

City Council Regular Meeting Transcript – 03/24/2022

Title: ATXN-1 (24hr)

Channel: 6 - ATXN-1

Recorded On: 3/24/2022 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 3/24/2022

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.

[10:08:15 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Gavel in this meeting. It is Thursday, March 24th, 2022. It is 10:08, and we're going to convene the Austin city council meeting here in city hall. I don't think we have any members calling in remote, so we're all here. It's good to see everybody's face on the dais. It's been a long time since we were here and could see each other. Orders yesterday said that there's no longer required masking in city buildings. That does not mean that you can't wear a mask in a city building, and anybody who wants to certainly can. And our health department, in fact, advises that for people that are susceptible or are around people who are susceptible. But no requirement to wear a mask, so we can all celebrate

[10:09:16 AM]

that. I am a little nervous, as I think is the health department folks looking at the spikes that we're seeing, the surges we're seeing in western Europe and seeing maybe in some other states around the country. We're all watching that really closely to see if another surge comes back to us. It would not be unthinkable if that happened. If that happened, probably everybody would get asked to put back on the masks for three weeks to tamp it back down, but we don't have to worry about that now, and we can celebrate where we are and enjoy being able to see one another. Colleagues, by way of changes and corrections that we want to read into the record for today's meeting, item number 33 on March 21st, 2022 was recommended by the electric utility

[10:10:17 AM]

commission on a 7-0 vote with commissioners Bowen, Chapman, and Funkhouser absent. Item 42 withdrawn and replaced with item 46. Item 63 postponed to April 7th, 2022. Item 76 and 77 is district 7, not district 1. Item number 85, the relevant ordinance is number 011213-41 and that's a correction. And item number 93, the mayor pro tem, alter, has been added as a sponsor. We have some pulled items -- 27 by Kelly, 37 by tovo, 52 by

[10:11:17 AM]

alter and 55 and 57 by tovo. We have late backup in items 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 34, 54, 55, 57, 61, 63, 69, 70, 73, 76, 77, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, and 89. I don't see listed here on 57 -- oh, there it is. Draft resolution v2. There's a v3 as well, so -- there it is, draft resolution v3. Okay. Those are all the late backup items. We have speakers signed up, both

[10:12:21 AM]

remote and in person. We're going to call the speakers that are in person first. I would point out that it's my belief at this point that the dacc item is going to get postponed. That dacc item is several items on our agenda -- items 13, 14, and 34. So, the appropriate time then to speak on the merits of those would be if and when it comes back to us. But there will be only the postponement happening today. So we're not going to call people to speak on the merits of the resolution, because it's not going to be considered today. Given that, I think we can go for two minutes per speaker and that's what we're going to set

[10:13:23 AM]

the clock at. Mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: Good morning. A couple questions. One for the dacc. Is it possible for us to pull that so those of us who are not in your quorum can understand what you're proposing, a how we arrived at that a little bit better? I think that would be helpful for the community, who doesn't always read our message board to hear that, and then we can take up the motion to postpone 13, 14, and 24.

>> Mayor Adler: Yep.

>> Alter: And then I will lay out my direction -- or amendments later, but I wanted to point out that I have the amendment drafted that goes with the lifeguard item to add the exploring the transportation obstacles and then I have put such direction for item 40

[10:14:24 AM]

related to the information security office lease and in relation to 43 with respect to workforce and have pulled 52.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Yes, councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Mayor pro tem, I'm sorry, I missed something you said about the security item?

>> Alter: I posted last night direction on the message board with respect to next steps for moving them from lease to owning, and I'm assuming that that can still go on consent. I was just calling attention to it since we've had so many emails and messages on the message board.

>> Mayor Adler: What numeral number is that?

>> Alter: Number 40.

>> Mayor Adler: You called up some other items?

>> Tovo: Thank you for that. I appreciate you doing that, because I hadn't looked at the message board yet this morning and missed that. I know you had asked some questions of staff, as I did as well, and so I'm eager to see our next steps, I think. There does need to be a plan.

[10:15:26 AM]

Thankou for taking the lead on that.

>> Alter: Thank you. So, direction on 40, which is the iso lease, 43, the workforce contract, both of those I posted last night. And then I posted -- I don't remember, that I wanted to be added as a cosponsor for the life guard I item and expressed a need for us to explore if we could address transportation obstacles, I don't see a version two, so I have an amendment that does that. But I think that could still go on consent and I have pulled 52, the social service contracts, which I've pulled because we have not fully funded the prime time contract for aid.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Yes, councilmember Ellis.

>> Ellis: I appreciate the mayor pro tem's cosponsorship on that, and bringing the amendment. So I agree, we don't need to pull it, but at the appropriate time to add in that amendment, and I have a couple comments. After the speakers we can do

[10:16:26 AM]

that. For item 46, I don't need to pull that one, either. I intend to move its passage with some direction today, so that doesn't need to be pulled, but I wanted to flag that for after the speakers, just that I would want to add a direction.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Councilmember Ellis, is that the -- doc? I think there were two items on that, with the consent, I don't know how we pass both of those, so.

>> Ellis: I believe 42 has been withdrawn and replaced. There were two items --

>> Alter: I missed that.

>> Ellis: I'm going to move passage of 46 for one year, but appreciate that clarification.

>> Alter: Thank you. I missed that.

>> Mayor Adler: 42 is withdrawn, replaced with 46. Okay. After the speakers, we'll give you a chance to make that amendment, make some comments, and keep it on consent if there's not any issues with that. All right. Let's go ahead and then hear speakers. We'll start with the speakers

[10:17:27 AM]

that are here, that are signed up to speak in person. There's a whole group of people -- bill Bryce, Kimberly, Jeff, Chris, Jeff, holly, Elizabeth, Steven, Andrew. Do any of you need to speak here this morning on those items being postponed? Okay. What about item number 55? Ryan Harvey? Why don't you come on up and speak. You have two minutes. Mr. Harvey is speaking on item 55. Good morning.

>> So, this is my first meeting.

>> Mayor Adler: Can you hold on one second? Do we have the mic on?

[10:18:30 AM]

>> Sorry.

>> Hello?

>> Mayor Adler: Now you are.

>> Okay. So, my name is Ryan Harvey. I've lived in Austin for 33 years, and this is my first city council meeting public comment. I came down to applaud the council for both resolutions 55 and 57, and I was inspired by your talk on Tuesday during the city work meeting to see how savvy the discussion was and how open everyone was to exploring blockchain solutions for the city. I thought that there were so many intelligent questions about how it can be used to solve problems serving folks that are homeless, and any other potential investigations within the space, because blockchain and crypto are moving so

[10:19:30 AM]

quickly. The technology from six months ago can be ancient. There's new stuff coming in every day and I'm excited to see Austin broadcasting itself as open for business, open for dialogue, but also with a little bit of caution to all of the volatility, which I know was mentioned on Tuesday. I think that there are organizations here in town like mine, atx Dao. I was excited to see Dao was mentioned in the resolution, that can be a point of information for the organization, the city innovation office. If we can be a resource to you for informing you on what's going on in the industry, we would be happy to. And how Austin can improve with this new technology. So, thank you very much. Use us. We're right down the street and we're creating every week out in the open just like you guys are.

[10:20:31 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Great. Thank you very much. All right. What about Sam Padilla? Why don't you come on up. Speaking on item number 57. Jessie Patterson is on deck. Two minutes.

>> Thank you so much. My name is Sam, I'm here representing atx Dao, too. I moved here seven months ago and have fallen in love with the city, on one level, with the forward thinking of the city. This I believe is reflected in resolution 57 that I'm speaking to. I want to express my support for digitalization on a personal level and on behalf of atx Dao, we support Austin moving forward. Beyond just expressing this support for the resolution, I also want to share some words of caution and also make ourselves available to support the city council as you move forward.

[10:21:32 AM]

We ask the city council and the city manager not to be taken by the excitement of the industry and the blockchain technology, and rush into different projects that may not be beneficial. We want to ensure that innovations implemented in the city of Austin benefit the local community and not just try to capitalize on the good intentions of the city council, mayor, manager, and the citizens and the members. And that is what we're here for. We want to make atx Dao available to you for that. We are a community of professionals in the space, all native to Austin, all living in Austin, and all of us have fallen in love with the city in many different levels. We have the knowledge, we have the experience. We are and we understand the community. So we are asking the city council and the city manager as you pursue this resolution to please use us as a resource. Please work with us, because we want to make sure that any innovations in the space of blockchain implemented in the city of Austin have the interest of the citizens at heart and the interest of the city, because

[10:22:33 AM]

we're a community of people who fell in love with the city and want to see the city prosper. We're here to fully support you all and we're really happy to see Austin moving forward in this space. Thank you.

>> Hello. I'm Jesse Patterson, born and raised in Austin, Texas, here as a representative of the atx Dao organization. I'm the head of education for atx Dao. I want to offer our services to any coalition that may form to further these investigations, reiterating the concerns and expressions of optimism of the members of my organization, we think that this resolution is a great step forward and we know that many in the web 3 industry

[10:23:35 AM]

have seen Austin moving in this direction and have started to view the city as an area that may be very promising for our industry. So again, thank you for introducing these resolutions, and we really look forward to working with you if they should pass.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. All right. I'm going to go backwards just a second, because I understand it might have been confusing. Items 13, 14, and 34 are going to get postponed. That's the dacc item. If someone wants to speak on whether or not it should be postponed, because that's the action that's being taken today, I want to give the people an opportunity to speak on the postponement issue. Mr. Bryce, you signed up to speak -- not on the merits of whether it should be in this place or not, but on the postponement.

>> Thank you, I'll bill Bryce, downtown Austin alliance. I was confused. I'll be very brief. Downtown Austin alliance has always been an advocate and partner with community court,

[10:24:35 AM]

partnering on many initiatives to address the needs of people with highly acute issues, very complex issues, many of who are experiencing homelessness. We oppose moving community court to 124 west 8th street. It's about what's in the best interest of the court and its clients. In light of current efforts related to homelessness, we have an unprecedented opportunity that we must leverage. We need to be forward-thinking about how the court can better serve the community before selecting a building for the court to operate, much as it is in the P there are innovative court models out there that can be applied here to increase service delivery and reduce failure to appear rates, which often result in people being arrested for with technical support and local expertise, we can define a more effective and cost effective model for Austin. It's imperative to be future-minded and informed before deciding on a facility. We urge you to postpone these

[10:25:35 AM]

actions. The decision to postpone is in the best interest of the court's clients, Austin taxpayers, downtown, and the city as a whole. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Does anybody else want to speak on the issue of postponement? Come on down.

>> Yes. Thank you. Hi, everyone. I'm Jeff Steinley. Good morning, Mayor Adler and councilmembers. Putting on record again, I strongly oppose items 13, 14, and 24. The old building is the wrong building and site for the DACC itself. All its services and the DACC clientele. I'm encouraged by what I heard from you a minute ago, that a motion will be passed today to review operations. Assuming this passes, thank you for listening to your constituents on this issue. One other thing. I want to look forward. I'm here to advocate for a resolution that was unanimously passed by city council in May of 2020 to make the old building a cultural arts center for the

[10:26:36 AM]

arts. With its long history and prime location, this would make a great addition to Austin's cultural trust. To this end, hats off to the city for its inaugural piece of art placed out front, the rainbow cowboy, which you have a picture of. He's Austin's ambassador for the arts. I respectfully ask the city continue to advance the resolution you passed to make the old Muni building a cultural center that our rainbow cowboy can be proud to promote. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Anyone else? Okay. We're going to continue forward, then, again, with in-person folks. Item number 46. Is Mike Martinez here? Why don't you come on down. Welcome back into city hall.

[10:27:41 AM]

>> Thank you, Mayor, I'm Mike, I'm here on behalf of my client, the dock. Susan is the owner. She's back here in the back. First of all, we wanted to thank you all for allowing us the time to continue meeting with staff. We want to thank the city manager and his staff, purchasing staff, and especially Director McNeely. We'll come to -- we've come to an agreement on a one-year extension. We've asked for some additional direction. And so we will accept and support the will of the council. We wanted to say thank you all for letting us get to this point. And we're here for any questions if you have any. Thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Okay. Is Ryan Harvey here? We already had you speak, right?

[10:28:41 AM]

That sounds good, thank you. Gotcha. And I think we got the two on 57, thank you both. On 61, what about Tricia? Is Tricia with us? Why don't you come on down.

>> Good morning. Thank you so much for hearing me today. My name is Tricia Forbes and I am the Texas manager for crime survivors for safety and justice. We are an organization with more than 80,000 members across the country, many thousands of them in Texas. We believe in solutions like trauma recovery centers that serve people who often fall through the cracks in

[10:29:41 AM]

traditional services. Many of our members are victims of gun violence, are family members who have lost loved ones to violence, and all other kinds of trauma. Many of our members also have complex trauma from a lifetime of violent experiences. We believe in new public safety solutions, and that trauma recovery centers are very much in line with making our community safer. They offer comprehensive case management and trauma-informed counseling for individuals and families at no cost. And they also serve people who do not file a police report, which is important because a lot of times people who don't go through the system do not have the same kind of access to services as people who do. However, we have found in the 39

[10:30:44 AM]

trauma recovery centers that operate around the country, that with comprehensive case management and someone to walk a victim through all of the systems that they come into contact with, they are more likely to report their crimes. So, we really applaud councilmember Fuentes and every one of you who has shown us support and given your time as we've worked on making this a reality over the last couple of years. We have Sal of our members --

[buzzer sing]

>> Here to speak as well. So, thank you again for hearing us, and for supporting trauma recovery centers in Austin.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Clarence Watson. You have two minutes, sir.

>> Good morning, and thank you for your time. My name is Clarence Watson and I'm the Austin chapter

[10:31:44 AM]

coordinator for crime survivors of safety and justice and Austin anaustinite. I've been raised in Austin and love my city, but I've experienced a lot of dark times in my city. I am a survivor of sexual assault as a

child. I'm a survivor of gun violence as a young man. All these traumas I experienced in my younger years led me down a long journey of setbacks and challenges. As a community member, I would love to see a trauma recovery center because I know that those -- they provide mental health services, critical case management, crisis intervention, and free counseling, something that my family really needed at the time. These services are proven to work and can help end the cycle of violence, trauma, and incarceration many like myself have fallen into. They say doing the same thing and expecting a different

[10:32:44 AM]

outcome is insanity, but what do you call giving minimum or no services and expecting a different outcome from individuals in the community? Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Item number 65, is Sylvia blanco here? Why don't you come on down. Is Stuart Hersh here? Mr. Hersh, you are on deck. Two minutes.

>> Good morning, mayor, mayor pro tem, and city councilmembers. I'm Sylvia blanco, chief operating officer for the housing authority of the city of Austin. And I want to thank you for the opportunity to provide some brief comments on the city's fy22-23 action plan. I'm excited to share that haca is projecting a late summer

[10:33:45 AM]

closing for the long-anticipated rosewood courts redevelopment project. That transformation project will significantly improve quality of life for current rosewood residents as well as future families that will call rosewood home. In a nutshell, the project entails the creation of 164 brand new energy-efficient housing units. The full restoration and preservation of eight historic buildings with twenty fully renovated housing units, a total of 184 deeply affore housing units, a commemorative green space to honor the history of Austin's original emancipation park, and the construction of 12 brand new truly affordable for sale homes for eligible haca families. All elements of this project provide a significant benefit to the broader community and clearly meet the objectives of Austin -- the city of Austin

[10:34:47 AM]

strategic housing blueprint. I will share that there is a sizable gap in the funding for the financing of this project due to the extensive historic restoration scope and the ever-rising costs of construction materials and labor. We need the city's help in making this transformative project a reality. Therefore, as HPD works to identify projects to assist in its action plan, haca respectfully asks for the city's help in filling some of this gap through the rhda program in fiscal year 22/23.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Thank you for your consideration.

>> Mayor, may I ask a question?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, go ahead.

>> Did you give us a sense of the size of the gap?

>> Yes, madam mayor pro tem, it's approximately a \$10 million gap.

>> Alter: Oh. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

[10:35:47 AM]

Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Hersh, two minutes.

>> Thank you, mayor, members of the council. My name is Stuart Harry Hersh and this week I got to testify on needs assessment both here today and the past Tuesday at the Travis county commissioners court. It's required by HUD. Some of the poorest among us are homeowners who are in 80, 50, and 30% of the median family income within the Austin city limits, or in unincorporated Travis county. These are the same types of individuals and families who I was allowed to help with weatherization home repairs when I became the city's weatherization coordinator in 1977. At the time, when I was hired, I earned \$5.93 an hour. And at the end of my probationary period I earned \$6.38 an hour. So it was pretty easy to

[10:36:48 AM]

understand the housing needs of families, both in Austin and Travis county. I'm asking you to establish as part of the action plan process the highest priorities for the 2022-2023 budget year for the following repairs for low-income homeowners. Roof repairs, repairs to leaking water pipes, replacement of failing septic systems, repairs to electric wiring systems, replacement of unvented space heaters with ventilated heating systems, repairs to heating ventilation and air conditioning systems, and repairs to homes damaged by flooding, high winds, and fire. City and county budgets should reflect the number of low-income households to be served by home repair programs in the next fiscal year with a reminder of the strategic housing blueprint goal of 600 homes repaired per year over a ten-year period. So I'm asking you to help some of the poorest homeowners among us.

[10:37:48 AM]

They are facing enormous gentrification pressures, and continued funding of home repair will make it possible for them to age in place, like the rest of us are trying to do. Thank you very much for your time.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Item number 69, is Taylor Lang here?

>> Mayor, those are zoning items.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, great. So I think then that those will be all the speakers that we have this morning. Were there any addendum items that were lower on this?

>> We do not have any, but we do have speakers online.

