in the floodplain. There are properties that remain on the list where part of the property is in the floodplain and part of the property is elevated.

[3:57:33 PM]

But what has not happened is a complete analysis of, should there be extensive rains or a flood situation, what risk is that elevated property at. I haven't been able -- there were some that clearly -- you could just clearly take off the list, but others that have an elevation that are still under -- you know, still have to be reviewed. And to answer the second question, I think that we will take all the feedback that you have provided for us today and probably, as a team, get together and discuss how we would like to bring forward properties in the future. I do believe that the resolution very specifically said a minimum of one property per district. And I would be amenable, if there were more than one property that seemed to meet the core -- not just the base, but some of the core feedback you provided me, bus lines, does not restrict public access, those things that you told me today, that

[3:58:34 PM]

if there were more than one property in given district that seemed property, I think that providing choices -- we always say in youth development, voice and choice, providing choices might be appropriate. But I don't want to speak for my entire team, and I think we would have to just discuss the best possible way, but certainly would take feedback from the council offices.

>> Thank you, director. Then, manager cronk, how would you like us to share community feedback with you, and what can the community expect in terms of community engagement on the proposed list and/or, like, what's the best way for us to ensure that we -- that, you know, you're looped in on the feedback that we're receiving in our respective districts?

>> Thank you, council member. Certainly, as a short next step, we will be setting 7:00 meetings with each of you to talk about the locations that were identified in your district, the call to action that has been expressed a number of times about other potential sites, and hearing from your constituents about their

[3:59:35 PM]

engagement. And so I think we were planning to establish an email address specific to this type of feedback, but we'll have that to you, if not today, then tomorrow so you can start to filter comments that way as well.

>> Yeah. I think having an email address would be great for us to share out, especially since this is all being made public today, that way, we can start capturing the feedback that we're already receiving. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: You know, this is -- this is hard work because there's not a good answer for the challenge we're trying to execute. In a lot of ways, we're always trying to find the best answer among choices that we -- that we don't like. That said, manager, you know it's your job to enforce the law, as voted by the community. I appreciate trying to reach a balance between speed and

[4:00:40 PM]

humaneness in this. I would urge you to overcommunicate on this issue to the public. There's -- if the public continue to see tents, it's real important for them to understand why they continue to see that. And I think that if we go silent or there's not real strong communications on this, it'll be misinterpreted as not trying to apply the law or to enforce the law. So I would urge you to just really, really, really overcommunicate on this issue as to what's happening. You know, more frequent memos to council that are public for people to see. Just whatever, so that peak can see what it is at any point in time, as to what's going on. As you go through this analysis, Ms. Mcneeley, I

[4:01:41 PM]

would also add my voice to those that are saying that it would be hard to vote to locate something in a park area that was being utilized for its park purposes by the community. I know that was kind of the sentiment in 2017, but I just want to reiterate that as well. Manager, I would also suggest that the safety issues that were raised with respect to what's happening in, you know, potential sanctioned camp areas, that we do a really strong effort to enforce those all over this city where we have ecampments now. There was a list of things that were back in the resolution that we passed in June of 2019 that was considered by the council later that fall that, I think, lists some of those things that seem to follow from the existing laws and

[4:02:46 PM]

ordinances, we should really do that. It's going to be difficult to -- [audio difficulties] -- Places to have on a piece of paper, reiterating that there's no choices made with respect to these, but I think there has to be a list at some point to start, and I think when it started, people are now going to be able to comment to it, and the locational search will be sharpened in part because there was a list for people to be able to react to. And even doing this, there will never be the perfect location for any of these things, just because that kind of thing doesn't -- doesn't exist. But I'm happy we're starting that process, and I think we have to work our way through it. When this conversation does really reiterate the need for an emphasis to get housing exits from these locations, so that they are, in fact, temporary, and so

[4:03:46 PM]

that people just don't go into these places and end up being warehoused, it's -- as we move people into places like this, essential camp areas, we need to pull them out into places that are better equipped to get them back into society or help them stabilize their lives. And I appreciate the work that everybody in the community is doing to try to catch up in that infrastructure that we're so, so far behind on. And I'm happy that we're actually getting started in an even more accelerated way to do this. The single biggest problem to homelessness is housing prices, as housing prices go up, it gets harder and harder to own a house, you see increases in homelessness in cities across the country, and Austin is the poster child for that. We've got to get a system established in our community

[4:04:47 PM]

where, six to eight years from now, the challenge is going to be so far beyond any scale we can do anything about, now is the time that we have to get that system in place. And I hope there are some suggestions about size. It may be, as we locate these, that we can't get the bigger sites in order to be able to locate them. Maybe there is an opportunity to get parking areas and churches that would be willing to take some folks, hope we're doing that kind of potential outreach too, sanction parking areas and parking lots, to be able to take a look at. It's real clear and reaffirming for me that these need to be in all parts of the city so that everybody -- everybody is participating in the challenge that we have. Council member Renteria, then council member kitchen.