>> Mayor Adler: So the speakers that show up on item 93 --

>> Yes, that's an addendum.

>> Mayor Adler: We have three people signed up there.

[10:38:50 AM]

What about Scott Cobb?

>> I'm here.

>> Mayor Adler: Do you want to come down? And Angela Richter, and Sophia Peña. You each have two minutes.

>> Good morning. My name is Scott Cobb, I work as a lifeguard at Barton springs pool and I just want to talk to you about the job we do there. We're very understaffed right now. It's actually a worse situation you've been told by the media and you've heard. We just got an email two days ago saying there are only five to nine Barton springs lifeguards with open availability of the twenty six and that is because of - in the wintertime, there are temporary lifeguards and they get other jobs. When it comes around T spring those people have other jobs and they also go to school. That's why we're down to five to nine. Other people can work some, but

[10:39:50 AM]

not all the time. That's why it's difficult to fully staff. My suggestions going forward is to raise the cost of living wage to \$22 an hour, which I suggest you add to the resolution that you send to the city manager. Parks and recreation board finance committee supported that on a vote two days ago, or a few days ago. Monday they're going -- the full board is probably going to also support \$22 an hour. I also ask you

to make some of the lifeguards who work all year round full-time employees, or regular part-time employees, or regular employees, whether full-time or part-time. That way you have people working all year round and you won't have this period in the spring and early summer where you're down to few lifeguards. We need benefits. Someone talked about transportation. You could add an extra hour of -- a stipend for each shift, or a weekly stipend for

[10:40:52 AM]

transportation. We get a bus pass but it takes too long for me to get to work, two hours on the bus. It's a very difficult job. We deserve more Payn what we can get in other jobs like food or retail. People get hurt doing lifeguarding. This past weekend there were only five of nine --

[buzzer sounding]

>> If anybody has any questions?

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Angela Richter.

>> Hi, everyone, I'm the advocacy manager at Austin parks foundation. And first of all, I wanted to thank councilmember Ellis and all of you who are cosponsoring this item on lifeguards for recognizing the importance of our public pools and the important job that our lifeguards do. We know that it's so important that we take every action to make sure that our pools are

[10:41:52 AM]

fully staffed and open this summer. All austinites deserve to have a place to swim, regardless of their ability to have their own private pool or to pay membership at a private pool. I am certainly going to continue to teach my children how to swim in city of Austin pools this summer. City of Austin lifeguards did recently speak at the parks board meetings and you heard from one of them just now about the importance of a living wage and the value of other ntives. One that we heard from them was about lunch being provided. I'm not sure if someone will speak to that today. Austin parks foundation is committed to being a partner in this. We have let the parks department know we are very happy to help contribute to an incentive that could work to make sure that we have enough lifeguards this summer. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Sofia Peña.

[10:42:56 AM]

>> Thank you, and good morning, mayor Adler and councilmembers. I stand before you here today as an open waterguard at Barton springs. Part of the reason that we have this huge lack of lifeguards is the pay rate, which is no more than is paid at any other job with a lot less responsibility and work, especially because at Barton springs our job isn't just to watch the water. In typical day, there are two to four saves not counting medicals and delete first AIDS. We maintain a clean and safe facility, which includes no alcohol, no glass. And this is a lot of job. This is an important reason to increase pay. But with everything increasing -- rent, gas nearly doubling in price -- and Austin being a major growing city, 15 or even \$17 per hour is barely making it by. For many guards, especially at Barton springs, this job is their main source of income. I love my job. Speaking for all of us at Barton springs, it's a great job to work in. But with only 25 guards on

[10:43:57 AM]

payroll, each time it becomes more stressful and less flexible. Barton springs as a main tourist attraction being closed an extra two days a week, patrons are not happy. With 8 to 10,000 people visiting a day, that's less income. I ask for your help, not just us, but for our managers, supervisors, and thousands of patrons and tourists who visit. In order to address this, my proposal is to increase the living wage to \$22. Not just this, but as she mentioned, providing lunch, because we had lunch provided for spring break and that was a huge help because an eight-hour shift, you don't have time to think about what you're going to eat. If we had lunch provided it would be a huge help and incentive for people to work as lifeguards. Thank you for your time.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Rnrna, if you would go ahead and

[10:44:58 AM]

take us to the non-zoning speakers that are participating remotely.

>> Sure. We have a few that are registered for 13, 14, and 34. If they are speaking on the postponement, I will call them up. Richard straccs.

>> Hello. Thank you for listening to me. My name is Richard straccs. I've been a downtown homeowner for 20 years. Thank you for considering postponement of items 13, 14, and 24 related to the downtown Austin community court. This will allow the city to reconsider not only the location, but also the form of the dacc. Please remember that this portion of downtown is being advanced as the center of tourism and commerce. The building is one block from two new luxury hotels under construction, one block from the new UT towers, and down the street from the governor's

[10:46:00 AM]

mansion. It is an ideal location for an arts and cultural center, but a questionable location for this court. I urge the council to postpone and reconsider what is best for our homeless population and this neighborhood. Thank you.

>> Susana Galahue.

>> Hi. My name is Susie. I spoke a few weeks ago at the original hearing. And I am -- I oppose having the downtown Austin community court moved to the location. I'm really in favor of what Jeff Steinley, my colleague in the building, proposed to actually keep the original plan of using the municipal building as a

[10:47:01 AM]

cultural arts center. I think that would be a much better use of the space, and especially being two blocks away from the governor's mansion and right in the center of the historic district of Austin. I just think it's a highly visited tourist area and that would be a much better use of the space. Thank you so much.

>> Mayor Adler: We'll go to the next speaker. Just a reminder, the testimony now should be about whether or not we should postpone this action or not.

>> Blaine Seville.

>> Hello. Thank you, Mayor Adler and councilmembers. I appreciate your postponement of items 13, 14, and 34. Again, just to echo that we've got so few historic buildings left downtown. I feel this building should be preserved and the city should move forward with its initial

[10:48:01 AM]

unanimous decision for a cultural center in its entirety. The other item is that speaking with developers in today's inflated environment, some developers believe that your \$32 million estimate to whitebox and build out this building is more likely in the 45 to \$60 million range in today's dollars. This amount of money dictates that there are definitely better avenues having more complementary co-located services. It would also be better to have cheaper lease facilities, given given -- giving the service the mobility to move to areas that best fit the needs of the services at any point in time. Again, thank you for the postponement and analysis, and I appreciate your consideration. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: And I appreciate you speaking. I do want to just make sure that

[10:49:03 AM]

the record on this is accurate as people discuss it. Obviously I'm bringing the motion to postpone because I think we have issues we need to speak through. The action that we took as a body with respect to cultural arts in that property was not to designate that property for cultural arts. The resolution was broader than that. It said we need to find and take a look at city-owned properties, to find properties that would be amenable for cultural art uses. And we wanted them to look across the board, we said, at the entire portfolio of city-owned buildings, and to make recommendations to the council on properties that could be suitable for cultural uses. And we asked that that review include but not be limited to the municipal building at 8th street. Also, by the way, the closed fire station that Austin had

[10:50:03 AM]

been used up on Guadalupe. And so my interest is still there for us to find city-owned properties that can be put to cultural use. And that's something that has to be considered for this building. And I appreciate the support of the community for that use. But just to make sure that the record is clear, the council never took an designating this property for that use. Councilmember pool?

>> Pool: Thanks, mayor. I'm glad you clarified that. I was a bit surprised that that resolution had been mistaken in the community and I wasn't sure how that had happened. So we regularly put out broad initiative-type resolutions asking for a wide array, a broad expansion of information. And we certainly don't choose one over many before we have the

[10:51:05 AM]

information on the many, or at least we try really hard not to because it's not really good public policy. So thank you for clarifying that. I think that that has been mistaken broadly in the community, and that -- certainly what you have just said will help clear that up for everybody.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. All right. Continuing on with speakers, please call the next one.

>> Candy Sibill.

>> Hi. I appreciate the postponement of voting on items number 13, 14, and 34. Thank you very much.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Alex Stringer for item 55.

>> Hello. Can you guys hear me?

>> Yes, please proceed.

>> Okay. My name is Alex and I'm just calling to voice my support for

[10:52:07 AM]

Mackenzie Kelly's item 55 and 57 resolution to explore using Bitcoin as a mode of payment as well as exploring how we can best utilize blockchain technology in the city. I started buying Bitcoin around the spring of 2020. And before I started buying Bitcoin, I was broke. And as a result of having bought Bitcoin and owning Bitcoin I am a lot less broke. I was able to buy a house with my Bitcoin money. My financial situation has improved. Also throughout this process I got the chance to really learn a lot about this asset and why it's so valuable. I applaud you guys tremendously for taking this initiative. Not only is Austin a tech hub where we can attract a lot of people and intelligent growth that will benefit everybody, but

[10:53:08 AM]

in putting Bitcoin on your balance sheet, which I strongly suggest you guys doing, you guys are going to have a lot of money and a lot more disposable income within the next five to ten years to spend money on a lot of other social initiatives that you guys pride yourself on, like affordability, helping homeless, green transportation, etc. So I think that this is a really great opportunity for you guys to do. I also have one more thing to say about this. And this past couple years there's been a lot of censorship and devaluing of currency. And giving residents the opportunity to pay taxes with Bitcoin, I would also explore offering people discounts to pay their taxes in Bitcoin because, you know, nobody will want to give it up unless there's incentive to do it.

[Buzzer sounding]

>> Thank you, speaker.

[10:54:08 AM]

Your time has expired.

>> Property taxes.

>> Jen margiles.

>> Good morning. Thank you. I'm speaking in support of the resolution for a trauma recovery center, item 61. As part of Austin's reimagining public safety efforts, I served on the working group for services for survivors of violence and violence prevention. And one of our strong recommendations was that Austin join the 39 cities that have already created trauma recovery centers. I thank councilmember Fuentes, my councilmember, harper-madison, councilmembers tovo and kitchen, the mayor pro tem, is the mayor, and everyone who has worked to bring this resolution forward. As someone with decades of

experience in the movement to end domestic violence, in ice and prevention, I cannot emphasize enough how crucial it

[10:55:08 AM]

is for survivors to have accessible avenues to deal with trauma, especially survivors who experience concentrated cycles of crime without access to prevention and treatment as the earlier speaker mentioned. As we work to bring true public safety to our city, it's especially important that we invest in the people who are woefully underserved and harmed by existing systems, people who are homeless, lgbt + survivors, communities of color, and people experiencing street and gun violence. Trauma recovery centers provide resources to survivors least likely to be served by systems. Funds we spend to break cycles of violence a the most cost effective the city can make. A trauma recovery center in Austin would be a major step towards equity-based solutions that address theory of harm with intensive community care. I urge you to vote in favor of this resolution. Thank you.

[10:56:15 AM]

>> Mohini Lal.

>> I'm a public policy manager at the Texas council on family violence. Kara from alliance for safety and justice serves on our public policy committee and has been pivotal in elevating and educating us on trauma recovery centers. Trauma recovery centers are placed within the most vulnerable communities with the least amount of resources so more marginalized victims have the opportunity to receive services from trauma recovery centers, even if they choose not to file a police report. Trcs offer an added layer of support for folks who don't access existing services. Many victims don't choose to utilize the system for a myriad of reasons. Family violence programs are critical to community work. But many survivors first seek support at other sites. We also support enhanced community response to violence that works in concert with local programs. To enhance community safety,

[10:57:15 AM]

crime survivors need more options. In adopting this resolution and funding a center, Austin will not only develop a trauma recovery center to serve victims, but also a model we can learn from in our ongoing efforts to support multiple pathways towards healing. Thank you for your time.

>> Amelia gasas.

>> Good morning, my name is Amelia and I'm a resident in district 6 and policy analyst with the Texas fair defense project. Thank you for allowing me to speak in favor of item 61 today. I will be brief. As a

member organization of the reimagining public safety task force, we support item 61 and the cession of trauma recovery centers. On a daily basis we see the impact of harm and trauma on our clients. Without holistic services and trauma-informed treatment, low-income and communities of color feel the brunt of both violence and criminalization the

[10:58:16 AM]

most. The city's lack of resources to provide critical trauma-informed therapy and case management restrict communities to remain in a place of hurt and trauma, and prevents them from healing. Trauma recovery centers are one of the many solutions we need to reduce community harm. They're evidence-based and address the root causes of violence. I'm excited the city is having these conversations around trauma and recovery and making intentional steps towards healing and harm reduction. I urge you to vote in favor of item 61. Thank you so much.

>> Jill Henderson.

>> Good morning. My name is Jill Henderson and I am also speaking on resolution 61. I am a member of district 10, have been a resident of Austin for 31 years and actually am a crime survivor. So I lost a bonus child to

[10:59:19 AM]

gun violence in 2017 and recently lost another son to a brutal murder in Greece in 2017, ricari Henderson. I am speaking of firsthand experience of why we feel a trauma recovery center would work in our community. We feel as community members this is something that would have helped our family tremendously. We would have been able to get the help we need with counseling services as well as fill out victim's compensation paperwork and helping us with legal resources also that we need to navigate through at such an horrific season in our lives. TRC's are important because they not only help with one service, but with all victims. So it's something that can help our community heal and

[11:00:20 AM]

come together and be more united in how we D with issues that impact such a vulnerable community. So I'ming that you please vote for this resolution, and thank you again for your time.

>> Chivas Watson. Mr. Watson, please unmute. Chrissy o'brien.

[11:01:21 AM]

>> Hello?

>> Yes, please proceed.

>> Good morning, mayor and council. This is Christy o'brien with the American federation of state and county municipal employees. We are calling to express our support for item number 93. Thanks to councilmember Ellis and her staff for bringing it forward. We feel it's an important step in right direction. I specifically want to call attention to the recommendation to look at more permanent fte hiring for staff servicing pools that are open year-round. These employees need stability and should be full-time status. Staffing shortages are citywide and the employees are suffering because of it. We still have admin staff at APD crawling through the backlog of 911 calls. We should be doing everything we can to bring relief. Local 61 is looking forward to a work session where we will be bringing a recommendation to bring the wage forward. We must raise the wage to 22 an hour this year to attract

[11:02:23 AM]

and retain public service workers. We know the budget will be tight and we ask that you put your operation and the employees Thate it happen first when considering your funding priorities this year. On item 55 we appreciate innovative ideas and we do Noel this is a time to be spending taxpayer funds resources, time and energy on new tasks such as crypto currency or blockchain studies when there's so many other issues like employee retention, recruitment, we should be focused on addressing these issues first and foremost. Lastly we support item number 5, spending for additional staff. To support the rapid increase in traffic. It would help to adequately fund airport staffing operational needs. Thank you so much for your time.

>> Chris Harris.

[11:03:36 AM]

>> I'm calling to oppose item 55, support item 57 continuing on the provision for public bank and and wholeheartedly support item 61 helping to have a trauma recovery center. On item 55, as a member of the public safety task force, I appreciate that despite state and local efforts by the associations to kill ourists that the recommendations we've put forward approve resilient and necessary. Trauma recovery centers provide critical care to those harmed typically without access and their absence within our public safety system. To this point it highlights the bankruptcy of the long-standing police approach that we've taken and that most cities across the country have taken. I'm really heartened to see the city and hopefully the county as well actually take

[11:04:37 AM]

an approach that recognizes those that have been victimized, understand that their recovery is part of and crucial to what we refer to as public safety. And not focused primarily on the threat of abuse and punishment cannot get us to a safe city. So thank you to all those who have been behind item 61 and really appreciate the work to get this through, especially to the mayor pro tem, councilmember Fuentes, councilmember harper-madison and the alliance for safety and justice and crime survivors for criminal justice.

>> Zenobia Joseph.

[11:05:42 AM]

Ms. Joseph, please unmute.

>> Thank you, mayor, council, I'm Zenobia Joseph. My comments are specifically related to items 43 and 44, those are your two workforce solutions items. The clerk's office should have forwarded you my written testimony. As it relates specifically to the \$3.2 million for childcare and the \$6.6 million for workforce, I specifically would ask that you redirect those funds to help Travis county commissioners' court with the evictions that are impending. Specifically as they stated during their meeting on Tuesday.

[11:06:43 AM]

There are 4,876 applications and so to the mayor pro tem I just want to remind you that on may 6, 2021, you called for the city manager to actually look collaboratively at the funding that was coming from the federal government. Also from capital metro. So as it relates specifically to the reallocation of these dollars, I would ask you to recognize the need for metrorapid on Parmer, Samsung to apple. As it relates specifically to the evictions, I want you to recognize that the city has an obligation as well to address people that will become homeless. So the county has done it's part to set aside \$110 million for the homeless issue but that's \$10 million more than you requested. So if you're not going to allocate these dollars to help the people who are being evicted, I would ask the county to take their \$10 million and use it to help the people avert being

[11:07:45 AM]

put out of their homes. And lastly, I would just say that they're having a work session today as it relates to affordable housing and I just want to call to your attention that you do have some links in the email that I sent so that you can see specifically that the county's rental assistance program was open one week and over 3,000 people applied.

[Buzzer]. So I would ask you yes, childcare is important, but if the people don't have a place to live, then the children will suffer as well. And I realize that --

>> Thank you,, speaker. Your time has expired.

>> Chivas Watson?