>> Renteria: Thank you, mayor. And, you know, I agree with you that everybody should

[4:05:49 PM]

participate. You know, I've been able to identify a site that I think would probably work, that could take in under 50 people. But, you know, unless everyone else participates, I don't feel my community would accept, you know, a homeless campground on this location, and if they do, they would want to make sure that it is -- the homeless people are coming from my district area, you know, from that particular area. Because if we don't do that, it just -- it won't work. You know, so far, we've only gotten, what, three hotels? I was the first one that raised my hand up. I didn't get a lot of push-back on it. But I thought since everyone was going to get a hotel, we were going to go get the homeless in my district to transition them up to

[4:06:50 PM]

permanent housing, where it just didn't work out that way. And I'm very hesitant to go out there and raise my hand again, unless everybody participates, and if I'm the only one or a few that participate, then I feel like it should be the homeless encampments at my district, should go in there first. You know. And that's how I feel about it because, you know, we always make that commitment that we're going to have a hotel in every district; it just didn't work out. So if we're going to have a campsite in everybody's district, then we need to make sure that everybody's district gets one, and then it concentrates those homeless that live in their district to give them an opportunity to go into a encampment so that we can -- a campsite sowe can transition with them and work them out to permanent housing.

>> Mayor Adler: I think it was Ann?

>> Kitchen: Let's see. I wanted to -- thank you, council member Renteria. I understand that concern,

[4:07:51 PM]

and I think we are hearing those kinds of concerns from our constituents, and it's certainly understandable. And something that we need to be thinking about how we're going to address. I wanted -- I wanted to say two things. First off, I wanted to ask that we -- I appreciated when council member tovo brought forward her resolution, that she put in it that this is not to supplant our efforts to get people connected to housing. And I think that's going to be very important, and that is important both from the perspective of the time and energy that our various staff members spend on this, but also the cost. So -- because it appears to be a sizable cost for temporary camping, I hope that we would consider whether, you know, in individual circumstances, it makes more sense to help an

[4:08:53 PM]

individual in an apartment or something like that. I know that doesn't work for everyone. But to the extent that it does, if we're going to offer someone a place in a temporary camp at a cost that could be more, actually, than staying, you know -- getting them launched in an apartment, I hope we're -- I hope we're weighing all those things. I know it's not that simple, and I know there's a lot of different needs for people, but I'm just wanting to caution that we need to be looking at the cost at the same time that we're doing this. So related to that, I just have one specific question related to cost. I notice that the cost for laundry, for example, was large, and -- on an annual basis, regardless of the size of the camp, and I'm just hoping that what we're doing is looking at options like mobile shower trailers that are able to serve more than one camp at a time. So I have some specific questions about the line

[4:09:55 PM]

item costs that were part of the memo. So I don't know if you want to answer those now, or I can send those specific questions to Diana or to Kimberly, whoever the appropriate person is. I'm just thinking -- I'm very concerned about the level of the cost and hoping that we can reduce those.

>> Sure. I'll speak and then let director Mcneeley fill in. Yes, so, you know, I think when we sort of developed the pro Forma budgets for 50 or a hundred-unit site, there was no assumption made about how many sites there would be overall and what resources could be shared, and certainly the mobile mobile showers are a good example of something like that, that were they to serve a single site, impose a very significant cost. So we will -- as counsel direction takes shape, we will certainly look for opportunities to chief some savings and, you know, think

[4:10:55 PM]

about any of the amenities or services that are particularly costly.

>> Mayor Adler: Kathie?

>> I will only add that we did not consider -- each of those costs are for stand-alone locations. There was not a consideration, so...

>> Kitchen: Thank you. So we can't just multiply it by 10 and think that that's the cost, necessarily. Okay. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Kathie, you said you had some questions about cost as well?

>> Tovo: Yeah, I did. And they run a bit along the same lines -- am I to understand the exchange that took place just now to suggest that say the shower trailer might service all -- might service five encampments, is that what you were suggesting, council member kitchen?

>> Kitchen: I was asking if that -- I think what they answered for me was that, you know, there's the temptation to say that the cost for one, if you have

[4:11:56 PM]

ten, it's time ten? But what I'm hearing is that they didn't account for the potential, you know, other cost sites. So I just want to caution the public to not think in terms of if we're talking ten sites, that it's ten times the cost of one. You know, with the mobile showers being an example of where you can have services across multiple sites at the same cost. So that's the only point I was trying to determine.

>> Tovo: Yeah. Thank you for that.

>> Yeah. And I think, to your question, council member tovo, I mean, I think that's the most obvious example of a resource that could be shared and would level your per-person cost, per se. It is, of course,

as you correctly point out, council member kitchen, you know, it is expensive to operate these kinds of encampments, and so that will be a consideration in terms of how we balance that with

[4:13:00 PM]

other needs to serve this population.

>> Tovo: And so I think -- you know, I was concerned when I saw the -- when I saw the list of costs, and, you know, that immediately started to prompt concerns from members of the public, too, from all sides of the issue. And so I guess I want to back up a little bit on them and really understand some of the -- some of these costs. And let me say again how much I appreciate you providing this to us on such a short time frame. I think this is really good information for us to have. And, you know, as the mayor said -- having a list, having this information provides a starting place, we need to make progress quickly. Having said that, I believe that we should really consider these just in the way they were proposed, which is an alternative we need, but not where we want

[4:14:00 PM]

to put a lot of our investment, because we want to continue to preserve our investment for those shelter and permanent housing opportunities. And so, you know, I really think we should consider these in the same way we do the safe sleep program. And so maybe these are safe sleep options, as designated camping areas, we don't traditionally provide laundry services within the context of safe sleep program. We don't traditionally provide meals within that context, nor do we provide services. And so I guess, to me, you know, as I look at some of the costs on here, I think that those might be the things, unfortunately, that are going to have to fall off if we are trying to get these sites up and running very quickly so that we can continue to focus our case managing services on the hill locations, so some of the other needs. If we had the funding to do all of those things, absolutely I would like to see every individual who's

[4:15:01 PM]

experiencing homelessness supported with case management. I know that's everyone's goal here. But we need to be kind of realistic about what we can and cannot take on in this -- with our current level of funding. And so just to kind of level set, you know, that's where I see some of the changes happening probably from here to implementation. And I'd also like to say, I think this is another area where I think we can ask our partners to assist. We have a lot of philanthropic minded individuals, perhaps they would like to sponsor mobile showers at three of the ten locations, or perhaps there could be a safe food option partnership with some partner organizations. I don't mean asking community members to come

and bring food, which gives me -- makes me concerned about the safety of the individuals who would be receiving that food, but if there are volunteer organizations who want to step up and make a commitment to provide food over time, you know, that might be an option that

[4:16:04 PM]

makes sense. Right now, in the interim, we do have the eat program that is providing food to individuals experiencing homelessness, and so that's being funded through, you know, the 300,000 on here in this next year or so already has funding. So I'm not sure whether this was contemplated as ongoing meal service at the designated camping areas or whether it's for this period of time where with we're trying to provide those meals as a pandemic response. So I guess that's a question.

>> There was no particular assumption made about whether eat would come into this or not. I believe it was one of the costs that was included in that memo -- or excuse me, the resolution. I may be mistaken. I will say that for most operators, I think their input is -- it is obviously a substantial cost. Most of them provide at least one meal a day. And I think part of the consideration there is about

[4:17:06 PM]

the ability to really maintain that health and safety environment, so, you know, most of our fires are caused by cooking fires, currently. And so -- which is what people are using when they need to prepare their own food. And the need to keep food within tents, obviously, I think, you know, creates more opportunity for some problems around sanitation. And so those are all considerations, absolutely. But, again, this is sort of a menu of the costs that we know about as being typical. And so we can certainly get more granular as we move forward.

>> Tovo: Well, that's helpful. I understand then the consideration around meals. So some of the services such as laundry might be shared among different sites. Some say trash and maintenance are costs

[4:18:07 PM]

frankly we're incurring at some of the public -- oh dear -- am I still here?

>> You are.

>> Tovo: Okay. We lost power for a moment. Some of those costs we're currently incurring throughout our city at public encampments --

>> Yes.

>> Tovo: -- You know, that we would actually -- even at 10 timings 35,000, there would be savings in that line item. So I want to point that out to the public as well. Can you help me understand the relationship - I think it's important just to get back to a point that council member kitchen raised. So we have the hill initiative, and I think it's worth just pausing there for a minute and talking about the relationship and just making sure that we're all really crystal clear that there is still -- the hill initiative is still continuing to move forward and will focus on four encampments connecting those individuals with permanent housing, and we've had some -- we've had some contracts on our agenda

[4:19:08 PM]

already, and we'll have some additional ones. So the services here would be -- would be after hill and kind of with the next batch of encampments that would, at that point, be designated -- or can you talk me through the relationship there?

>> Sure. I will say that I don't know that we have determined the relationship clearly because we have not determined how heal going forward would be resourced, so how much rehousing we would be able to be doing directly from an unsheltered status, nor the number of sanctioned encampments. Are you able to hear me now? It looks like I'm having some connectivity issues as well.

>> Tovo: Yeah, we can hear you.

>> But I would say, you know, that I think fundamentally, the concept

[4:20:08 PM]

of heal is that -- most important thing is not where the interim shelter is, whether that is -- you know, could be in a sanctioned encampment, or in, as we have at south bridge, the new south bridge shelter, in this case a converted hotel, but that we are dedicating permanent housing resources and immediately beginning to move people into housing. And so ideally, certainly, should we have any number of sanctioned encampments, we would have ready resources so that when someone entered, and maybe even before, we are able to assess their needs, refer them to either a rapid rehousing provider, a permanent supportive housing provider, or if there are other needs that they have, so that that process of getting them off the street has already started.

>> Tovo: Yeah. Thank you. I think it's important that we not think of these as permanent destinations, as many of you have mentioned already, that our approach

[4:21:09 PM]

is going to continue, even if designated camping areas are established, the intent is going to continue to be to use the approach from heal with individuals who are in the designated encampments and connecting them to the services and to the permanent housing that -- that is really our goal. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. All right. Colleagues, it's 20 after 4:00. We're going to try to get to the [indiscernible] If we can. Ann?

>> Kitchen: Just to quickly clarify, I think you meant this, Diana, I just want to make sure it came across that way. The initial -- when you say we don't know what the resources are for heal, you mean after the first four. We have the resources for the first four. The question is continuing it past that.

>> Yes, council member. Yes. Thank you.

>> Kitchen: Good. Just want to do make that clear for folks.

[4:22:09 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Colleagues, anything else on this before we try to hit the pulled items? Council member Kelly?

>> Kelly: Thank you. While looking at the costs, it occurred to me that I haven't seen a comparison of the costs of sanctioned campsites for city of Austin would provide, versus something like

[indiscernible] Has been dealing with over the last year or so. Is there any way to get a side-by-side on that, by reaching out to the governor's office, so we can maybe utilize some lessons learned in.

>> Council member, I've already reached out to the foundation, the interesting running camp Esperanza, and I can tell you that preliminary aerial the cost estimates are tracking to something similar to what the foundation has suggested would be the appropriate costs. But I can work on trying to get a cost -- a side-by-side comparison. But they're tracking

[4:23:10 PM]

similarly.