>> Hey, everybody. It's been moons. Chivas Watson here, admin of working group 512 who sits

[11:08:46 AM]

at the underbelly of the city to see what you all have not done. I'm glad that Zenobia went before me because I will echo the absolute same. Since I returned from prison in may 2020 you all have denied the people. You all have denied what we've needed. We have asked, we have labored, we have toiled and asked for real solutions, not neosporin on gaping wounds. You all know me to be on I-10 sometimes when I jump into the queue. It doesn't matter where I am. We begin sit at the underbelly of the city of Austin. No disrespect to the Texas alliance for safety and justice, but we need to improve delivery of justice in the city of Austin. Today. Steve, we've had this conversation before. Alison, we've had this conversation before. I am tired of hearing austinites come to you all week after week after week,

[11:09:46 AM]

month after month after month, hoping that you all do something about housing injustices, food insecurities. Make real solutions today. As sister Zenobia said, real Nate that country to the county to evolve evictions. In every zip code we have people fearing losing everything they have. Again, I appreciate the time. As always standing for the people, hoping that you all hear, but knowing that you all may not. I'm always available for questions. Please do something. Something other than neosporin on a gaping wound. Thank you.

>> Mayor, that concludes the consent speakers. We do have Ms. Joseph on the line for ahfc.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Colleagues, we're going to go ahead and recess the

[11:10:51 AM]

Austin city council meeting here at 11:10 for just a moment. We'll convene the Austin housing finance corporation meeting here on March 24th, 2020 -- 2022. What did I say, 2020?

[Laughter] 2022. We've kind of lost a couple of years in there.

>> Alter: And we don't want to repeat that.

>> Mayor Adler: We don't want to repeat them. But we have a quorum present. We're going to go ahead and convene this meeting for the purpose of taking public testimony. I think we have one speaker signed up. Would you please call her?

>> Zenobia Joseph.

>> Thank you, mayor and council, I'm Zenobia Joseph. Mayor, do I have two minutes or three?

>> Mayor Adler: Three minutes.

>> Thank you, mayor. My opposition specifically as it relates to the Austin

[11:11:54 AM]

housing finance corporation item 1 is specifically the \$458,000 specifies that this money is coming from the anti-displacement fund specifically related to project connect. On our agenda today, however, you do have the community advisory committee bylaws which specifies that anti-displacement and equity matters will be brought before that committee before you take action. I want to remind you as well that your joint powers agreement 3.2.2, the priority population, bipoc, which I hate that term that's in the language, black, indigenous and person of color, are priorities for community outreach. So my question as it relates to this fourplex, is there four two bedroom units. What black people have you spoken to? What organizations you have communicated with? How did Greg Smith come to

[11:12:55 AM]

this project? And specifically how is this going to improve economic development? You just heard from Mr. Watson talking about the needs in east Austin specifically. I want you to recognize that this anti-displacement fund is really a farce. So specifically mayor I'm not sure why you have such an aversion to black people. That's not going to grow any type of wealth in east Austin. You have on your agenda today, 56, the colony park sustainable community initiative. That is nothing more than a regurgitated resolution. What I want you to recognize is just Ned, mayor, the Eno report specified that people have lost faith in this process as it relates to project connect. So unless you're just going to go through the motions and this is merely an exercise in futility, I would ask you to pause this item, go out to the community and recognize the need for home ownership. I support ohm ownership in this area. This is in the area off of

[11:13:56 AM]

Loyola lane. This is not a priority for anti-displacement and it relates to the resolution that talks about colony park, the green line specifically June 20th, 2017, tod hemmingson told Travis county commissioner it does not meet the ridership for federal funding. And Natasha harper-madison, the district 1 council member, asked this question during the mobility committee. This is dysinformation and that language needs to be danged and it needs to accurately reflect what is happening. If you are going to do anything in this area there needs to be home ownership. And I would just ask the council, 8402gore clerk circle, which is near route 37, to consider a plot of land so that people can grow their own food, home ownership where you have the -- [buzzer] You would own the land and someone

[11:14:56 AM]

could actually have some type of equity in the property but they don't own the land. You actually through the community land trust.

>> Thank you, speaker, your time has expired. If you have any questions, I'll gladly answer them at this time.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. Do we have any other speakers to speak?

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. I'm going to go ahead and recess the Austin housing finance corporation meeting here at 11:15. I'm going to reconvene the Austin city council meeting, continuing here on March 24th, 2022. The time is 11:15. Colleagues, we've now had speakers, we're now back to our agenda. Councilmember kitchen?

>> Kchchen: I have an item that we need to discuss before we vote.

>> Mayor Adler: Which number is that?

>> Kitchen: It's not a

[11:15:57 AM]

numbered item on the agenda, but it's something that I think it's really important to recognize. We have a person on our council today who is having a very special day. And I for one would like to recognize and thank him, and perhaps, you know, we have sang happy birthday before in the past... And so I don't know if anyone with a better voice than mine would like to lead that effort, but, mayor, I hope you're having a very special day.

[Laughter].

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. And I am. It's a beautiful day.

[Applause].

>> Kitchen: So nobody is going to take me up on singing?

>> [Inaudible].

>> I say we do it without the microphones. We don't need to put y'all through all that.

[11:17:01 AM]

>> [All singing happy birthday].

[Applause].

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you all very much. Thank you. It's good we turned off the microphones.

[Laughter] Those things go viral, you know. All right. So we're back to the agenda. I think that the pulled items that I have at this point are items 13, 14 and 34:00 that's the dacc three items. Also items 27, 34, 37, 55

[11:18:03 AM]

and 57. For the record I think that 52 was also pulled. So 52, 55 and 57 were pulled. Again, the pulled items I have are 13, 14, 34, 27, 34, 37, 52, 55 and 57. There are some other items we'll put amendments to and we'll discuss but we're going try to leave those on consent.

>> Kelly: I am going to put item 27 back on consent. Staff was able to answer any questions so we don't need to talk about it.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. 27 back on consent. Mayor pro tem?

>> I would like to pull 64. I have a super quick question and it will not take long.

>> Mayor Adler: I have 64 not on the consent agenda.

>> Alter: Okay. Then I'll try to figure it out before then.

>> Mayor Adler: That's okay. Is there a motion to approve the consent agenda?

[11:19:08 AM]

Anything else, any other pulled items?

>> Tovo: I think it can stay on consent, but I do have a question for councilmember harper-madison about one of the changes that she made to her resolution, which I think was just distributed. And that item 56. I think we can talk about it, but I want to talk about the date change you mentioned.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool makes a motion, seconded by council member Fuentes. Discussion on the consent item that would include making amendments, include asking questions. And I would like the record to reflect THA on item number 52 I'm not going to be voting. I don't think I have a legal responsibility not to vote. My wife Diane is an officer of safe and on the board, so I'm just not going to vote on that item.

>> Alter: I pulled that item.

>> Oh, you pulled that, that's right.

[11:20:08 AM]

We'll get to that one later.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. There were some quick changes to the items on consent. Mayor pro tem, I think you had two or three of those. Do you want to pull yours up?

>> Alter: Sure, I'll do my amendments and then I'll do my remarks later for other items. So for item number 40, this is the lease for the information and security office. I would like to offer the

following direction: City manager is directed to work with the iso and the re office, to develop a plan to make sure they move into a facility that meets the technical and security requirements before the end of the requested lease extension. I want to just a little a little bit why this is important. As a member of the audit and finance committee and now as chair, I've worked with staff to make a plan for the

[11:21:08 AM]

city to switch from leasing space to owning space, which is projected to save over \$300 million in 30 years and move over 20 million a year from operating costs to capital. Those are the projections we had before we were able to move to a lot of telecommuting so those numbers might be even higher. But it is both the \$300 million in 30 years savings, but also really important under our revenue cap is ability to switch from operating to capital costs. It gives us a lot more flexibility in our regular budget. If we want to see this plan and these savings implemented we must consciously and deliberately move to owning space and not just wake up at the end of a lease and go oh, what do we do now? So this direction pushes us in that -- towards implementing that plan and you will see me doing that when there are no alternatives to leases on a pretty regular basis because I think it's really important that we take these

[11:22:11 AM]

physically prudent -- fiscally prudent steps. So I would move adding that direction to item 40.

>> Mayor Adler: Anybody have any objection to that amendment being added to item 40? Hearing no objection, that is added to item 40. That item stays on consent.

>> Alter and for item 43 I would like to briefly highlight that item. It's a contract with workforce solutions to implement 6.6 millions of the city's arpa framework designated for workforce development. These investments will ensure we're investing in our community's long-term resilience. I posted some direction to the message board that I hope will be adopted on consent, which direct the city manager to identify and explore potential opportunities within the workforce development services agreement to support the city's own workforce needs. For example, the CDL driver vacancies. So we've been talking a lot about the vacancies we have at the city. We are spending a significant amount of money to invest in workforce training. I would like us to try to make that connection up with our own workforce.

[11:23:11 AM]

We have openings and jobs and that we can make this not just transition planning, but actually people to jobs and benefit from the training that we are paying for. So I would like to move adoption of that direction along with the consent.

>> Mayor Adler: Does your direction make it so that it's that exclusively?

>> Alter: No. It says -- it says to support the city's own workforce needs and then in parenthesis it says, for example, CDL driver vacancies. And it doesn't say -- it says identify and explore potential opportunities within. So it doesn't have to exclusively go to the city, but I do believe it's an opportunity that we should not miss for addressing some of our own needs and collaborating with workforce solutions to help us do that.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. So for that reason it's supported. Any objection to that amendment being added? Hearing none that is added and added to consent.

>> Alter: And then I have a third amendment to item

[11:24:13 AM]

number 33 that councilmember Ellis is bringing, which is amplifying pard's efforts to support our lifeguards and temporary pard staff. I think it's a really important item. I'm a lifeguard myself and I know that the value that these job experiences can bring to young people or to anyone who has these jobs. But I'm also a parent of teens with friends who have kids who are teens that could work at the pools,

but transportation is an issue, especially when your hours shift all the time. So I'm proposing an amendment that adds a bullet to the things that consider that is addressing transportation obstacles facing perspective staff and I believe that's been distributed.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Does anybody have any objection to that amendment being added to 93? Hearing none, it's added. That stays on consent.

>> Alter: Thank you. I'll let other people talk and come back to my comments.

>> Mayor Adler: We'll do that. Councilmember Ellis, did you want to add something to item 46?

>> Ellis: I did and I had some comments on 93 as well.

[11:25:14 AM]

I don't know if we just want to make those comments. I think there may be some others that want to be made. Is that appropriate at this time?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Ellis: Thank you. I really want to extend my appreciation for the folks speak today about incentivizing more people to be lifeguards today. I love seeing you in chambers and I know afsome has been pivotal in advocating for our lifeguards year over year in the budget cycle. Everyone knows when thinking about summer in Austin we think about swimming. And after two Summers of pandemic and repairs I know many residents are ready to jump back into the pools. However, we are facing a critical lifeguard shortage and we won't be able to open all of our pools and keep our residents safe if we can't train of you enough lifeguards in the next few months. I no he that lifeguards are first responders who take control in emergency situations even before ems arrives. I was trained many years ago to be a lifeguard for my

[11:26:14 AM]

first job as a 16-year-old. I was able to work my way up to teaching certification courses before graduating college. My skills then have taught me how to step up when the moment calls you and I know our community members do the same day in and day out. So as you can tell I think of lifeguards as essential first responders who deserve respect and appropriate compensation. It's a job that requires certification, dedication and critical decision making skills in those seconds before ems arrives are critical. What this resolution does is enhance the existing efforts of the parks department and potentially gives them more tools to hire the seasonal employees that they so desperately need. It asks the city manager to explore recruitment and retention strategies and come back with some options for us to consider that might include waiving training fees, offering bonuses and/or longevity pay, increasing hourly pay, offering full-time status and benefits to certain employees that are working all year-round and increasing funding for

[11:27:15 AM]

marketing efforts. The parks department has launched hiring fairs, one of which I was lucky to attend last week. I really enjoyed myself at that hiring fair. And they're beginning to offer summer completion bonuses. They are also working with aid. I know I've heard suggestions about going into the high schools and making sure to get the word out, and they've been launching robust marketing efforts already. They're doing everything in their power to get the word out, but they're facing obstacles that may be able to be overcome with a few more tools in the toolbox. So when I was with our parks staff last week they told me they were only about 10% of the way of hiring the lifeguards they need. They need 750 lifeguards to be fully staffed at 30 public pools. I know we don't want to make decisions about which pools stay open, but there are some like Barton springs that have to close on certain days because they don't have enough open water trained lifeguards to be able to staff every single position. So if we don't get there our

[11:28:16 AM]

pools won't fully open. Summer camp programs that so many parents rely on might need to be cut or postponed or diminished in some way. So let me take a moment to thank my co-sponsors, acoustics kitchen, harper-madison, and tovo, as well as mayor Adler and mayor pro tem alter, and I want to thank the parks board who have been wrestling with these questions as well and made some great recommendations along the way that we've incorporated. And most of all I'd like to thank our existing lifeguards, camp counselors and other employees who reached out to my office with suggestions and offered really helpful feedback. You are what makes Austin the incredible city that it is and I want you to know how much we appreciate you. And I can make comments on 46 if no one else wants to talk on 93.

>> I do.

>> Mayor Adler: I'll give people a chance to speak as they want to.

>> I think he wants to speak on 93.

>> Mayor Adler: Why don't you go ahead.

>> Vela: I appreciate this item. I'm a former Barton springs

[11:29:16 AM]

lifeguard, 1997-1998, I can't remember. But it was probably to this day still the best job I've ever had. It's a tougher job than people would imagine, especially at Barton springs, because you have to have our

open water certification, which in the universe of people that are looking for jobs, there are physical requirements for being a lifeguard. So already you're kind of narrowing the scope of people that would be eligible for the job and then for something like Barton springs there's even tougher physical requirements that you have to have to get the open water certification so it's an even smaller group of people. And we really need to recognize that. And honestly, I think full time it's open year-round, we need guards year-round. We should have a core group of lifeguards who are full time city employees with full pay and benefits to reflect that. It's always been strange to me that we don't. And I just wanted to mention also just in terms of staffing needs, it's not

[11:30:17 AM]

like a security guard where you can kind of sit there and just watch T door or something like that. Lifeguards really have to keep a focus on the water and that's why they rotate them so frequently. And to run a time them frequently you need enough staff to run a time. I can't sit there for three hours because you will lose focus and someone will slip away and you will have a tragedy. And so there's higher staffing needs that people realize. They do maintenance, they also really kind of are default security guards at the pools, deal with any kinds of problems, fights, disruptions. Again, I want to thank councilmember Ellis for bringing the resolution and if possible I would love to be listed as a co-sponsor as well.

>> Ellis: I'd love that. Thank you for those comments.

>> Mayor Adler: The record will reflect that you are listed as a co-sponsor as well. Councilmember Kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Yes. I wanted to briefly comment

[11:31:19 AM]

on 93 and thank councilmember Ellis and all the co-sponsors and all the support for bringing this forward. I heard from lots of folks, I know all of you have, but my district is so close to the pool we have a lot of folks that really rely on the pool for peace of mind in terms of exercising every morning and swimming every morning. And it's really been a blow to them to have to be concerned about whether we have sufficient lifeguards. So I appreciate your words, councilmember Ellis, and yours too council member vela. I think there's a real recognition in the community about how important lifeguards are for all of us. So thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: I wanted to weigh in as somebody who has never been a lifeguard.

[Laughter]. But who absolutely

[11:32:22 AM]

appreciates them. In particular it's been long-standing shortage of lifeguards because it's a part-time job and seasonal and I love the concept that would have this be a year-round profile. So thanks for that. I hope we are able to do it. And thanks for the folks who do this job for us every year, every season, and I look forward to having all of our pools open regularly and consistently throughout the swimming season. And one last little shout-out to our parks and recs staff for support of our public pools and if there were ever a way that we might be able to change the opening date and the closing date of the majority of our pools to more closely align to when it is really hot in our city, that would be a nice additional reform potentially. Thanks so much for bringing

[11:33:22 AM]

this, councilmember Ellis.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Thank you, councilmember Ellis, for your leadership on this issue. I know that we've been in touch a little bit with the parks department to inquire about the status of the program that's -- that happens in conjunction with several of our high schools. I know since this is on consent, I don't want to slow this down, but I know director Mcneeley, I know during covid some of that work stopped and it's an important partnership. And we don't need an answer today, but it would be great to know if that program has restarted because it was designed to really help recruit lifeguards among some of our youth in our community. So thanks again, councilmember Ellis, I think this is an important step forward. I do want to say, mayor, on item 37 I really would like just to postpone it. So if there's no concerns about that we have checked with the staff to see if there's any impact of postponing it for one

[11:34:22 AM]

meeting. This is an unusual thing to arrive on our agenda. It's a piece of property that appears to have been built -- purchased for the hancocks water treatment plant and we have been asked about a lease for storage on that tract. I would like to ask staff about really to get a sense of how fully vetted it was, this proposal was with our strategic facilities committee. So if nobody is concerned about the postponement, I would just leave it on consent.

>> Mayor Adler: Manager, is staff okay with postponement?

>> I'm confirming, but I believe we are.

>> Tovo: And then I had --

>> Mayor Adler: Hang on. Anybody have an objection to postponing this and leaving it on consent?
Mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: I don't have an objection, but I think for next steps, councilmember tovo, probably this is in

[11:35:23 AM]

councilmember Kelly's district, will be in my district come january.so we would also like -- I know you're responding to some questions that I asked about it, but we would also like to be involved in the discussions.

>> Tovo: And I had reached out to councilmember Kelly and so absolutely will loop you in as well.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. That will stay then on consent with a motion to postpone until our next meeting.
Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: And then with regard to 56, I had a question for councilmember harper-madison. I see -- thank you for bringing forward this important resolution. I'm really eager to see this plan be funded as well and I appreciate your leadership on this issue. I did notice in the draft that was distributed this morning that you changed the date rather substantially and it's a long while from now. So I wanted to ask you about that, especially since I think it may be scheduled now for the last council meeting of the year, which is usually a really large one and a lot of things get postponed. So I would -- but in any case, I assume you've been talking with staff and that

[11:36:23 AM]

was their suggestion, but I wondered if you could walk us through that change and see if there were any opportunities to take it up any sooner.

>> Harper-madison: Sure. I would operate in deference to acm Gonzalez with anything beyond the fact that this updated language just reflects staff's request and was done in collaboration with catellus. The update basically ensures that staff can get with catellus and get what they need in time and so in order for it to move the project forward, but beyond that I would defer to acm Gonzalez. And to your point, yes, we're definitely working in collaboration with staff and with catellus and the colony park folks.

>> And I'll just note, council member, that that's just the later date. So obviously it could come earlier obviously if we're able to get there sooner. But acm Gonzalez, do you want to add anything?

[11:37:27 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Hang on one second. Wait until I get your mic on. Not yet? Go ahead.

>> Now? Okay, thank you, mayor, manager. Rodney Gonzalez, assistant city manager. We are pleased to see that the date has been expanded and to the city manager's point if we finish the work early we will certainly bring it back to council earlier.

>> Tovo: So I wonder, manager, sometimes when things -- I would like to suggest that we shift gears a little bit for some of these really large information requests and instead of waiting for every piece of information to be available when it comes back to council, in some cases to be helpful to have check-in points and start to get that information as it becomes available. So councilmember harper-madison, I wasn't in your quorum so I wasn't able to have this conversation with you, but would you be welcome to adding language along those lines so we can get some updates even if there would be a memo or just a super brief

[11:38:28 AM]

conversation in work session so we have a sense of how some of those conversations are transpiring. And I've been asking for that from health south as well. I would like to have a conversation about big projects like health south before it lands on our agenda as a finished project. I just think that we are using these big projects in our community and we can be helpful as that work goes on. I think manager you and I have had this conversation before, but I would ask you for you to regard some of our work sessions and things as an opportunity to be iterative and talk about things even if they're not fully finished. Sorry. That was a long -- a long lot of talking, but councilmember harper-madison, I guess if I could get back, are you comfortable if we add in some language that asks for those interim report backs?

>> Harper-madison: You will have to forgive me, council member.

[11:39:28 AM]

I have terrible allergies right now so I was clearing your thought when you were speaking and didn't hear exactly what it was that you wanted to add. But essentially what you're asking for is additional updates, notification. First of all, I can assure you that there is no part of that that will not be very consistently working with staff on this item. It is extraordinarily important. But if potentially what you're saying is you want to add language that says bring us more updates, why not? Of course I'm comfortable with that?

>> Tovo: That would be great. I know that you and your office will continue to --

>> Harper-madison: Sounds good.

>> Tovo: Will continue to be leaders on this and continue to be in touch with staff, but it needs to be distributed across the dais.

>> Harper-madison: No problem with that whatsoever.

>> Tovo: Thank you so much. So I would add language that suggests the manager come back with an update let's say by the end of July -- excuse me, by the end of June. With an update.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to that language

[11:40:28 AM]

being included? Councilmember harper-madison, were you okay with that?

>> Harper-madison: Chair, I have had my hand raised for like five speakers at this point. So if once we're resolved with this, I would like very much to be recognized.

>> Mayor Adler: You will be the next speaker. On this issue are you okay with the wording change from councilmember tovo? Does anyone have an objection to that? Without objection then, that's added then to that item 56. Okay. Councilmember harper-madison, I will recognize you.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you, I appreciate it. It's perfect timing. Maybe my hand raise is premature. I want to talk about colony park. The colony park sustainability community initiative it started out as a three-year planning process. That was 10 years ago. We've made a lot of progress since then, but we've worked extensively with the community to come up with a

[11:41:29 AM]

vision for the plan, working with -- with central health to fast track the health care that we finally got. Selecting catellus as our private development partner. But the fact is that we don't have one of the most vital things, a financing plan. It's not everyday that we have a community begging for major development in their backyard, but this is a community that has experienced decades of neglect and disinvestment. Almost a quarter of its residents live in poverty. They live miles -- I don't know how familiar y'all are with the area, but literally miles away from decent groceries, from a pharmacy, from a health clinic, from a

[11:42:30 AM]

bank from all those things that so many in the community and more fortunate communities have access to and take for granted, frankly. This sustainable community initiative will transform this corner of town. It will bring walkable, transit friendly mixed use development to colony park. It will serve as an important node for two important project connect investments, including our second commuter rail line. It will bring better parks, better trails and open space and it will bring nearly 2,000 new units of

housing, both single and multi-family. And in one of those five units -- I'm sorry, in one in five of those units will be reserved for people who cannot otherwise afford to buy or rent in Austin right now. The current residents of

[11:43:30 AM]

colony park realize this is about access, access to housing, access to mobility, access to economic opportunities. We have been promising them this access for a long time and we still haven't delivered. I understand and I feel their frustrations deeply. I feel the frustration and I don't think it's disproportionate given how long folks have been waiting. I hope that with this resolution that we demonstrate to them and to everyone else that this is truly a top priority for the city of Austin and to the point that I made with councilmember Tovo, I don't intend to let this go. I will be relentless in the remainder of my time on the Austin city council to make sure that we deliver. I hope that we signal that we're not just looking at

[11:44:35 AM]

the development itself. That want to have thoughtful, deliberate strategies with our community partners who ensure that the residents who live in the area right now will be able to stay in place and enjoy everything that a sustainable community will bring. So thank you to my co-sponsors and colleagues for supporting the effort. Thank you to city staff who have invested so much time and energy. I mean, I really can't express how much time and effort has gone into this. Thank you to Catellus for your partnership and thank you to Ms. Barbara Scott. The colony park neighborhood association and everyone else in the community who have been tirelessly, relentlessly pushing this Boulder up the hill for years now, I am deeply grateful and appreciate your effort and look forward to us putting our effort behind what we claim to be valuable

[11:45:36 AM]

to us. Thank you, chair.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Colleagues, we have the motion in front of us for the consent agenda. Councilmember Kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I would like to request to be shown as a co-sponsor on the item related to colony park, which I think is 56. And I want to thank councilmember Harper-Madison. I truly appreciate her leadership on this very, very important issue and just want to commit to being helpful in any way that I can to move this forward as quickly as possible.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member Fuentes P.

>> Kitchen: So we show me as a co-sponsor.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. Council member Fuentes.

>> Fuentes: First for those who called in and those in the audience, I will have comments to give on the trauma recovery center when we take that up. It is not on the consent

[11:46:37 AM]

agenda as it was a committee unanimously passed out of the public health committee so it's later on our agenda. For our comments today I did want to take a brief moment to thank the city manager and city staff for their announcement yesterday in adding paid leave for all our sworn personnel. I firmly believe that everyone should have guaranteed access to paid parental leave so I'm glad to see that our ems, fire and police will now be up to parity with six weeks paid leave along with the rest of the city of Austin employees. I want to thank councilmember kitchen who led the policy resolution that resulted in that action. So thank you, city manager and staff. Colleagues, there are a number of items on today's consent agenda that I want to highlight. There are a few from the aviation department. One of those items includes adding 80 new positions, 50 of which are frontline positions comprising of security, maintenance, custodial, guest services, operations and technical positions. And by adding the staffing

[11:47:38 AM]

it will allow the aviation department to convert 50 temporary employee positions to full time and that will help us with retention. As we know we are experiencing tremendous growth with our airport, and by having additional staff we'll ensure that we have safe and smooth travel for everyone that visits our airport. I'm glad to see that item move forward. Also on the agenda we have a number of Austin water related items and as chair of the Austin water oversight committee I wanted to draw attention to them. One of them is about updating existing chlorine and ammonia systems and this will allow us to maximize the utility of the you want current Ullrich plant allowing for technologies with the updates. We've this had conversation before that Ullrich is our second oldest water plant that we have in Austin and certainly the recent incidents we've had with the water utility have come with the Ullrich treatment plant. It's good to see the items

[11:48:40 AM]

come forward that will help us in making necessary investments in our infrastructure. So that's one of the Austin water items. There's also one item 24 that will increase the frequency of testing of cytotoxins

and algae blooms which we know has in the past resulted in or causing pets to die. And so that's another good item for us to bring forward subpoena and to adopt and ensure that we have safe water for our pets. And also on the agenda we have the chambers which brings together and I want to highlight the work of the then called meca chamber and now been rebranded as the dec, diversity and ethnic chamber alliance. It's so wonderful to see that type of collaboration and the minority chambers and I'm pleased to see the items move forward and I

[11:49:40 AM]

want to thank the for coming together and having the joint plan on economic equity development. And lastly on a personal note I want to highlight that this marks the last council meeting of one of my team members, Jesse Acuna, who is our communications director. She's embarking on a new chapter, but I want to thank her for her service. She is a former journalist who I have been so lucky to work with. There's not a week that goes by that I don't hear positive feedback from our community about the ways we've engaged our district 2 community and Jesse was such a huge part in our communications and our social media and driving our weekly newsletter. So her expertise, her talents, her work ethic is certainly going to be missed in our district 2 office but I wish her all the best and I know that she will always be on our d2 team. So I want to thank you,

[11:50:42 AM]

Jesse, for your service.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. Mayor pro tem and then councilmember Ellis.

>> Alter: For over a year I've worked closely with the Austin lbgtq chamber, the greater Austin Asian chamber, the greater Austin black chamber and the greater Austin hispanic chamber of commerce and city staff for a more meaningful way for the city to partner with the organizations and the chambers to partner with each other. Austin has a growing population and economy. And all of us up here on council know that doesn't mean that everyone is lifted up equally by that growth. Within the business sector we must support and foster the creation and sustainability of minority-owned businesses. Our chambers can help us with that. We underwent this review of

[11:51:44 AM]

the previous system to move away from the siloed nature of those contracts and in recognition that the city should partner with the four chambers that comprise the new diversity and ethnic chamber alliance in a way that leverages their comparative advantage of reducing barriers, building community and supporting the long-term success of the businesses they 11. In a way this new approach is strategic

capacity building for these chambers and our minority-owned businesses. With the implementation of the regional economic asset development plan, the de ca chambers will work together to bolster economic opportunity for all the businesses and communities supported by the alliance and invite our community to engage in the process as we move forward so the replan can reflect all of the region's priorities with respect to economic equity and development. Thank you again to the chambers and to the city staff for the hard work that you've done over many months

[11:52:44 AM]

to make this new path forward and I want to thank my staff member, Nina, who worked really hard on this as well. I very much look forward to the next steps and I invite you to join myself and the four chambers for a press conference at 5:30 in the press room as we officially launch the regional economic equity development plan process. Thank you for that item. I also want to comment on item 44, which is related to childcare. As you know, investing in our children is one of the most important obligations we have to our community. These investments began for generation of success by six partners and I was happy to include them in our arpa spending framework. It will reduce the number of children and families on the subsidy childcare waitlist. Provide stipends for essential childcare workers and add capacity to our continued duty of care

[11:53:45 AM]

program. I also want to thank our childcare advocates, our staff and my colleagues for the work and collaboration it took to bring this to fruition. Finally on consent, I just want to acknowledge that I'm really proud to co-sponsor councilmember harper-madison's resolution on colony pa and thank her for her leadership. A lot has already been said on this item, but I just want to add my voice to say this is long past time to accelerate this process and I look forward to working with her to make that happen. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Further discussion? Yes, councilmember Ellis.

>> Ellis: Thank you. I would also like to be added as a co-sponsor to item 56, the colony park item. I think that's a fantastic resolution and look forward to seeing its success. I also have comments and direction on item 46, which is the rowing dock item. Thank you for allowing me some more time over the past

[11:54:47 AM]

few weeks, colleagues, to be able to talk with the rowing dock owners and city staff on this particular item. The rowing dock as we all know is a beloved woman-owned business that has been in operation for many years in Austin. Their contract is set to expire next month and so late last year they were

gearing up and expecting to be able to respond to a new rfp that if awarded to them would have set their business up for another decade or two a lady bird lake. My understanding is that the rfp was getting ready to go and the rowing dock was expecting it to be released late last year, however, they were a bit surprised to learn that the rfp would not be released after all and instead a two-year extension was originally offered to their existing contract. So we're trying to help them navigate, you know, what happens while the vision planning for zilker park is happening. So for today the rowing dock director Mcneeley and pard staff, we've been in discussion with them and so

[11:55:47 AM]

item 42, which was the two year extension, is being withdrawn and replaced with item 46, which is the one year extension, and now as it-- as it stands now is good to stay on the consent agenda. We know this is a balance of predictability and consistency for our concession agreements, which are usually small business owners that operate and maintain our public spaces, all while respecting the processes of vision plans for our parks. We know that this is happening in a couple of different parks in Austin and so we want to make sure that we can find the correct balance between, you know, what has been, what will be and how we can help our small business owners succeed in that space. So my direction is to the city manager to explore options on how an rfp for this concession can be issued within the next year in relation to the expected timeline of the zilker park vision plan process, and report back to council by may 19th, 2022. We'd like a little better

[11:56:47 AM]

understanding about how this rfp process is going to work moving forward, understanding it is -- was almost out the door. So we want to respect the timeline of the vision planning process and not get ahead of it, but at the same time we need to understand how these rfps and concessions are going to be able to transition into their next 10 and 2 year contracts with respect that these are public bidding processes. So we know nothing is a given to a certain group. There will be a public process. But if we could have that information come back by the may 19th meeting of this year it would help us understand what will happen after this one year extension

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to that being included? Seeing none, that's included. It remains on consent, item number 93.

-- I mean item 46. And I would like to be shown also as a co-sponsor of item 93. Further discussion on the

[11:57:49 AM]

consent? Yes.

>> Vela: I just want to give thanks and credit to my predecessor, item 41. It's a small item, acquisition of a house next to a treat that will increase connectivity in an area that is park deficient. It will protect the neighborhood from flooding. The house was flooding because of its proximity to the creek and it will add parkland, badly needed parkland, in a parks deficient area. I just wanted to note that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Colleagues, any further discussion on the consent agenda? Again, the item -- it's consent agenda items 1 through 59, also item 93. The items that have been pulled are 13, 14 and 34. Also item 52, 55 and 57.

[11:58:53 AM]

>> Tovo: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry, go ahead.

>> Tovo: I'd also like to add myself as a co-sponsor to the colony park item, number 56. Some weeks we do that, some weeks we don't. As I've said before, often I just support things by voting for them rather than adding myself as a co-sponsor, but at this point we've got so many folks adding themselves to different issues that I want to be very clear this is a project I've had the privilege of being able to vote on to move forward in the past and again I really appreciate councilmember harper-madison's work today to make sure that we're honoring that commitment and really getting that work done. And huge thanks to the community members who have driven this project forward for so very, very long.

>> Mayor Adler: I agree with you it's not necessary to be listed as a cosponsor to indicate support or long history of being involved in

[11:59:54 AM]

that subject or subject matter. Council member pool?

>> Pool: I think -- I don't need to say anything. I was going to add myself and mentioned I worked with council member Houston and so on and so on but I think the record is full for the past years and our past action. Thanks and I'm happy the colony park is moving forward and good to see you all on the back row there.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. We have a motion and a second on the consent agenda. Those in favor, please raise your hand. Those opposed? It's unanimous with the comments that people have made. Colleagues, that gets us to noon. Do we have any executive session items at this time? I don't think we do. Let's go to noon.

[12:00:56 PM]

We have citizens -- we have public communication on our agenda. Let's go ahead and call those speakers, and then I'm going to suggest probably that we take a break for lunch, come back at 1:30 or 2:00. Let's make that call at the end of the conversation to do the zoning speakers, and then handle the consent zoning the best of the pulled items and the public hearings in the zoning cases. Let's begin with public communications. Susanna Almanza.

>> We have a report and would like to get approval to take it out of order so that Dr. Silveria will go first.

[12:01:57 PM]

I have talked to Paul Ryans if it was all right. We have a consecutive powerpoint presentation.

>> Mayor Adler: That's fine. Thank you.

>> How do you advance the slides up here? This is new to us.

>> Stand by, please.

[12:03:02 PM]

>> Okay. Good afternoon, mayor and city council members. I'm health coordinator for -- we're here to present the findings that has been done in demolitions, continued gentrification in east Austin. Before we begin to present the facts let me provide a historical context for the report. As we know, the city of Austin, city of Austin master plan -- the city continues to use zoning tools to displace and gentrify the communities in east Austin and neighborhoods in east Austin. Fast forward to 19 -- the 1990s

[12:04:09 PM]

where we have continued to experience relocation, including the smart growth initiative that designated east Austin as a desired development zone, so east Austin was once a thriving and vibrant community. Isolated considerably. The adoption of land use and zoning policies have ultimately destroyed east side communities and relocated families to east of highway 183. Excuse me. Sadly, this is what the report that we did in 1993 that showed the relocation of indigenous communities that we're dealing with. Sadly this has become the

[12:05:10 PM]

reality. This is a map that shows the relocation of our community, east all the way out to past 183. The voices of east Austin residents and these are long-time residents for generations -- the only thing I foresee is people with money are coming to the east side and the people that live here will be forced to get out. They raise your property value where you can't afford to pay your taxes on it. Now most of the neighbors are white and they don't socialize with us. I miss the sound of children playing because when I was growing up it was all families and each family probably had five to six kids, and we all played together. So what we have now in east

[12:06:11 PM]

Austin is what's left of a once-great community. The demolition process -- this report looks at the pss of the existing demolition process. What you have is mostly directed to commercial and multifamily. That process has a site plan of different steps that communities take, but this does not apply to the residential communities, and this is what we're concerned about -- that the demolition process is not equitable to residential properties.

>> Mayor Adler: Thayou.

>> Thank you.