>> Kelly: Great. If you could provide that to council, that would be wonderful. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Ann?

>> Kitchen: Just very quickly, a number us, many of us have been hearing from folks who are offering, you know, innovations in terms of tiny -- not tiny homes even, just temporary structures. So I know that part of council member tovo's resolution was, at a later time, to come back with recommendations related to that. I just wanted to ask if you are factoring in or considering any of those kinds of offers, I suppose you would call them, that are coming forward from different sources.

>> Yes, council member. We've been gathering some of those examples. I think that many of you have received, as you say, emails or contact from vendors. Feel free to forward those to us, and we can speak to,

[4:24:12 PM]

I think at the next reporting, through the memo or briefing, you know, what our perception of the relative costs and benefits are of using something like that.

>> Kitchen: Thank you. I think some of those are very -- it's very innovative and interesting, the kinds of structures that are being -- that are being developed, at fairly low prices, too. So thank you assist if I could add to what Diana said, please know that we've also preliminarily gauged dsd with regards to permitting, because depending upon the type of structure, there may be some things that we have to work through. So preliminarily, we haven't selected a structure nor a site, but they're on standby to help us with that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else for right now?

[4:25:14 PM]

Ms. Mcneeley, thank you. Thank you to the rest of the staff on this. We'll move to pulled items. Manager, thank you. Please overcommunicate on this to the community. Let's go to pulled items, colleagues. We have about half an hour. The first pulled item, item number 13, council member kitchen, you pulled this?

>> Kitchen: Yes. Given that amount of time, I'm happy to have that one go last if there is time for it because I just wanted to quickly point out a few things to my colleagues, but I know there's quite a few things that are up, so --

>> Mayor Adler: We'll come back to you then. Thank you. We'll come back to you then. Thank you.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Item anybody 29 you also pulled. This was capmetro tod, that's being postponed.

>> Kitchen: Well, I think that -- I'm not sure that everyone agrees to

[4:26:14 PM]

postponing it, probably we would, but I'm wanting to have a conversation on Thursday -- I don't think we should today because the mayor pro tem is not with us, and, you know, we need to have that conversation when she's available.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: Do you know if she will be participating on Thursday at this point?

>> Mayor Adler: I anticipate her being here on Thursday. I haven't heard otherwise. If we're going to postpone it, we can certainly discuss it in the context of postponing it.

>> Kitchen: Right. Yeah. I would want to be able to discuss it because if we postpone it and then -- because we have yet to have a discussion, and we've had to postpone it several times, which is fine; it's just we need a time to discuss it or we'll never get to -- you know, we'll never get to a point where we can move it forward. So, that's fine. We don't have to do it right now. We'll wait.

>> Mayor Adler: Yep. Item number 60, council member Fuentes, you pulled that?

[4:27:14 PM]

>> Fuentes: Yes. I think we can hopefully -- it shouldn't take too long, but this resolution goes right in line to -- or it's related to a conversation around the American rescue plan dollars, and what I'm sure all of us have now received several emails and calls from individuals in the arts community and in the music community, and what we know is that these communities are asking for help now. They are on their last leg, and so when we talk about the deeper transformational projects for these communities who have been hard hit from the pandemic, and because of the winter storm, the need is for stabilization and recovery funding. And so that was kind of the impetus -- it was why I'm bringing forward this resolution. The resolution does a number of things. First and foremost, it reaffirms our commitment to the four policy challenges that we prioritize in the resilient atx resolution, being number one, homelessness, food and housing insecurity, early

[4:28:16 PM]

childhood care, and jobs for working class austinites and workforce development. It reaffirms our commitment to those four priority buckets. And then it also directs the city manager to provide a plan to how we appropriate stabilization and recovery funds for up to 15 million over the two years for the arts community and up to 10 million over two years for the music community. And this plan is important. It goes right in line with the conversation we were having earlier, because we know there is spending available, not only through the arp, but also through the city general revenue fund budget, and other local, state, and federal funding. We know that both of these communities are also seeking funding from Travis county, and so we're trying to get a holistic plan, as much as we can, to see how we can provide

this crucial stabilization and recovery funding. It also draws attention to the legacy business relief grant program.

[4:29:16 PM]

We talked about this before on the dais, about the need for us to include nonprofits as eligible to receive part of the funds from this program. And so we have met with EdD staff. They are aware of the need for us to be able to offer funding for our nonprofits, and so they -- I don't know if they're available to speak to this or we could talk about it on Thursday, but there are a couple of ways we can address this. And then thirdly, this resolution that I think I really want to hone in on is what the arts community has made very clear, that they don't want if you think the from the arp to go towards -- funding to go towards backfilling the hot deficit, which is believed to be four to five million, they would prefer for that to be paid out of the H.O.T.

[4:30:16 PM]

Revenue that we garner, over a longer period of time. This is a then unknown process, it's one that we just went through, one that was undertaken in 2008, and one that EdD has already had conversations with our budget staff about. So there is a distinction there that when it comes to funding our cultural arts and music community through the arp funds, the request is that any allocation that we make from the arp funds, that it goes towards stabilization and recovery, first and foremost, and that any funds needed to back

--backfill H.O.T. Would be best served at a later time or we would prefer the city manager to come back to us with recommendations in how to address that deficit over a number of years, and that practice has been explored before. And so this would also direct the city manager to come back to city council by

[4:31:17 PM]

June 8th with that plan. You know, it goes over all the potential funding sources. We realize the arp is just one of the potential funding sources. The county could also dedicate and the venues grant, federal program out there, and a number of federal programs are also resources, so that will help us make an informed decision on how we allocate from the arp funds. Then also, it calls for us to take steps to expedite the administration and release of the current live music fund dollars. But it's my understanding that there is none -- there's not funds left in that, in that pot of money, and so perhaps we would have to do a third phase on that, on that fund. So we would have to inject new dollars to help supplement that area. So with that, I'm happy to open it up to questions.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member tovo.