>> The objectives of the demolition report was to analyze the demolition permits between 2010 and 2020 to

[12:07:13 PM]

identify gentrification patterns and how demolition permits negatively impacts the community. This chart is the ererall demolition permits that have been given. In this chart 70 per cent of the demolitionermits were for single family homes. We looked at six zip codes, and we saw a significant increase in demolition, especially from 2015 to 2019 which is when the single member district took power. You can see it ranges from 17 per cent increase to 154 increase in 78744. We analyzed the permitsish shoed in west and central -- issued in west and central Austin. East Austin is the Orange and there is significantly more

[12:08:13 PM]

single family home demolition permits that were issued. 28 per cent were for partial. Additionally we looked at the square footage of single family house that was demolished in east Austin and the -- it shows there has been significant destruction with over 2 million square foot that was demolished in the six selected zip codes. From 2014 to 2017 in one zip code alone there was over 700,000 square footage of affordable housing that was destroyed. We also looked at increase in property taxes to look at how this connects to gentrification. We saw there was a significant increase in property taxes and

[12:09:14 PM]

the taxes were quadrupled while in other areas it was almost doubled. This is one of the ways in which gentrification happens. The demolished homes -- lot of times two properties on one single lot and they had an average of 45 per cent increase in property value.

>> Good afternoon. I want to let you all know that these are the findings when T new city council came aboard and it's important to take a look. We have lost more single family housing, had more demolitions in east Austin -- that was her time. Than ever before. So when we look at increase in property taxes, demolition of family homes equals luxury and

[12:10:17 PM]

nanaffordable housing which equals increase in property taxes and displacement in our community. Recommendations -- first we recommend changes to the demolition process for residents' participation to ensure equity and environmental justice. They will include public hearing process that will require 120-day written notifications to the community on up coming demolition hearing including blblc, on-site notification to provide environmental listed review, protected trees prior to hearing and permit -- it would require opportunity for permits to be appealed. If a single family home is demolished one of the homes has to be a single family home built at 50 per cent mfi. If an apartment complex is being built 30 per cent of the housing must be affordable,

[12:11:19 PM]

housing at 50 per cent mfi. I think we have reached a time when we need to think out of the box and just as we looked at affordability on cock and so H, we need to look at policies of how we can, you know, mitigate what's happening in communities of color and look at how we can STO the increased property taxes on the poor and the working poor communities of color by adding policies when we look at zoning of how -- cannot only we increase the affordable housing but how can we increase low-income affordable housing and hit it at 35, 40, and 50 per cent mfi. We're doing 60 per cent and 80 per cent for

homeownership. That I continuing the displacement and gentrification. I think that's a legacy we want to address. Again, how zoning tools are

[12:12:20 PM]

used and have been used historically to displace communities of color and demolition process is just another one of those zoning tools that is adding to the displacement and gentrification. Thank you so much for your time.

>> Mayor Adler: Thanku.

>> I have a quick question. Would you mind -- right here. Sorry. Would you mind forwarding a copy of the slide deck to my office.

>> We just e-mailed -- we e-mailed everyone a copy of the gentrification report. There was a few missing but we'll make sure everybody gets it. Thank you so much.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Was that our last speaker on the topic?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> I want to thank the community members. I appreciate B you coming today and -- I look forward to

[12:13:21 PM]

exploring your ideas and talking to you about some of the paths we have explored that we haven't been able to get -- incorporate and approve into policy, including tougher, more stringent regulations on asbestos and lead, which I believe would help slow down the state of demolitions. This is really valuable. I look forward to exploring it more.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Mr. Robins? You have three minutes.

>> I'm an environmental activist. This is about information being withheld by Austin energy. Since summer of 2014 I've been using open records laws to prove Austin's customer assistance program for utility discounts to the poor was giving money to wealthy customers and I have been trying for seven and a half

[12:14:22 PM]

years to correct this program. F V -- revolution of the programs has led the city to repurpose millions of dollars formerly given to wealthy customers really in need of assistance. The program today is still broken but it is not as broken. It still needs further repair. So I am outraged and insulted that Austin energy is now refusing to release data that they have routinely provided since 2014. Austin energy is refusing to provide information that enables the public to monitor its customers that own mansions and multiple properties are -- if they are receiving discounts to the poor. This particular mansion that you see here -- do note the tennis court in the bottom left corner. This particular owner has

[12:15:23 PM]

received cap discounts at another property for many years. The bureaucracy claims that a new state law allows them to withhold this embarrassing information. My best informon is that the city government supported this bill. The law itself is ambiguous. I've read it, and I've read the analysis, and it does not deal with customer assistance at all. Even if I am wrong, nothing prevents the city from establishing a rule that cap customers are subject to release of limited information that has been public since 2014. Cap is a discretionary program and not subject to other utility terms of service. Going past this clumsy attempt by the utility to -- seven and

[12:16:25 PM]

a half years after your utility cannot fix this program. The customers with high property wealth are the tip of the iceberg, council. There are literally thousands of other things wrong with this program. There are people receiving money for the poor. If you allow Austin energy to do this you will enable rogue bureaucrats to hide even more information on other issues. Maybe some of you do not completely agree with my stand on cap, but you all agree we need accountable government.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Thank you.

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> City manager -- Mr. Robins has been advocatgg on this for a long time. We just did a project -- I'm

[12:17:29 PM]

hear to -- concerned to hear about changes in this data process. If you can find information on this and get him the data, that would be appreciated.

>> Thank you, council member.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member vela?

>> Vela: We received a response regarding the evaluation that was done. Did you -- were you able to see that regarding cap -- there was a -- I guess an audit and they responded to the audit. What is your response to their response.

>> Sir, I submitted a complaint to the auditor's office in January of 2021. It was a six-part complaint. The auditor's office chose to audit one part of one part of the complaint.

[12:18:30 PM]

They called me prior to their audit of one part of one part of the complaint and explained what they were going to do. I told them at the time, you're not going to find any major breaking of the rules. The problem is that the rules are ludicrous, so that would -- I could go on for half an hour and you don't have that much time. But -- and I'll be happy to meet with you in your office, but that would be my limited response to the audit.

>> Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

>> Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Next speaker is Mario Cantu.

[12:19:31 PM]

>> Good afternoon, council members. Happy birthday, mayor Adler.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Council members, I wanted to mention today the focus is ems, police, fire, APD. The focus will be adjusted a little bit to emt's, paramedics and dispatchers that work for the city of Austin. I asked a person a while back, have you ever met a paramedic and the person said was the only one I ever met was in back of an ambulance. Most individuals don't have friends that are paramedics because we're somewhat rare. I'm here to advocate for austin/travis county ems employees. There was no pandemic pay for those that served in this

[12:20:31 PM]

little war of combat we had a couple of years. It was literally like that at times, like being a war zone. I did hear about life guards. I'm glad that the -- the decisions you made about life guards and for staff that have worked as life guards -- you know, some of the things that were mentioned was life guards do

critical thinking. They focus. Sometimes they get fatigued. It's a job they trust. I heard that when a life guard goes in to save somebody and might have to do cpr or pull the child out, they call ems. It's a dual role. At the end of the day, the -- the pay we needed to give them better pay. It's the same thing with Austin ems. We need to give them better

[12:21:33 PM]

pay. Right now the turn-over rate is very high, and I don't know about you, but if we don't take care of that, you know, there could be a shortage or time delay with ems. And so, you know, I want to emphasize to focus on getting better pay for the ems staff -- new hires, the ones that have been there. And making sure that that has really been taken care of because we need to make sure we have the staff should the pandemic come back again, which we may/may not know. But the probability could be high, and if it does, we need to make sure we have the staff iner to take care of each and every one of us. The life guard part is very important, and the reason I say that is because of the children. We're going to take care of those children during the summer days that they can go

[12:22:33 PM]

and have fun at a swimming pool that they haven't had fun in for almost two years. To me that's a big focus. That's a great thing you're doing right there, is for the child so thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Hannah leady? No? What about Zackary ferres.

>> He is remote.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Going to call them both. They're our next two. Actually, let's hold on to them and get the ones that are here remote. We'll come back to those.

[12:23:34 PM]

Is Zion jeffamoth here.

>> Good morning -- or afternoon. I'm a homeless veteran that's been on the streets roughly 14 years. I've come to talk about solutions. To be honest I have a phd when it comes to being homeless. I've been out here for a while. I've witnessed mental illness, drug abuse, discrimination, violence and bias in the streets of Austin. There's a complete disconnect with a human that has less. I think Austin, Texas could be the blueprint when it comes to the unhoused. I've come up with a permanent solution that helps the homeless become equals again. I can't get anyone to listens because I lack the resources or credential. The police department constantly targets the

[12:24:36 PM]

homeless. Little does Travis county know this is the only city where a homeless person has 20 misdemeanors and seven fe felonies. Leasing agencies can rent to whoever they want to. Due to low education, due to mental disability, due to rejection and criminal background, 70 to 80 per cent of the homeless is eliminated from opportunity to go back indoors. I'm asking the council to listen to my proposal that's far cheaper than 40 to 60 million in hotels. The homeless require for apartments that 80 per cent will not get because of the bias in Austin. Proposition B took 200 people off the street and left 3600 people on the streets. I didn't see how they worked. On the news it said 1700 people

[12:25:40 PM]

were housed. I'm trying to figure out where the proof is. Some have been in hotels five months. The wait list for case management is over 300 people. Regardless, even if they were given a voucher to get an apartment the criminal backgrouets in the way of being approved at a leasing agency. Just like me, I'm having an issue with getting an apartment and I have a voucher and because of my criminal background from being homeless and catching misdemeanors, I've been denied. Bricks and mortar for an individual who's not potty trained to housing is logical. There are plenty of apartments that an individual qualify for, but as I speak again, it's the homeless, the mhm, the people with difference in Austin. Sometimes people can walk down the street and say hello and

[12:26:41 PM]

people will act like their headphones are too loud. No. Regardless of that, I'd like an opportunity to use this chance to talk to council about a permanent solution that everyone else can copy in the United States. A homeless shelter is a scam. That's been used for 70, 80 years in this country. It's a business to be homeless. And a sandwich that someone hands out doesn't end homelessness. The hotels are a temporary band aid. There are thousands of people in the streets that don't qualify for the motels that you bought. I have a solution that can turn someone into an equal for 24 hours. They can make decisions. And I'd like an opportunity for the council to actually hear me out on a proposition, on a way that you can spend the money correctly and make you guys look good.

>> Mayor Adler: Reach out to council offices with a way to get ahold of you.

>> It's a little difficult.

[12:27:42 PM]

I'm homeless and don't have the resources so I can't jump in my schedule book like I need to. Thank you for having me here today. I hope you can take my proposal serious.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

>> Kitchen: May I speak?

>> Mayor Adler: Council member kitchen, go ahead

>> Kitchen: Sir, tell me your name again.

>> My name is Zion jeffamoth

>> Kitchen: If you are here to be -- if you're able to be here a few more minutes I'll see if my staff person can speak to you.

>> That would be helpful.

>> Mayor Adler: Next speaker.

>> Michael ward.

>> Good afternoon, everyone. I'm excited to be here once again. I believe this is my second or third time connecting with you

[12:28:43 PM]

all directly in this setting here or in meeting we've been together in the past. I'm the president and CEO of Austin P -- I'm on the advisory board university of Texas at Austin engineering school and Texas A&M advisory for the Texas science fair they're having this weekend. I'm the newest community partner for the caucus. I do wear a couple of hats. I'm here today because I'm pretty sure you know of Samsung, Amazon, Tesla, Oracle. They decided to move their headquarters to Austin or to expand their existing presence here in Austin. And based on the numbers

[12:29:44 PM]

released by the Austin chamber of commerce we have not only served past the number of jobs we had 2020 but have added more than 30,000 job ins the central Texas area. I'm here to follow up on the budget amendment I've requested to provide a solution to place our community members into these jobs or at least learn the skills necessary for the Samsung, Tesla, Oracle, and apples of the world. I request your assistance in H creating aution to solve this problem. I've been in many different meetings with you all, with community members, other organizations, institutions. A lot of them ask for solutions.

How can we get plugged in with employers? All those things we do at automate hq. We have 145 people enrolled in

[12:30:44 PM]

our program right now for training and development. We have over 500 people on our job board looking for jobs at Samsung, Oracle, Facebook, you name it. We are building a tech eco system that Austin says they want to have. We have over 44 employers on our website saying we support this system through jobs, through funding, through volunteers, through participants or resources. I'm here to say we need your help. I want to stop having these conversations about helping the community but yet we look at the numbers -- they're still in poverty. The employers are saying we don't know where to look. As I conclude I have some documentation. I would love to leave it with you all. I would like to work on solving the lack of development in our

[12:31:47 PM]

community.

>> Mayor? One of the things that we just passed was a series of contracts with our multiethnic chambers, which are the diversity and ethnic chamber of alliance. They're going to be tasked with developing an equity and development plan. If you can get with my office we can connect you up with that office. I think your voice and experience and ideas that you have -- that would be a particular place that we could advance that and -- you know, just kicking that off today. I think it would be appropriate to connect you with that. Thank you for being here.

>> I welcome the opportunity and the last thing I will say is I would love to work as fast as we can. I'm interested in the pay for success model. If asking for funding up front

[12:32:47 PM]

takes too long for whatever policies, requirements -- not a probe let us show you the work we're doing and we can invoice you afterwards and use the testimonies of the people we're helping to be the value of approval. Can we leave the documentation with you?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. If you'll hand it to the clerk.

>> Thank you so much.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Go ahead.

>> Paula Kauffman.

>> I represent approximately 5,000 households. We agree Austin's more affordable housing could help cut the traffic congestion. We disagree with fee in lieu alternatives for developers who receive greater incentives. 20 per cent of the units should be on site affordable housing.

[12:33:50 PM]

Flexibility and Adu's covered with -- a positive step to avoid extensive demolition. These are my personal remarks. The position echoes today's presentation by our east side neighbors. It is rapidly losing affordable housing to demolition, which is because of the huge jump in property taxes from 2020 to 2021 -- approximately \$4 to 7,000 in one year. You've given -- why not incentivize landlords to provide affordable housing by renting affordable versus market rate. This would mitigate

[12:34:50 PM]

displacement and I believe demolition. Many of these landlords are debt free and can't afford to rent to tenants for market affordable rates. It needs no subsidy to be paid by the rest of the taxpayers. Landlords are raising rent 33 per cent because of taxes. Commit to -- the rise in property taxes, 3.5 per cent a year regardless of place values. Simply adjust your rate. The developers are using fee in lieu so they can make more profits but often they are building those in the east Austin area which raises the property taxes for everyone around them as we heard from people today. Your proposed payment for fee in lieu are absolutely unreasonable. For example, fee in lieu to build a studio of \$135,000 is

[12:35:52 PM]

not possible if you don't have the land. And that means the rest of taxpayers are going to have to fund any type of new affordable housing that's built using fee in lieu. And lastly, stop taking on debt. The reason the landlords can do well is because they have no debt. Every time you take out debt that puts more tax burdens on other people and prevents them from being able to buy a home. To consider taking out a \$270 million loan is absolutely?

>> Thank you, speaker. Your time has expired.

>> It will displace many -- too many people in Austin. Zackary Ferras.

[12:36:56 PM]

Go ahead.

>> Good morning. I'm a resident of the Johnson terrace neighborhood a member of an organization that fights for -- organization that fights for affordable housing for everyone. As part of your regular business today you'll hear from many people trying to change their property to build more. They will come to you having gone before commission and may have to come to you twice more. Often times your answer will be to negotiate with the local club of incumbent landowners. Nothing is stopping anyone from building a single family home but the minute you would like to build more, to house more people, do more affordable means you must commit yourself through regulatory gauntlet -- zoning, overlays, commissions and finally yourselves.

[12:37:57 PM]

We tell ourselves every development must be perfect and unoffensive to all parties. The obvious outcome is fewer homes are built. We have built a system in which the default answer is no. No to more homes. No to more neighbors. No to being a welcome neighbor to anyone but the rich. The people who do not feel the pain of increasing rent can become millionaires because of severe lack of housing. To them more housing means more traffic and a change they resent or fear. They do not see or feel the pain obstruction causes -- the car dependency it ensures. We can't deny change. We can only direct it. By refusing to build housing to accommodate the population we are deciding our neighborhoods should become increasingly expensive over time.

[12:38:57 PM]

The past is something we can mourn but we can't cling to it and destroy your future. By keeping the neighborhoods exclusive we are not keeping out newcomers. We are casting out the poorest amongst us. We are ensuring growth causes displacement. This is politics of scarcity. When increasing population must fight over fixed supply of housing. Instead, we must plan for abundance. There's more than enough love and land to go around in our great city where we must learn to say yes -- first with our hearts, then with our laws. That's my piece. Thanks for your time.

>> That concludes all the speakers.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Colleagues, so we can let staff go. Let's check and see if there are things we can get done without discussion. I think there are items that I would -- I'm sorry.

[12:40:01 PM]

>> I got an e-mail that I was signed up to speak.

>> Mayor Adler: What's your name.

>> [Microphone not turned on].

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. All right. We're going to go ahead and proceed. We have -- all right, colleagues. Let's see if there are colleagues we can take care of without discussion.

>> I think item 61. I have to step away at 2:00 o'clock for an hour or so and might miss it.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's see if we can do these without discussion. If we can discuss them later in the day. Let's see how many we can get through without discussion.

[12:41:01 PM]

Council member Fuentes moves passage of item 61. Second? Council member kitchen seconds. Discussion? Those in favor, please raise your hand. Those opposed? I'm showing that be unanimous. Several items in a row. Item 60. Council member -- mayor pro tem makes that motion to pass. Council member pool seconds. Any discussion. Those in favor raise your hand. Those opposed? That passes unanimously. We have Austin financing housing corporation. Do we have staff with us? Let's see if we can let them go. While we're waiting for them to come to us, item number 63 is postponed until April 7th meeting. Any objection to postponement?