>> Tovo: Yeah. Thank you for that explanation. I do have some questions for you. So I think one confusing

[4:32:18 PM]

thing is that we've done a lot of different programs and relief for cultural arts and live music. So the last -- I want to end on your last point. You talked about the live music fund, and I notice on page 8 you talked about expediting the use of the live music fund, and on page 8 of 9 you've asked the manager to develop and present recommendation to see council on the best use of music fund, including the live music fund. Are you talking about the live music fund that the live music task force has been deliberating about for the last couple of -- is that -- I'm not clear on which fund you're talking about.

>> It's the live music fund and its associated programs, is what we're wanting to direct attention to. That -- thing intention -- the intention was to expedite the release of dollars that were held up, but we medicine with EdD yesterday, if they're on the line, they can also speak to this, and they let us know that they have sent out

[4:33:20 PM]

notices to the wardees or will send it out this Wike to let them know that they are getting funded. So by the time they finish out those notices, there will not be any left. So the need would be to, you know -- to inject new dollars into that fund because there wouldn't be any funds left over. But I would love for EdD staff to confirm my understanding.

>> Tovo: Just so he I'm

-- just so I'm clear, there was the live music fund that was created when we agreed to the 2% increase for the convention center expansion, and then that money went into the live music fund that the live music task force has been talking about for a long time.

>> A long time.

>> Tovo: How to spend it, and they've been meeting, and I believe they're just about to release their recommendation. So I think you're not recommending -- I think we just have a language issue. It doesn't sound to me like you're recommending that process be expedited and that council make recommendations about that funding because we had asked the live music task force to

[4:34:21 PM]

do that, and I think they are just about to get those recommendations to us. And when we had this conversation about a year ago about whether or not we should tap into it and spend it, the decision of the council was not to, to let them finish their work. So that's -- so that's not -- that particular one is not one that you're speaking to right now. Is that right?

>> No, I think that's the one that I'm speaking to. Unless -- are you -- the other would be the stage live music fund, right?

>> Tovo: So -- yeah. I think -- I think we -- I think maybe you're talking about the one that we set up as a result of the resolution that I think I brought -- again, I think it's very confusing because there have been several allocations of funding for live music and cultural arts and venue support through the cares act. Separate from all that, there is this live music fund that preexisted the

[4:35:21 PM]

pandemic, around which stakeholders are talking about.

>> Sinovia, I don't know if you can speak to that, but the concern that came from the community was standard live music fund. I don't know if it was the one that's part of the cares act or the one that council member tovo is speaking to, but if you could talk a little bit about that part.

>> Yes. Good afternoon, council. I'm with the economic development department. There are two funds that have been established to assist the live music venues. There is the live music preservation fund that council established that we are now in the final phase of the venues producing their strategic economic plan, and then there is the live music fund that was established as part of the expansion from the 2%. We are working on that, to

[4:36:25 PM]

bring that to the music commission to opine on before bringing those to council. And so there are two separate funds.

>> Tovo: So just on page 8, I would just call the sponsor's attention to page 8 where you, I think, talk about both. I think the one is sort of on a different track. So then I had a question for you about -- I'm sorry, I'm not following clearly a couple things here. I think you had talked about -- you had said something about not wanting to use H.O.T. Funding -- that you wanted to use -- could you explain to me what you said about wanting to use H.O.T. Funding to supplement the missing H.O.T. Funding?

>> So we would -- the arts and music community would rather -- instead of using the arp dollars to basically fill the short fall that is between four to five million, they would prefer that that short fall, that deficit, be addressed through the general revenue

[4:37:26 PM]

fund process, and that it be paid out through a number of years. This process has been done, I think, last year, and it was also done in 2008 where we pay out the deficit over the course of a few budget cycles. So the preference is that we use the arp dollars, the amount that we dedicate from there, to do new supplemental funding to support the arts and music community.

>> Tovo: Okay. I'll have to think about that. Because I'm not sure where we would get it from. Did you have any thoughts on where we would get it from in the general fund? I mean we can't take it out of the H.O.T. Funding because that's part of the -- where we're seeing the short fall. So that's why I thought there was a proposal to use the American rescue plan to try to supplement some of that funding.

>> Yeah. So we're asking for staff to come back and lay out those recommendations.

[4:38:26 PM]

It could be if the H.O.T. Fund, you know, stabilizes and has increased revenue, that we use any surplus in the H.O.T. Fund for next year to pay back that deficit. So we would want to explore those options, but we'd want to know what those options could be.

>> Tovo: Staff, can you talk through -- how could that work with -- given that we're limited to 15%? I mean we hope that the hot funding will come in next year higher than it did this year, but we're still limited to 15% each year for cultural arts. So even if it comes in higher, which I hope it does, it doesn't -- it was my understanding it doesn't allow us to suddenly spend more on the cultural arts through the H.O.T. Funding.

>> Sylvia again. You are correct, we are not allowed to collect more than 15% of hotel occupancy tax to fund the cultural arts. We are working with the budget office and the law

[4:39:27 PM]

department to come back with a plan on how to close the gap in the cultural arts fund. As you may recall, we issued a memo honoring the contracts that council had approved for the current year because of the current nature of what's going on and allow -- excuse me -- the arts community to keep those contracts. And so we have been in discussion with the budget office on how to eliminate the deficit that is anticipated by September 30th of this year.

>> Tovo: I also just want to point out that the hot fund is a special revenue fund so it's allowed to run as a deficit. And so, synovia, can you speak -- it's my understanding that this is something that we've done just this past year, where we ran as a deficit so we'll

[4:40:33 PM]

pay back that gap.

>> As I understand, there was a deficit of \$800,000. So we have worked with the budget office to close that gap. And, again, this you're's anticipated gap is much larger, and so -- this-year's gap is much larger so we're gone still in discussions about the most appropriate way to close that gap. And we will come back with the recommendation as articulated in the ifc. I definitely want to give time to discuss it with the law department, as well as the budget office, to make sure we are in compliance.

>> Tovo: So I wonder if you could explain -- so some of this seems to be about how we spend the -- how we invest the arp dollars. I guess I'm still struggling to understand how this -- how this changes, how the passage of this resolution would change the recommendation you've made for the investment of arp. Because as I understood the correction we had this

[4:41:35 PM]

morning, Dr. Holt rab, the staff are suggesting we invest some of the arp dollars in funding that gap between the anticipated H.O.T. Revenue and what actually was received, and use that for our cultural arts contracts. So how does this resolution -- how do you see this ifc and its potential passage changing the work that you're doing?

>> At this time, we again are exploring a couple of ideas, part of that funding process, we definitely heard the conversation around transformational projects, and so again, we will bring back forth those details that were discussed earlier today. But we definitely heard that concept around transformational projects on moving forward.

>> Mayor Adler: Kathie, should I go on to someone

[4:42:35 PM]

else?

>> Tovo: Sure. Maybe in the course of conversation -- I'm still struggling to understand this a bit, but I think others have questions, so...

>> Mayor Adler: Council member alter.

>> Alter: I think council member Ellis had her hand up.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member Ellis, you want to go ahead?

>> Ellis: Sure. I hope this is covered with the resolution, but I just wanted to get a little clarity. We talk a lot about how our arts and music, you know, commission recommendations are implemented and some of the relief engaged we've done. Can you tell me how this affects folks in theater? I wasn't sure how that was umbrellaed with some of the other cultural arts or if that's a separate conversation. Can you help me understand that better?

>> Yes. The theater is covered as part of the cultural funding program. So literature, dance, et cetera. There are several disciplines covered.

>> Ellis: Okay. That's good to hear because

[4:43:37 PM]

I know there are folks in the theater community that have started becoming more organized so they can understand better what city programs or options are available to them so that's really good to hear.

>> Uh-huh.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member alter and then council member kitchen.

>> Alter: Thank you. So I think I'm still in the place that council member tovo is where I'm just trying to understand what the resolution is. I know we've received lots and lots of emails and they all say things -- they say 15 different things about what this is doing, which reflects the need that I think that council member Fuentes is trying to address with this resolution that builds on work that we've all done over the past year-plus and beyond to support our creative sector. So I want to just make sure, from a basic level -- and I'm assuming there was just the initial draft, not a second version yet -- that

[4:44:38 PM]

it is saying that we would fund up to 15 million over two years, and is the first -- I guess it's the second "Be it resolved." But first kind of substantive section, is that one saying it's for arts, and then the fourth one is for music? Because I was a little bit unsure there, so if you can clarify for me, council member Fuentes. The second one is up to 15 million over two years for arts. Then it's saying come up with a solution for a deficit from H.O.T. And then it's saying up to 10 million over two years for music? Is that correct?

>> Fuentes: Yes. So there is -- I do want to point out that Katie just sent out the revised version too, because we did have a typo in one of our "Be it resolved," so I did want to mention that. That might be where the

[4:45:40 PM]

confusion is stemming from. I'm just trying to find it here in my hard copy. But you're right, the arts commission recommended 20 million for two years, and so this resolution is up to 15 million for two years. And the music commission recommended 20 million each year, so 40 million, and this resolution calls for up to 10 million. So we wanted to be very mindful of the fact that we are still undergoing conversations about how we allocate the arp funds with those four strategic priorities that we outlined in the resilient atx. And we also recognize that a number of individual needs for our creative sector will be addressed -- will be addressed from the other programs we have available, you know, such as the rise in rent funds. And so we wanted to -- you know, after having many conversations, those were the numbers that we landed upon. But we -- this is -- we wanted to give the flexibility because we know

[4:46:40 PM]

that there are also federal relief programs. We know that we're going to go through a budget process, and so that's why it directs staff to come back to us with recommendations on how to plan up to this amount, and also being aware that these groups are also asking Travis county for funding. And so that might be a way to supplement, to get to their full -- their original full ask. And so -- and what was the third question, council member alter? >>Lter: The -- I guess the other one was, like, figure out a solution for the drop in H.O.T. Funds.

>> Right. And so that's the meat I -- that's the need I want to get to. Our communities need relief now, and so the concern is, is that if we use the arp dollars to backfill H.O.T., that they won't get the necessary funds to make it through. And so that is why we're asking for arp dollars to be used for more of the transformational, you know,

[4:47:41 PM]

projects and funding and that we supplement the hot funds through a different process, either there you the budget or any other funding revenue streams that staff might recommend as possible avenues for us to explore.