[12:42:02 PM]

Hearing none, the item is postponed. Tem 64 is the resolution authorizing change in dedicated parkland. Motion to pass 64? Council member renterria makes the motion.

>> Tovo: I reached out to staff to ask what the mitigation would be. I don't think it was in the back-up that there would be mitigation another time -- I think it's in the neighborhood of around 300-plus thousand dollars. I would appreciate confirmation about that. We don't need to do it before we vote but I would be interested in an e-mail letting us know how that will be invested in the vision of the park.

>> Mayor Adler: Manager says that will happen.

>> That was the question I was trying to get resolved earlier.

[12:43:04 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Let the council know. Thank you, manager. Item 64 I think was moved and seconded. Those in favor, raise your hand. Those opposed? That passes. Item 65. This is to approve the action land. Motion to approve? Council member harper-madison.

>> Council member vela was not with us for the last vote.

>> Mayor Adler: Let the record reflect that. I'm going to recess at 12:43 and I'm going to convene the housing finance corporation. We're in city hall. We were convened earlier. We heard public comment. Now time for us to take care of the agenda. Staf do you want to take us through items.

[12:44:07 PM]

>> Sure. We only have one item on the agenda Toda and that is to authorize staff to move forward with a loan to Austin revitalization -- 8402 gar creek circle. The home will be for all four units to be rented to folks at or below 50 per cent median income per regulations of our new program, the antidisplacement community acquisition program utilizing the project connect dollars.

>> Mayor Adler: Motion to approve the item? Harper-madison makes the motion. Renteria seconds. It was director harper-madison

[12:45:17 PM]

and director Renteria. I'm going to adjourn the housing finance corporation. I'm going to reconvene the Austin council meeting on March 24th, 2022. Motion to approve the hud action plan? Council member Renteria makes the motion. Those in favor? It's unanimous with council member vela off the dais. He's back, voting in favor. It's unanimous. Item 66 is the?

>> For item 65 don't we just need to close the public hearing because it's --

[12:46:18 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: It's not -- thank you very much. So we have called earlier. Anyone here to speak on it that we missed? We've taken care of the public hearing on item 66. With that, colleagues.

>> Mayor? I'm sorry T interrupt. On item 66, I would like to make note in the ordinance there was an error. It was conducted on March 3rd, not today.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm confused. On our agenda today to do what.

>> Item 66 is the annexation is the city-owned property. It's the ordnance in your back-up says the public hearing was conducted today. It was conducted on March third.

>> Mayor Adler: That was for public hearing.

[12:47:19 PM]

What are we doing today.

>> We're voting on the annexation itself.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. We've been noted to consider an ordinance. Council member Kelly makes the motion. Second? Council member vela seconds. Any discussion? In favor? H raise your hands. Opposed? That item is approved. All right, guys. We have pulled items when we come back and we have the zoning cases. It is 12:47 at this point. I suggest we come back at 2:00. We'll take the speakers, handle the consent zoning. Do the pulled items and then the zoning cases.

>> Mayor, I will be off the dais at 2:00 o'clock. I think --

>> Mayor Adler: I think there are several of us that will be off the dais momentarily. Mayor pro tem, if you can at least call the speakers.

[12:48:19 PM]

>> Alter: I didn't hear the time.

>> Mayor Adler: 2:00 o'clock

>> Alter: We'll do the speakers -- consent agenda and remaining we have 13, 14 --

>> Mayor Adler: Consent will be the zoning consent

>> Alter: I understand. The pulled items -- we have 13, 14, 34, 52, 55, and 57?

>> Mayor Adler: 13, 14, 34, 53, 55, and 57.

>> Alter: Everything else is zoning.

>> Mayor Adler: Everything else is zoning. We should be back by the time you take the speakers and do the consent zoning agenda. We'll be back at that point

>> Alter: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: I think we have 30, 40 speakers. I would suggest two minutes on the zoning speakers.

[12:49:20 PM]

We'll be in recess until 2:00 o'clock. See you guys then.

[2:07:52 PM]

>> Alter: We have a couple of requests to reconsider some items from earlier from the agenda which we're going to do and we'll try and -- I want to wait for one of them for council member renterria. It was item 64, which was in his district. The other item is 66 but I think we can go ahead and reconsider item 66. Are there any objections to reconsidering item 66? No. Okay. Jerry, I invite you to come up and correct the record so we can redo that.

>> Cronk: Thank you. I have a correction to my correction from earlier. The public hearing was conducted today -- or I guess you're about to conduct the public hearing today. The -- it says March D. Just need to make note of that.

[2:08:53 PM]

>> Alter: Thank you.

>> Cronk: So if you would vote to reconsider and vote again to reapprove that would be great

>> Alter: Do we have to close the public hearing?

>> Cronk: Yes

>> Alter: We need to vote to pass item 66. I believe council member Kelly made that motion. I will second that. And so all those in favor of item 66. That includes closing the public hearing. That's unanimous with Vela, Kelly, myself, Pool, Ellis, Kitchen. On the regular dais voting yes -- council member Madison did you vote yes? We have to vote on Mayor Adler

[2:09:56 PM]

off the dais at this time. We need to take up item 64 again and reconsider it so we can close the public hearing and a brief statement can be read into the record because of the nature of the item. Any objections to reconsidering item 64? Seeing none, I would invite Mr. Montez to make his presentation to council.

>> Good afternoon, Mayor pro tem and council members. Can you hear me okay?

>> Alter: Yes, we can.

>> I'm with parks and recreation. Item 64 is a public hearing in accordance with chapter 26 of the Texas parks and -- the purpose is due to a permanent change in use from dedicated parkland to a nonrecreational use. This request comes to build a

[2:11:03 PM]

subterranean duct bank. Legal fact finding for the request is there's no feasible or prudent alternative to the taking of dedicated parkland to minimize harm to the park. It totals \$327,000 to be paid to parks and recreation department. The date of notification were February 27th, March 6th and 13th of this year. This concludes my presentation. I'll be happy to take any questions should you have any.

>> Alter: I do not recall if council member tovo had direction on that amount or if she just wanted to havelarity on whether the mitigation money would be spent in that park in particular.

>> The mitigation funds are directed back to the impacted . What you could do -- this is up to the council, is if in you motion you wanted to add that

[2:12:05 PM]

language to the motion and have that approved, we can do it that way as well so you can make sure that the department was --

>> Alter: Council member renterria, would you like to make that motion or take their word for it?

>> Renteria: I would love to make that motion, that any funds that is -- goes back dedicate D to the parkland -- to the park.

>> Alter: Council member Renteria makes the motion. Council member pool seconds that. I know council member tovo and I were asking questions about this. We sometimes do need to use this state vehicle to use easements and other things within our parks. And there's usually money that comes from that because you

[2:13:05 PM]

would otherwise be paying a private entity to store stuff or do that in any other case. In this practice of paying the park folks -- the remuneration was important. It was critical when we did the renovations of Ramsey park so I think something that does help the parks undergo the process and be out of service. It's one way for us to say thank you to the users who have been unable to use often their neighborhood park or district park that's nearby then. So thank you. Mr. Montez, is there anything else we need to know before we vote? .

>> No, that is it.

>> Alter: With that amendment we are reconsidering item 66. All those in favor.

>> 64?

>> Alter: 64. Sorry. Appreciate all the help. We are reconsidering item 64 and that amendment was to item

[2:14:06 PM]

64 as well in case there was no confusion and we've closed the public hearing. That was unanimous on the dais with Fuentes, tovo, and Adler off the dais. We are going to move over to zoning and take up our postponement requests and then our consent -- speakers and consent agenda.

>> Thank you, mayor pro tem. I'm with housing and planning department. As mayor pro tem stated your first case is to consider -- or the discussion postponement cases which are 83 and 84. 83 is item number npa 2021. Item 84 is C 142021. We do Ms. Kristen hinny

[2:15:07 PM]

speaking in support of the neighborhood postponement request and Mr. Subtle speaking against the postponement request. This is the neighborhood's first postponement request.

>> Alter: Thank you. You'll have -- I think we said we're having two minutes for speakers.

>> Yeah, two minutes.

>> On behalf of the ecc I'm here to request a postponement of 83 and 84 regarding 1400 east fourth street. We're requesting a new hearing date of may 5th, six weeks from today. Last week the ecc received an initial offer let free the applicant. This is the first offer received from the applicant since we voted to oppose the project one month earlier. The terms of that offer were discussed in a meeting with both parties and council member Renteria's staff last we

[2:16:11 PM]

understand -- Wednesday. We are working with staff and neighborhood stakeholders to propose amendments to the offer that we find fair, agreeable and worthy of everyone's time and energy for discussion. We intend to propose a solution that we can support while acknowledging a solution that we can remain neutral to with additional community benefits. We simply need more time. We're waiting on answers to some of our questions and council member Renteria's chief of staff is working on that. We

don't have all the information we need yet. The may 5th date allows us to facilitate the conversations that requires to present at the next general meeting for final vote. The neighborhood strongly encourages you to support our postponement request. Thank you.

[2:17:11 PM]

>> Alter: Yes?

>> Renteria: I would like to ask -- what was the vote on the postponement with the contact team.

>> What was the vote on the postponement?

>> Renteria: Yes.

>> Do you mean --

>> Renteria: The contact team?

>> Are you asking how many were in favor and how many were opposed?

>> Renteria: Cot.

>> I don't believe we voted -- we didn't need a vote on the postponement. It was a discussion to make sure that we had enough time to vet this conversation fully

>> Renteria: The contact team didn't take a vote.

>> We didn't take a vote

>> Renteria: Thank you.

>> We discussed it at our meeting on Wednesday

>> Alter: Mr. Suttle, two minutes.

>> I'm here on behalf of the applicant. I kind of don't even know how to respond without sounding

[2:18:11 PM]

snarky. We've been in contact with the contact team and got a letter dated February 7th based on previous offer for community benefits on top of the city's density bonus and on February 7th they voted and said that they would not oppose our proposal. It wasn't until then at some point they came back and reconsidered and we have -- while we've reallocated some of the money they've asked for, it's still the same amount of money. It still exceeds downtown density money and we just can't see a six-week postponement to continue this conversation. In addition, it's not the neighborhood's first true first

request for postponement. They made a request for postponement last time. Found they had not gotten it in on time so we withdrew it. I know the council likes to hon

[2:19:11 PM]

nor the first postponement requests. I will tell you that I think since August of 2021 we've been at the table with everybody. Got it to where they didn't oppose it and now they oppose it again. There's a pattern there. I would think -- I would hope we could move forward on this today and finish it up. I'll be happy to answer any questions you have. Thank you.

>> Alter: Thank you. I want to procedurally check for postponements. Does the applicant get more than two minutes? I don't know if he needs more than that, but.... No? Okay. Great. Thank you. So no Mr. Speakers? Any remote? Okay. So the item before us is whether to postpone items 83 and 84 -- or we need to see if there's a motion to postpone items 83 and 84 to the may -- first meeting in may.

[2:20:21 PM]

We would need a motion for that.

>> Renteria: Chair, I'm not going to request a postponement. I think it's -- that we have worked out a pretty fair deal, is what's going on. We're not only dedicating funds that my understanding that it's going to go to the east Austin conservancy. We're going to work to support the trail that's there. They're going to get some of the funding for affordable housing, and what people don't realize that is that any new building gets built there, because it's a tift, it is also -- we're going to recover 20 per cent of that added value back into the neighborhood for affordable housing, and it's

[2:21:21 PM]

right next to the rail itself. I mean, it's a stone's throw away from the actual station, the red line station. So this is a great opportunity for my neighborhood, and I know that I asked my sector rep and out of frustration she said she couldn't go to the meetings anymore. She was going to -- she stepped down. So there's a lot of things that are happening in this contact team that we don't know exactly how they're taking their votes, whether they are meeting and voting, but I know we had a deal and then all the sudden we don't have a deal. So, you know, we have sat down there with some of the members of the tact team, and we have worked with the applicant to get a fair deal for my

[2:22:23 PM]

neighborhood because I am part of Cesar Chavez. I had to step down because I'm an elected official. We have worked hard on our contact team. I was one of the original persons that actually developed that -- the contact team. And I really am supportive of this project. I believe that the sooner we get this done, the more we can benefit. Especially in my area and especially in the tift which include also district one. It goes all the way to manor. We need all the fundings we can get for our affordable housing projects. We have plenty of nonprofits that are sitting on vacant property but not the funding that's needed, so that's -- one of the main reasons why I don't

[2:23:25 PM]

recommend postponement, because we have sat down there and worked over the past two months to get where we're at right now.

>> Alter: Council member pool?

>> Pool: I'm curious -- and maybe I can ask Mr. Suttle this question. I'm worried about losing some of the benefits that may emerge from additional discussions, but I agree that six weeks is a pretty long period of time. If I were to make a motion to postpone to April 7th, to our next meeting, is that something that Ms. Hinny and Mr. Suttle to agree to and with a little more push we might be able to get more movement and that might satisfy the concerns on the dais as concerned by

[2:24:28 PM]

council member Renteria about time and later date.

>> I mean, that's much better than six weeks. We prefer today but if it's the will of council to go until April 7th, I won't hold my nose until I pass out.

>> Pool: That would be a great thing because we don't want to have to revive you here.

>> It might be interested to watch.

>> Pool: Ms. Hinny, is this something you would agree to.

>> It would help. I think there's more to present to all of you. We need the time to share with everybody to give you the full history of what's happened here and how important this project is to the future development of our neighborhood. Thank you.

>> Pool: Great. Council member Renteria, is that something --

>> Renteria: I wouldn't have any problems if we deferred it -- postponed it to --

[2:25:34 PM]

>> Pool: I would be happy to second?

>> The staff will not -- we have been keeping the seven consent or postponement items because we have the statesman put on that day. That's the only --

>> Pool: What I might suggest is if we -- we have the agreement of folks of the parties that the 7th is okay. I think that will be benefit to all of us. We might have some significant conversations about it in work session, on the fifth. Which I know we're going to talk about the pud also but maybe we could shift the conversation to the 5th. When we get to the 7th we'll know where we're at.

>> Sounds good

>> Alter: Jerry, I have a couple of questions for you. Yes. We have a motion to postpone to April 7th made by council

[2:26:35 PM]

member Renteria and seconded by council member pool. I didn't understand what Mr. Suttle said about this not being the first postponement. Had they -- were they given a postponement at some point.

>> There's a part of the code that -- not enforced very often that talks about the time line for postponement request, that they need to be be timely. There was a postponement request from the neighborhood before, or from the contact team. And that was submitted short of the timeliness that the code calls for. That postponement was not timely as per the code so they withdrew THA postponement request. Now they're asking for one, so that's why (indiscernible). They took one before. We did it on first reading.

>> Alter: They have not been given a postponement.

[2:27:36 PM]

>> That's correct

>> Alter: It is our practice to provide the neighborhood with at least one postponement.

>> Yes

>> Alter: Thank you. And I just want to clarify, Mr. Renteria, it's a homestead preservation district, not a dif per se. Is that what you were referring to?

>> Renteria: Correct

>> Alter: All those in fair of postponing to April 7th, please raise your hand. Unanimous on the dais. With council members Fuentes, tovo, and mayor Adler not present. Do we have another postponement request.

>> Mayor pro tem and council we have postponements -- item 71 and

[2:28:37 PM]

72. Applicant postponement to 4/21, manchaca south is another. Item 73, applicant postponement to 4/21. Item 80 is neighborhood postponement to 4/7. 83 and 84, which the council just upheld the neighborhood postponement request to 4/7. And item 88 is a staff postponement to 4/21. So all the speakers -- those are the consent postponements. All the speakers that wish to speak to the items would be to the merits to the postponement. I wanted to call those out before we hear from the speakers. We have speakers for 83 and 84 which council just postponed. So those speakers can call back in on April 7th unless they want to speak to the merits of postponement

>> Alter: To avoid confusion for those waiting to speak,

[2:29:38 PM]

items 71, 72, 73, 80, 83, 84, and 88 we're expecting to be postponed. 83 and 84 we just voted to postpone. If you're speaking on one of those items, per the rules you need to please be focused on the postponement request or the postponement -- question of postponing or not when you speak. Thank you so much. I believe now we are going to move over to the speakers. I believe there have been several changes, so the clerk is going to go ahead and read out names, both for in-chambers, which we will take up first, and then for folks who are remote. Clerk, if you could make sure that you read the item they're speaking to as they go. It gets a little confusing when we're not doing them with the item. It's helpful if you can read the item number along on our

[2:30:42 PM]

agenda as you go, please.

>> The first speaker is item 69, in person, Taylor Lang.

>> Greetings. I'm a resident in district 6. It is my belief that the proposed rezoning stands to have negative impact on affordability ur neighborhood. Austin is in the affordable for me. I have the privilege of having a more flexible household income than most and I'm still priced out of Austin. When I hear about inaffordability elsewhere I think of the struggle for homeowner shup across all incomes, including

those with can a more flexible income. I'm struggling to live and work in Austin despite working for a community based organization that advocates for marginalized

[2:31:43 PM]

communities in Austin. Even some of my friends who work for the city live in places like Georgetown and have to take on the burden of commuting. This affects our ability to contribute to the city's taxes and send our kids to Austin's wonderful schools. This is important as districts like AISD struggle with enrollment numbers, hemorrhaging students to factors like charter schools drastically affecting funding. By developers being so opaque with their intentions against the historical backdrop of broken promises, displacement skyrockets to surrounding communities like Georgetown. Uprooting our children's sense of continuity. My ask is that council adhere to the communities they serve

[2:32:44 PM]

and vote no. As our newest council member Vela has said before our area must be a safe and thriving home for the working class, not a playground for the wealthy. The only way to stay aligned with these values will be to say no to the rezoning case. Thank you

>> Jessica Robertson.