>> Alter: So thank you for the clarification. I think this gets to precisely the point that I was trying to get at earlier today when I was asking and suggesting we need more detail. As I understood the presentation from staff, they were saying we were covering the H.O.T. Money for the three buckets that are under H.O.T., which would be the cultural arts, the [indiscernible] Preservation fund and the live -- the live music fund. And that doesn't do any of the staff that's in here at all, and so -- and it's not transformational. And so that's why I kind of -- I'm a little bit at a loss for how to put all these things together. And everyone just shook their head earlier and said, yeah, that's what we want to do, and now we have this. And it seems -- I'm

[4:48:41 PM]

either -- I'm missing something or we're all on the same page and we're not -- we're not -- I haven't figured out how we've articulated, anyway. I think we all see the need to help the arts community, to help the music community. We recognize that we have a problem with our H.O.T. Deficit. I don't know how to reconcile these, and I'm a little bit concerned about what this direction means in light of the other and in light of our 20 million deficit in our budget. If the concern is that we need help now and we need to be doing that stuff now, backfilling the H.O.T. Fund and doing that doesn't necessarily get us there unless we want to buy us the money towards the groups that are already getting sort of H.O.T. Funding in terms of who we help, which I don't know if I'm hearing that that's what we want to do either. So I'm just right now trying to reconcile all of these

[4:49:42 PM]

things and figure out how we move forward when there's probably not that much difference of where we want to go, but I don't know that we're providing the clarity we need to for staff at this point for the next steps.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member Fuentes, as I read this as it was brought, I think that you were importantly raising the question of taking a look at what, in this area, was important for us to be able to address, and also taking a look at what the opportunities were. I appreciated that the resolution began with a strong reaffirmation of the earlier work that we had done, the priorities that we had set. Even that resolution allowed for some additional spending if there were other circumstances or particular things that needed to be done. But that is really focusing on those four priorities, so I appreciate the work that

[4:50:43 PM]

the staff did. I have some of the same questions, but I think that, in part, this resolution is to answer some of those questions. Some of the people that get funding and cultural arts funding are individual artists, they have a program they do once a year, and really, this is -- this funding provides them their income for that year. Some of those individual artists may well have been covered this year with the other relief programs, the rent program or the rise program or the artist relief program. So it may not -- I don't know, but it may not be them and it may not need to have the -- the H.O.T. Cultural arts fund put back into place to be able to help them. But at the same time, there may be some organizations that were not eligible for

[4:51:46 PM]

that funding that may not survive, in which case this would be an opportunity for staff to be able to identify that. There were some funds that we had set up that nonprofit organizations weren't able to get access to, depending on where they are, that might be something that we'd need to take a look at. And I do think that we're all focused on trying to do something that we can, that's transformational, and that the resolution gives us the opportunity to see whether those kinds of things exist as well, either as part of the arp process or part of a longer process, or even leaving it to the budget that we have. That's how I read the resolution. I see the questions that have been raised by some of our colleagues and would be available to help, you know, work on the language a little bit, if that's

[4:52:47 PM]

something that you wanted to do. But I see exactly that, that there are lots of questions here that we have that we need to try to answer. Staff may be able to help us. Council member kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Yes. I would say that I don't think this is inconsistent with our earlier conversation, but I understand -- I understand the questions that people are raising. I do think it would be helpful, and I would just ask our staff to do this, it would be helpful to just create a list for us as you think through your recommendations for arp and as you think through how you might respond to this resolution. We have done -- this council has done a lot of work over the last, you know, few years on arts and music, and there's a whole range of need, just like in other subject areas, there's a range of needs and we've

[4:53:48 PM]

been talking about different aspects of those needs today. They all exist. And they all are things that we need to talk about it and think about from an arp standpoint, as well as from other standpoints. So, you know, for example, the -- as y'all have articulated, there are some -- you know, some artists and musicians that may be in the position of actually needing to fill a gap because of the ways that you have articulated, mayor, and may be in serious need of immediate need. That's on one end of it. On the other end of it, there are several programs that have been passed by this council in the past that are transformational. One of them is the

[indiscernible] Fund that we just passed I think in December or so, I don't know exactly when we did it, and that one was all about how can we -- how can we protect and preserve the iconic

[4:54:49 PM]

venues that we have in our city instead of continuing to lose them. So from my perspective, there are a range of things that it's appropriate to spend arp dollars on and probably would be best if we had a list and understood the recommendation of our staff on that. But we also need to understand that even if they're not -- you know, there are a number of things that may not be covered by arp that we still need to find a way to cover. And those needs aren't going away. So -- but I think it might add some clarity to the conversation if we actually looked at a list, so perhaps you all as staff can think of presenting it that way. Because it can be confusing, all the different programs that are in existence right now to cover different aspects of the need. So -- but thank you, council member Fuentes, for bringing

[4:55:49 PM]

this forward. I think there's clearly a very urgent need in the arts and music community, and it's across a range of immediate needs to the needs that we've identified to actually preserve arts and music in our community in the long run.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any further discussion? Council member alter, council member pool.

>> Pool: Mine is on a different item.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anybody have a concluding thought on this?

>> Alter: Yeah. I just want to be clear. I think that we all share the same goal here. I'm trying to put all the different pieces, I'm sure fixing the typo may fix part of it. But it's important for us to understand that what staff was proposing this morning was using the H.O.T. Fund to backfill the H.O.T. It was not any of this. And now we're saying we want to put the other direction in. And I just don't know that that leaves staff with

[4:56:53 PM]

clarity. And so I just feel a process perspective -- you know, this is one of the reasons I said we need more conversation and we need more detail. You know, if what this resolution does is -- you know, so there's a part of, okay, what is our process and what does that look like and how do we make sure we have clarity for staff; then there's -- you know, is what this resolution is doing, you know, saying we need to find solutions for our music industry, we need to find solutions for our arts organizations, and we have a problem with H.O.T. -- Like I'm totally on board with that, but I'm -- I need to understand what the direction is specifically that this leads staff to do differently than what they were already, you know, doing, given our earlier conversation.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member tovo, council member kitchen.

>> Tovo: Thanks. I think that helps clarify

[4:57:54 PM]

some of what I was trying to ask for before. And I guess, council member Fuentes and others who co-sponsored it, I wonder whether this is a conversation we should have at the same time we're having the conversation about arp. One other thing I just wanted to ask for clarity on, the last "Be it resolved" almost sounds like we are allocating the funding, and I just want to be -- with all of these conversations we're having around investments with the arp and with others, I want to set really clear expectations for the public. So I would just ask if you could take a look at that language, too, it talks about the city manager is directed to report to city council the status on the allocation of these funds by June 8th. Again, I just would ask that you look to clarify that language, too, so it doesn't make it sound as if we are actually, in passing this, allocating funding, which we wouldn't be doing.

[4:58:54 PM]

So -- and too, you know, if you would between now and Thursday, just think about the timing of this and whether this is a resolution that should go forward at the same time we're having the arp conversation because it may -- as council member alter I think better articulated than I did, I think it's a little unclear to know how those two recommendations stand together. Fuentes thank you, council member tovo -- yeah, you know, I see it as actually providing that clarity. I mean it's providing direction on how we would like to see our dollars spent in addressing this immediate need so I think it is appropriate for us to be having this type of conversation as we consider how to spend arp, and the community is reaching out. They are letting us know that there's a gap in services, a gap in program funding, and they want us to consider funding from the arp, that is a specific ask from the community. So it makes sense that we are having this conversation. One thing that I think might

[4:59:57 PM]

be tweaked as well, we're asking for a report back on how we identify these funds to come back by June 8th, and if we're having our work session about the arp on June 1st, then maybe we could ask staff to see if we could have it a little bit earlier so as we -- if we intend to take a vote on the framework or how we spend at that June 3rd meeting, I would definitely want to have staff's recommendation, how we could address the needs of both these communities beforehand. But I think it would help us inform our decision. We met with EdD throughout this process so we were aware of the need, and the change and wanting to see the arp dollars be used for immediate relief efforts and more of that transformational nature, versus backfilling the H.O.T. -- The H.O.T. Funds, and that is a pathway that has been done before and could be done again. And so finding that recommendation come back from staff could be really

[5:00:58 PM]

very clear in laying that out. But by passing this resolution, we're giving staff very clear direction in that we want to ensure that there's funding for these communities, but we want to see what pathway, is it through arp, is it through general revenue, or is it, you know, Travis county, state, federal. Like, let's identify all of the options out there and get to that number, if possible.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Colleagues, it's after 5:00. I'm going to need to step off here in just a second. Council member pool, did you want to go real quickly?

>> Pool: Yeah, really, really quick, item 18 and 59 are related. And on Thursday, I may bring a recommendation to postpone them. This is related to the management of the Texas bungalows hotel conversion project that's in district 7. My staff is working with city staff to make sure that the city maintains

[5:01:58 PM]

management control over the property that would assure the accountability we need as promised to the community. We're talking about it to Diana gray and with public staff, hopefully Thursday we can move forward that day, but if not, I will be asking for probably just a one meeting postponement. Thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Sounds good. Thank you. Council member alter?

>> Alter: Thank you. If I could just go back a second to council member Fuentes's proposal, I wanted to ask that if you are going to do a revision, I had a suggestion. I know you've talked a lot about the importance of the navigator. I think it would be useful to make sure we have a navigator assisting the creative sector specifically, to pull down the funds. And since I think you're working on an iteration, maybe you could just do that. And then I wanted to ask -- this is something that I just need to make sure that

[5:03:00 PM]

I'm getting straight with respect to the H.O.T. And hopefully this will be quick. It's my understanding that we had a two-year contract that went through this year that we made folks hold for. We found a way to do that in the budget for fiscal year '21 so that starting September 30th and the next fiscal year, the question is how do we continue with our H.O.T. Funding, similar levels. Do we have contracts already with folks at fiscal year '22 and beyond or do we only have contracts that run through the end of fiscal year '21?

>> We only have contracts through September 30th, 2021.

>> Alter: Okay. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: All right, colleagues. We'll work with the city manager's office and the clerk and your offices to see whether we have a work session next week on the arp, or if it'll be another Wike. Week.

[5:04:02 PM]

With that, it is 5:03 and our work session is adjourned.

>> Kitchen: Mayor? S yes. Real fact.

>> Kitchen: I lost connections so I didn't hear the last part of what you said. We're finishing without -- can I just say one thing about item 13? Since we didn't get to it?

>> Mayor Adler: You can. I'm going to give the chair to Alison because I need to -- I need to go.

>> Kitchen: Well, you know, all I'm going to say is that I'll need time to really spend some time on Thursday to go over it with people and have our staff available to make a presentation. So we can do that.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. With that, we're adjourned. Thank you.