>> Thank you so much. I am -- one of my roles is serving as vice president of the North Austin SIFK association. I live two miles from the proposed development area. I got involved with my neighborhood group because among other things I want to help my neighbors cope with climate change and effects. I am speaking to oppose the outzoning. We are a dense and concrete area with minorly impactful

[2:33:44 PM]

green space. The green spaces in Austin have to work harder than other green spaces. We need more than a few extra trees and thirsty grass. What we have isn't effective enough to prevent us from being several degrees hotter in the worst parts of the summer. What's worse than driving on my bike in the hot weather is we're going to be priced out of my community. We expect our rents to rise again this year, quickly reaching our monthly cap if no affordable options are provided. Without firm commitments to affordable housing my husband and I will write high checks to our landlord until we can no longer remain in our duplex.

[2:34:45 PM]

With respect to the developer -- I wouldn't trust the development plan to fulfill flimsy of promises, particularly around green infrastructure. Austin needs more housing but will this do anything advantageous or open the door to more gentrification with the east [speaking rapidly]. Thank you so much for letting me speak.

>> Item 73, there is a request to postpone. Ruben Perez? Item 74, John looters.

[2:35:48 PM]

>> There's no request to postpone for this one. It's on consent. Sorry? I'm not John looters. I'm the applicant. I think he's here to speak to answer questions on consent.

>> Thank you.

>> Clayton stroll.

>> Sorry. He's in the same boat.

>> Alter: Clerk, I think some of them say they're the applicant or agent in the notes, that they're available if we need them.

>> Item 77, rally sitla.

>> Good afternoon. I want to thank you for giving me your time this afternoon.

[2:36:48 PM]

I had a couple of illustrations. Are they available? Okay. This regards -- I'm a resident of north Austin, directly across from a new venue called "The pitch." I have a couple of photographs here. I don't know how to get these up.

>> Alter: Are they documents or slides.

>> Pardon me?

>> Alter: Are they documents or slides.

>> I didn't understand

>> Alter: Are they printed or slides that you provided?

>> Yes

>> Alter: Which one? Are they printed or slides.

>> We do not have copies of the presentation.

>> I'm going to continue. My concern is that this venue called "The pitch" is directly adjacent to a soccer stadium, soccer field, and they have sports. And then if you move into the pitch, they have hard liquor,

[2:37:51 PM]

outdoor restaurants and the request here is to lift the -- lift a restriction for amplified outdoor music. Without these illustrations I can't go too far. But?

>> Mayor pro tem? Can we ask?

>> We have?

>> Can we ask?

>> Excuse me? We have created here a sixth-street type of venue with bars, outdoor restaurants, sports, outdoor amplification, amplified music, outdoor music, and our concern is that because you have the sports and you have the liquor, the restaurants -- this is outdoors. People can wander around freely. You can throw children into the mix. We have a situation here which has the potential to create a

[2:38:55 PM]

safety problem for the surrounding neighborhood, which is very close by. We have 469 homes directly across from this. So I understand this development is a huge revenue maker for the city of Austin and the owners, but for the safety of the neighborhood I think it's a huge concern. And also rezoning at this time is unfair to the owners who have invested in the neighborhood because this property was -- when we bought into this neighborhood, it was originally told that across -- directly across the street, Harris --

>> Alter: Thank you. You can finish your thought. You have two minutes. If you can finish your thought.

>> Pardon me?

>> Alter: Finish your thought.

>> Yes. I am asking for restriction for outdoor amplified music stay in

[2:39:58 PM]

this place. Thank you

>> Alter: Thank you, sir.

>> For item.... .

>> If I could ask the city clerk. The pitch is in district 7. If there are illustrations or back-up that rally would like to provide to the council, I would invite him to do so. The ones that he thought were going to be shown. Which staff did not receive. That may be a conversation to have with him.

>> We will.

>> That would be great. Council member tovo is also asking for them.

>> Alter: Thank you, council member pool. You can continue to call your

[2:41:00 PM]

speakers.

>> Item 78, Jason Dean. Andrew dolling. Item 83. That has been postponed. We have Tom walled, Kristen hinny, which has spoken, and Brad Wilkins.

>> Alter: Are either of those gentleman in the room? You don't need to? Tom walled doesn't need to speak.

>> Item 85, David Anderson.

[2:42:05 PM]

>> I'm here to answer questions if there are on any on items 85 and 86

>> Alter: Thank you.

>> Item 89, Mario Cantu.

>> Good evening, council. I'm with the south congress contact team. This is 4700 weedamar lane. There is a petition that has been verified from the neighborhood. We ask to respect that verification in the petition and to deny the future land use

[2:43:06 PM]

map and the rezoning of this property. The nearest metro station is .7 miles away. Many times I hear from council and from planning commission that imagine Austin and project connect -- the Austin strategic mobility plan, the bike scores and transit and walkability is a big, big thing for projects that are on corridors that have these. This property does not have that near it. It's almost a mile away. Next. As

you know, the railroad commission regulates, so when something happens they go in and investigate. If something happens with the gas line the only thing is to go in in there and do an investigation. We ask what is the worst case scenario for the road closure and/or explosion? And who will be responsible and accountable? This information has been hard to gather.

[2:44:06 PM]

We haven't gotten anything solid. Next. You can see the gas line in red. You see towards the end there's concrete. There is no building over the existing line. Next. The gas lines under concrete, no buildings. Same thing. Gas lines under concrete. No buildings. Next. Major condo. Does not -- has not been moved. This gas line -- major gas line from the other as well. Goes north and south of Austin and it was not moved and it's next to this. Next. Same gas line goes through this creek area. It has not been moved. Goes under concrete. Next. And this goes through St. Ed's. No concrete. I cannot find one building that sits on top of this gas line or a gas line has attempted to be moved in Austin. This is a safety factor.

[2:45:10 PM]

I hope that you vote against this. This could be a potential problem in the future. Thank you.

>> Paul shepherd.

>> Mayor pro tem, members of the council. I'm with legacy. I'm here today representing items 89 and 90. We're the applicant as well as the developer for the for sale 150 units that will be on the property. 15 will be affordable at 80 per cent and 100 per cent mfi. This is voluntary without any bonus. We're partnering with habitat for humanity, their affiliate home base. Attached is the zoning staff

[2:46:10 PM]

report. It's ready for recording sdoons E E zoning is approved. We are committed to adding as much as possible to meet the needs of the Austin community in this housing shortage. In fact, with home base as a partner and the davenport west pud that we are developing -- in district 10, five per cent of the condos will be affordable at 60 per cent mfi. We have met eight times with the neighbors since 2020. And to that end we have addressed every concern they have raised. So we ask that you please approve items 89 and 90 so will give us, legacy, the privilege to add as much needed housing as we can in Austin. Thank you.

>> James west.

[2:47:19 PM]

Elizabeth McFarland.

>> I'm the project architect for the rental portion of items 89 and 90 and here to answer any questions.

>> Elizabeth McFarland.

>> Good afternoon, mayor and city council members. I'm with Tramel Co Residential. Our development plan is a 370-unit class A project. 37 of the units or 10 per cent of them will be -- or I guess will be affordable at 60 per cent MFI, and we're doing that

[2:48:19 PM]

voluntarily, partnering with Home Base with Habitat for Humanity. It was mentioned a second ago that there's not a lot of connectivity in the area, and we will be upgrading the roads. We're going to add sidewalks for connectivity. And we're hoping to be able to add to the housing shortage in Austin, so we would appreciate your approval. Thank you.

>> Karl Hershey? .

>> Good afternoon, mayor, city council. We appreciate your time today. My name is Karl Hershey. I'm here answer any questions you may have about

[2:49:19 PM]

the development, but I do want to ask you to strongly consider approving us today. Items 89 and 90. To Elizabeth's point a few minutes ago, there's such a housing shortage in Austin and this development will offer over 500 units, both rental and for sale. A large portion of those will be affordable. So, again, thank you for your time and we would appreciate you approving us today.

>> Clayton Stroll.

>> Good afternoon. I'm the engineer for the it will units and have been coordinating with Texas Gas on the gas lines. We know neighbors have raised concerns about gas lines. We've determined one of the gas lines is abandoned and is no longer in use. The other gas line is a

[2:50:20 PM]

non-high pressure line, a line to serve the community. They're willing to relocate it. We've been coordinating with them on that. They're in design of relocation to move it farther away from the residents along the right of way. The -- Larry brown with Texas gas has written a letter to mayor and council members explaining the regulations that they follow and the safety protocols that they have and that they're obviously going to follow all those and do everything that the state requires of them. We would appreciate y'all's vote in positive on 89 and 90. Thank you.

>> Item 92, Laura burkeheart.

>> That's me.

>> Nick quitillano.

[2:51:22 PM]

>> He's here for questions as well on 92.

>> That concludes in-speak -- I mean in-person speakers. Should we proceed with remote?

>> Alter: Yes, please.

>> Okay. Lynn gillbreath.

>> Hello. I'm here to speak against changing the future land use map on item 69. Council members, mayor pro tem, your no-vote on this case says that we relegate city by zoning plans. We support builders through programs for density and affordability, not with back door subsidies to up zone cheap low density land they bought on speculation.

[2:52:22 PM]

We require development where residents have safe access to transit, schools, employment, food stores, and community activity hubs. We do not accept new development amongst substandard infrastructure because we appear desperate for any kind of housing anywhere. We insist on equity in quality of life for the working class and communities of color. This city no longer disproportionately places burdens on the city-wide housing shortage on to these communities because they lack the economic and political power to successfully resist. Please confirm the message and vote no on this case. Thank you.

>> Fred Louis.

>> Hello. Can you hear me.

[2:53:24 PM]

>> Yes. Please proceed.

>> Good afternoon. I'm here to ask on item 69 and 70 that you uphold the ballot petition of the neighborhood and deny this request. This is a working-class neighborhood of color, very diverse neighborhood, where people work very hard against long odds to buy a home and build a community. And their interests and their concerns and their family are entitled to respect just like the other residents of Austin. This area, if this condo, multiunit is allowed -- this area's property will appreciate and their taxes will go up, and frankly you will take an area

[2:54:26 PM]

that is not yet gentrified and you will accelerate the displacement of these working-class people, and they will have to leave the city because they will be unable to find affordable housing. The other thing I want to mention is you need to, in my view, uphold the petition rights also because the city has no real antidisplacement policy. Other than for project connect massive displacement that will occur in the future, the city has no policy to prevent antidisplacement, so it should give the respect to neighbors and their wishes, uphold the petition rights, and give them a seat at the table and the leverage to negotiate with this -- with the looper. The other thing I would like to point out is the developer has really manipulated and misled the petition signers.

[2:55:26 PM]

You've heard about it in the past. I'm sure you'll hear about it more. And frankly, by not recognizing their petition rights, you are enabling this type of conduct, not only here?

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

>> Thank you.

>> Zenobia Joseph.

>> Thank You my opposition is to items 69 and 70, which is the graded brown project. I wanted to call to our attention the letter in exhibit C from Mr. Thousander throw -- Mr. Thrower which specifically mentions the half mile of existing transit service as justification for this project. It is along the I-35 corridor, route 392. Breaker is the bus route, along with 383 lakeline.

[2:56:27 PM]

That started by advocacy. I want you to recognize that on the last day of early voting I waited one hour in 30-degree weather to go vote. This is N an area that is transit-friendly and rail is 24 to 30 years north of U.S. 183, specifically March 9th, 2020, page 29. Mayor pro tem, I would ask you not to continue with willful blindness. This morning you spoke offensively about public transportation barriers for life guards. People who live north of 183 have barriers too. And I would ask you to recognize that the staff report specifies that this project does not align with imagine Austin. However, staff went back and justified why you should have this project. It's not compact and connect

[2:57:27 PM]

and does not align with the climate equity plan. You're putting people of color next to pollution. I would like you to recognize the civil rights act of 1964 and the disparate -- it's a 30 minute transfer to the Arbor ree tum. It was eliminated June 2018. This is the route that the individuals who live in the development would have to rely on. It is car centric, not compact and connected.

>> Your time has expired.

>> And if you have any questions, I'll gladly answer them at this time.

>> Mucha Alva.

>> I am speaking on items 69 and 70. I would like to speak against

[2:58:28 PM]

the spot rezoning. I would like to use the time to explain why this rezoning would be hurtful to residents in and around the north Austin area. My belief is that the proposed rezoning stands to have a negative impact on the community by reducing green space and impervious surfaces in the area. North Austin is hot and the area does not have abundance of shade trees. For certain populations including older folks, children and people with chronic illness, walking around in the heat is a quality of life issue. This would radiate heat back into an already poorly shaded area. Reducing the impervious areas can cause pooling in the area with nowhere to drain. I ask that the neighborhood

[2:59:28 PM]

plan and the communities right to self-determine be respected. Existing residents should be able to maintain their quality of life while having agency in the future development of their neighborhoods. Just because you can do something doesn't mean you should. Thank you for your time.

>> Jade >> Jade.

>> I would like to express relief and gratitude that this is the final hearing. This is not about housing, community, or helping the crisis in any manner. This is a clear example of the continuation of Austin's systematic racism and discrimination practices that exploit low-income communities of color. Approving this rezoning proves this ugly history not only continues, but is rewarded in Austin and poses a great threat to undermine the big picture efforts of equity at hand. This was apparent from the very beginning and magnified at the last council meeting when the developers had no issue

[3:00:28 PM]

targeting an Asian resident to coerce removal of their signature from the petition. For the record, we as a united community with gratitude for the support from Gava were able to have a Vietnamese and Spanish translator speak to the residents with integrity. It was important to us that our neighborhoods understood and were to confidently voice their stands on this matter. Every single fact about this case shows why it is not probity D income- -- appropriate -- physically, socioeconomically, culturally, environmentally. The real-life domino effect on the community will begin with neighborhood incompatibility. We are subjected to displacement, gentrification, continued racism, oppression of lower socioeconomic status, negative health and environmental impacts and adverse effects of our overall quality of life and safety. Infrastructure is not sufficient to accommodate the additional

[3:01:28 PM]

population load. And a huge loss in what is currently an affordable neighborhood. And there's zero benefit to the community. Who is the development for? Not our community. And it's not for the greater district 4 area. No one here would be able to afford to live here. The discussion of affordability and the proposal of 10% at 100% mfi is not affordable, nor is it enough in unit count.

[Buzzer sounding]

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

>> Thousand dollars.

>> Preston king.

>> Yes, I'm here to speak on 69 and 70. My name is Preston king. First of all, I get really tired of hearing everyone talk about how there's no affordable housing, yet you want to make a decision that might make my house unaffordable. That doesn't make sense to me.

[3:02:29 PM]

This business -- what they did last week with the Vietnamese family, that's just -- shouldn't be tolerated. It should have been shut down right then. On the bus situation, there are two buses a mile away. One of them on breaker is a mile walk up a very narrow road that can't handle the traffic and the bicycles it has on it now. It's dangerous. This is going to make our streets more crowded. You know, we're going to be susceptible to more flooding. We have no drainage. A lot of the streets don't even have curbs. And this whole process -- I've -- it seems really like it's developer-related. My very first contact was with Maureen Meredith, and she told me I couldn't -- it was too late for me to have input. Thank god for Jay Lovera, who was able to straighten that out. But y'all don't need to reward this behavior. And the land is still for sale.

[3:03:29 PM]

They don't even plan to keep this land.

[Inaudible]

>> Migen.

>> Thank you, council and --

[audio stopped]

>> Mr. Briones, please unmute.

>> Hello?

>> We can hear you. Go ahead.

>> Hello? Okay. Thank you, council. I'm speaking in opposition of items 69 and 70. I'm a community organizer for go Austin, vamos Austin. When you speak of the dire need for housing in the city, who is it for? Residents from the Grady

[3:04:31 PM]

neighborhood were able to meet about the rezoning. Residents outlined their vision, in alignment with their existing plan, in which the blue-collar worker is protected from developers who look to make someone else's community their playground. The concerns were that Austin needs to be a welcoming city for low-income families, especially those who have been here for decades. Residents are seeking home options for low-income residents, with a focus on different types that are less expensive, because they provide less expensive housing options. In keeping with the spirit of accountable, councilmember vela, some of what I said comes from your campaign. Who is this housing for? A meeting with councilmember vela, residents proposed duplexes based on current zoning and neighborhood plans.

They were told this option would be unreasonable. Yet when the conversation of condo minimums for sale came up, it was acknowledged residents

[3:05:36 PM]

making \$31,000 or less, the median family income, there was no way a person in that income bracket could afford the property taxes alone. While we spoke of blue collar austinites being displaced, you and your staff talked about people making killings on the market. We were talking about sheltering community while you spoke about being financial -- big financial come-up. Who is this housing for? I yield my time so that you all can answer T question.

>> Ana Aguirre.

>> Good afternoon, mayor Adler, mayor pro tem alter, and city councilmembers. My name is Ana, the immediate past chair of the neighborhood plan contact team and the president of the Austin neighborhood council. I am speaking on items 69 and 70.

[3:06:36 PM]

The contact team voted on these cases last year, and the committee met this month and voted in support of the mockingbird hills neirhood. We support the residents and request you support these neighborhood groups in this area. As part of the eastern crescent, this area and our area in dove springs have similar concerns, which includes unprecedented gentrification and displacement of low-income, working-class and people of color, resulting from increases in property taxes. The current residents and families have established long-term neighborhood ties. Pushing the current residents and their families out will destabilize them and burden them with having to find new housing and schools, and services they may not have access to. This project as initially proposed by the developer does not provide a benefit to this neighborhood. Please ensure as you deliberate that actions taken today will not result in the displacement of the current residents.

[3:07:37 PM]

Thank you your time and consideration and for your service to our community.

>> Michelle meji landlla.

>> Can you hear me?

>> Yes.

>> Okay. Sorry. I'm on my way to pick up my child from school, so I'm walking. My name is Michelle mejilla, a resident of district 4, living in 7758, rundberg. I am here in support of my fellow neighbors in district 4 who are speaking against the development rezoning on brownie. I have lived along the north Lamar corridor for over ten years. I have seen the changes in our district and the displacement of people. To me, these people were my neighbors and friends, friends of my own children, families who have had to leave our schools and the comfort of living close to a bus line sometimes,

[3:08:37 PM]

libraries, an H-E-B, and now even a soccer stadium. We have seen a boom in development in our district 4, along with increased rents, exacerbating the need and lack of true affordable and accessible housing. It's already been happening to us on rundberg and the schools in our area. This past year, we lost our pta president to Elgin. And other families as well. And as my eldest is attending the local schoolcross the street from where we live, I can't help but see the bigger picture about his friends today not being there tomorrow. There is no stability and consistency for grownups or our children. When you change our neighborhoods, you change the makeup. Every decision you make has an impact. Though you might be seeing the "Bigger picture" on the dais, you aren't walking in the shoes of us folks in district 4, nor our neighbors.

[3:09:40 PM]

There is still time to thoughtfully work with community members. For some of us, it's too late, so do right by brownie and Grady. Thank you.

>> Cassie soldergrin.

>> Good afternoon, my name is cassie. I am a district 9 resident. Thank you to the council for allowing me to share my testimony today. I am here to speak against the rezoning as brownie and Grady drive. This area has been named as susceptible to displacement and to experience accelerating gentrification by U.T. Austin's uprooted study. Development threatens the diversity, affordability, and cultural richness of this area. As a community ally and resident, I understand the proposed rezoning to pose

[3:10:40 PM]

numerous concerns, despite residents asking multiple times, the developer has not named a single benefit to the community. Their presence has already been harmful by taking advantage of a resident with limited English proficiency to undermine a valid petition. An additional concern is the owner owes land on both sides of the property and, therefore, a concern that this development could be subject to actually be three times larger than what they're asking for. Lastly, the square footage requirements in

this recommended zoning will result in very pricey units. So to quote councilmember vela once again, Austin must be a safe and thriving home for the working class and not a playground for the wealthy. The only way this aligns with the values is to vote no. Thank you for your time and consideration.

>> Tyler boygen.

[3:11:55 PM]

>> Tyler, please unmute.

>> Hi. I'm not looking to speak on the item, it's not on consent, but I was here for item 85 and 86.

>> Okay. Go ahead and make comments if you have any. Thank you.

>> No comments.

>> We have one more speaker in person, Alice Glasgow speaking on 89 and 90.

[3:13:07 PM]

>> Good afternoon, mayor, mayor pro tem, councilmembers, and city manager. I'm Alice Glasgow representing the applicant for items 89 and 90. I will be short. The case before you -- or cases before you relate to items that we have addressed with the neighborhood. We've met eight times with the neighborhood neighbors and the contact team since 2020. So, we've been at this journey for a long time. During our eight meetings, several concerns were raised. In fact, a total of seven concerns. And a folder has been passed out to each of you with three exhibits. The first exhibit is a list of the seven issues that were raised. And I'm going to tell you how we've addressed them. The first one has to do with privacy concerns, because we adjoin single-family homes. We are providing a 30-foot vegetative buffer included as a conditional overlay in the draft

[3:14:08 PM]

ordinance. Number 2, there were concerns about the building height we were proposing. Our building, one of our buildings was 71 feet tall because we're asking for mf6 zoning which allows a height of 90 feet. We've agreed to limit the building height to 60 feet, comparable to the zoning height we have today under cs commercial zoning. Traffic and rdway improvements -- staff had deferred our traffic impact analysis to the time of site plan, but we agreed to go ahead and have that prepared and reviewed with the zoning and, therefore, that has provided mitigation and improvements that will be provided at the time of development. And that addresses the concerns that relate to mobility and

improvement to the roadway. Flooding -- the neighbors expressed concerns about current flooding in the area and they were concerned that our project might exacerbate that problem.

[3:15:09 PM]

I invited the assistant director, Mike --

[buzzer sounding]

>> Who -- and Mr. Kelley told them the current flooding was being addressed, we were not causing it, our site would have on-site detention and a pond. Affordable housing -- the contact team asked us to provide affordable housing. We are providing voluntarily without a density bonus, we are providing 37 for-rent affordable for 40 years and 15 for sale units for 99 years. We are partnering with habitat for humanities affiliate, home base. They will be our enforcement partner with this private restrictive covenant. And that concludes --

>> Mayor Adler: You've gone past the time here, but we give the applicant five minutes when we call up the case. So let's hold off at this point. Let's go through the consent agenda. If this is a discussion item, we'll recognize you to come back and finish talking.

>> Thank you. I apologize. I did not intend to go over my two minutes.

[3:16:09 PM]

Thank you very much, council and mayor pro tem.

>> Okay, mayor, mayor pro tem and council, joy Hardin, housing and planning department. Your zoning agenda begins with item 69, 221-0026.01. This case is offered for discussion. The related rezoning is item number 70, 0039, offered for discussion at the time of the discussion, we're at third reading, which is the final reading and there is a valid petition in opposition to this request. Item 71, 2020-0021.02, a postponement request by the applicant, to your April 21st council meeting. Item 72 rezoning. C14-2020 --

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry. The first one was 69 and 70, open for discussion.

>> Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: And then 71

[3:17:10 PM]

and 72 offered for discussion.

>> No. 71 and 72 are consent postponements. I read those earlier.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> There's a postponement request by the applicant to your 4/21 council meeting, and that's cases 71 and 72.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Item 73 is c14-2021-0150. There is an applicant postponement to your April 21st council meeting for 73. Item 74 is c1420210182. This item is being offered for consent on all three readings. Item 75 is c1420210188, offered for consent first reading. Item 76 is c1420190166. This item is being offered for consent on all three readings. The related restrictive covenant

[3:18:11 PM]

amendment is item number 77, c14-2016-20124rca offered for consent. This is the item in district 7, as councilmember pool stated, where the gentleman spoke, the prohibition of outdoor amplified sound is being requested to be lifted for seven acres for restaurant and cocktail lounge use, but the other 60 plus acres, the prohibition of outdoor amplified sound stays on that portion, 60 plus acres, the prohibition will stay on that portion of the land. Again, this is offered for consent, rcas only have one reading, so this would be your final reading. Item 78 is c14-2022-0002, being offered for consent on all three readings. Item 79, c1420210089, a discussion item. Item 80 is c14-020183, rca.

[3:19:16 PM]

This is a neighborhood postponement request to your April 7th council meeting. Item 81 is mpa2021011.01, offered for consent on all three readings. The related rezoning is item number 82, c14-2021-0034, being offered for consent on all three readings. Items 83 and 84 were your discussion postponement items. Th items are both being postponed to your April 7th council meeting, 83 and 84. Item 85 is mpa-2021-0009.01, offered for consent on all three readings. The related rezoning is number 86, c14-2021-0132 being offered for consent on all three readings. Item number 87, c14-2021-0174, being offered for consent, second and third readings. Item 88 is c14-99-0069.01.

[3:20:20 PM]

There is a staff postponement request to your April 21st council meeting. Item 89 and 90 are related. Mpa-2021-0020.01. This item is being offered for consent, second and third reading. Item 90 is the

related case, this item is being offered for consent, second and third readings. You heard from the applicant agent, Ms. Glasgow and the neighbors spoke on this, offered for a final reading and there is a valid petition. So this requires nine votes. Item 91, c14-2021-0137, offered for consent third reading. I have just a statement to read into the record. Staff offers an amendment to part two of the ordinance to remove condition 2b and to amend

[3:21:21 PM]

the renumbered condition 2c to add the phrase in Glenview Street and with that, I can offer this for consent third reading. 92, c14-82021, this time is being offered for discussion. And that concludes the reading of your zoning agenda.

>> Mayor Adler: Let me see if I got this right. I'm showing 69 and 70 are discussion. 73 was an applicant request for postponement. Is this the first request by the applicant?

>> Yes, I believe so. It's a consent postponement. Uh-huh.

>> Mayor Adler: 79 is discussion?

>> Correct. Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Right? And then 89 and 90, you're saying they should stay on the

[3:22:22 PM]

consent agenda?

>> Correct. But I am saying that, correct. But it does have a valid petition.

>> Mayor Adler: I understand that. And 92 is discussion.

>> Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Discussion items are 69 and 70, 79, and 92. And the rest stay on the consent agenda. Mayor pro tem?

>> Alter: I would like to leave 79 on consent and postpone it to April 21st, if that's okay. Then I would just like to speak to that motion briefly. 79, it's the Spicewood Springs property.

>> Mayor Adler: Does anybody object to that statement, postponement until April 21st? Hearing no objections, it will stay on consent, postponing to that place.

>> Alter: When appropriate, I'd want to speak to it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. All right. So, the consent agenda are items 69 through 92, except that

[3:23:26 PM]

the ones that are pulled are 69, 70, and 92, the rest remaining on consent. Is there a motion to approve the consent agenda? Councilmember Ellis makes that motion. Is there a second? Councilmember kitchen seconds. Any discussion on the consent agenda? Mayor pro tem, and then councilmember Kelly.

>> Alter: Thank you. I wanted to briefly speak to why I'm postponing item 79. This is a property on spicewood springs road to April 21st. I want -- is the applicant here? Okay. I want to speak to you directly first. If you represent a case in my district in the future I would advise you to start your process by contacting me office and speaking with me. At no point in this process have you ever contacted me or my office despite your case being opposed by your neighbors and your case being opposed by the zoning and platting commission.

[3:24:27 PM]

My staff contacted your firm on March 14th, spoke directly with repa, maybe you, was unable to answer our questions, and ten days later we have never been communicated with by your firm. That is not making it easier for us to support your case. I will not consider this case until I have my questions answered. I have significant concerns about this request to up-zone the back of this site which has significant environmental constraints. I might be comfortable with adding mu to the existing lo. That might have my support. But up-zoning the back does not and I have significant questions. So I'm asking my colleagues to postpone this until April 21st and I ask you please be in touch with my office so we can get our questions answered and see what would be appropriate zoning for this property.

>> Mayor Adler: Further discussion on the consent agenda? Councilmember Kelly.

[3:25:27 PM]

>> Kelly: Yes, I'd like the record to reflect me as voting no on item number 90, please. Thank you.

Mayor Adler: So noted.

Councilmember Renteria.>> Renteria: Can you have the record showing that I also voted against 89 and 90.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. The record will reflect. Any further discussion on the consent agenda? Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Mayor, I'd like the record reflect my recusal on items 72 and 71. I know it's just a postponement.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Are we ready to take a vote on the consent agenda? Those in favor of the consent agenda, please raise your hand. Councilmember harper-madison, are you voting yes? Yes, good. All those opposed? I'm showing that as being unanimous on the dais. So, colleagues --

>> Harper-madison: Chair, I was checking my notes just to make sure that there is an item that intend to vote no on.

[3:26:29 PM]

I just wanted to make certain it wasn't on the consent agenda.

>> Mayor Adler: Which item is that?

>> Harper-madison: 92?

>> Mayor Adler: 92 has been pulled.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: The ones that are being pulled that are still alive now we have yet to vote on 69 and and item 92. Okay? So we have those items in front of us. Thank you, everyone, who's been here. We have the dacc items 13, 14, and 34. We have the S.A.F.E. Item, 52. And then we have the crypto 55 and the blockchain 57, okay? Let's go ahead and start at the beginning of this. I'm going to call up 13, 14, and 34, which are the dacc items. Colleagues, I have proposed a

[3:27:30 PM]

motion sheet to postpone this -- these items 13, 14, and 34 with 3 directions. If there's a second, I'll address that. Councilmember pool seconds that. Thank you. Colleagues, this is hard. We're going to have to find a place for the dacc to be able to go. And it could be that this is the best place for it to go. But as we were leading up to this there were some questions that were being asked in the community that I did not have good answers to. And before I can consider these items 13, 14, and 34, I need better -- to know the answers so I know how to vote on this item. There's the question of looking at the operations of the dacc. There's been conversations about moving to a de-centralized operation, more of a

[3:28:30 PM]

decentralized operation that might have satellite locations. It might have mobile locations. And in that regard I don't know exactly whether the programming for the space that's needed would be the same if we were moving to a more decentralized location. I know that there's been some discussion that we

have two different departments in our city that are both dealing with casework they're doing it separately. The question has come up should they be talking to each other or working out between them, manager. Is that the best way to do it? Could be. But I'd really like to have you get with those different departments to figure out the answer to that question. But those questions that relate to -- we're extending the jurisdiction both geographically and as we are doing that, are we changing the offenses or the

[3:29:32 PM]

crimes, or the concerns or the challenges. I just think that we need to do that as it impacts the programming for the space that we need, which we should know before we start suspicioning spending money on a space, and that's what 13, 14, and 34 are about. We also wanted -- haven't received the report back on conversations with Travis county. The state of Texas reached out to us, three members of the preservation board offering assistance if they have a location for us or ideas on how to do this. I want to take them up on that. And we haven't had a chance to do that. We tried to schedule a meeting. They were unable to meet with us, but we really didn't give them a lot of notice. I understand that they have reaffirmed their request to be able to meet with us, so I think we need to do that as well. And then there are some downtown commission -- the advisory

[3:30:35 PM]

board, the commission, that I don't think this has been taken to. But this is kind of in their jurisdiction and I think it's important that they have a chance to weigh in. So, the motion is to postpone this. I've left the postponement indefinitely so that you would bring it back to us when you had the answers to these questions. And so it's a motion to postpone without a date certain to bring it back to us, when it's ready and to help us to answer at least these three questions that I would need before I could vote. That's my motion. It's been moved and seconded. Discussion? Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: Thanks, mayor. Yeah, I had a good conversation with judge Michael coffee and our presiding judge for the municipal court, sherry statman, earlier this week. And I learned that the location -- the current location for the community court is working quite well.

[3:31:36 PM]

And I know that anytime we have to relocate it costs money and effort, and kind of a psychological approach to things, too, when you have to disrupt your routine and then relocate and start all over again. So, part of the fallback and review piece that I think that the mayor's motion is broad enough to include the current location. And if, indeed, there are future plans for the 1 Texas center site, what

might we do to consider the community court staying there and all the disruptions that occur if you're in a redevelopment zone. But I would like to pursue that as part of the portfolio of work that you will be doing on -- kind of in my estimation, sort of a reimagining of the community court. And I don't know, maybe even some re-branding. After the passage of prop B, we

[3:32:37 PM]

are looking at people not just in the circumscribed central business district downtown, but more broadly around the city. I'm told there is a two-step process that folks who are being brought to the community court have to -- they have to first go through the municipal court and be received and processed in, and then ferried down to the community court, which is -- if that's how that's working, or would work, considering the jurisdictional constraints that the community court has, that's confusing. It's extra time. It's extra resources and energy. And I sure would like to see us smooth that out and make that -- and do away with the two-step. So I wanted to offer my support for the postponement because I do think that there is a lot of additional good conversations to be had. I'd like it to include the current location to see how much

[3:33:37 PM]

longer folks might be able to stay there. We can revisit the concept of the various different spots around the city. I think that that presented some concerns about trying to identify those locations. And when you disperse, of course there's costs for all of those, the dispersion. But mostly I think what we're log at here is kind of a re-branding of what we have been calling the downtown Austin community court. Maybe that court is serving the entirety of our community, not just the downtown. And to that end, I'm hoping that our staff will also bring back -- and I think, mayor, this is also part of your motion -- a review and assessment and updates and amendments that our excellent staff who do this work every day and do it so well can bring to us about amendments to the ordinances that direct their

[3:34:37 PM]

work so that if there are some updates and changes that need to happen in this changed environment that we're in since the passage of prop B last year, that we can deliberate on those and hopefully move those forward. So, thanks, mayor, for bringing this postponement request.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember Kelly.

>> Kelly: Thank you. You know, I think that there are a lot of misconceptions in the community about what it would be like to bring something like what the downtown Austin community court does. There's a lot of people who I've spoken with who are scared about what their neighborhood might become or

might be like. But as I've said before on the dais, I've visited the downtown Austin community court and these perceptions are maybe not true. And I would encourage anyone who has any interest to maybe go over there and check it out or talk to somebody who works there, reach out to the individuals doing the advocacy work. Because it plays a large role in assisting people experiencing

[3:35:39 PM]

homelessness to get out of that situation or access resources. And it is definitely needed in our community. So I appreciate the direction that you brought forward, mayor, so we can explore maybe improving efficiencies of the court and really making it out to be the best court it can be for these people experiencing homelessness.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. I want to come to councilmember tovo to make an amendment. Before I do, speak generally on the postponement question. Councilmember kitchen, councilmember Fuentes.

>> Kitchen: Mine is really a question and whether there's room for perhaps some additional language or direction. And that just relates to the timeline, because if I'm remembering correctly I didn't see a timeline in the direct and I don't want to create an expectation that's not realistic, on the one hand. On the other hand, I do think it's really important that this

[3:36:40 PM]

type of planning process occur expeditiously, because we've been trying to think through what's appropriate for the dacc for quite some time now. And I wouldn't want to take a long time for thinking through a reimagining or whatever. I forget the words that you used. I do think that the direction to pursue some additional analysis of what might be the best scoping and approach moving forward for the dacc -- that's very timely and necessary. But I also don't want it to be so open-ended. I really would like to set at least some expectation about how quickly that could be done, if that's possible. I'm not certain why, mayor, it doesn't have a timeline in it or if there's a reason not to, or if the thinking is that we're

[3:37:41 PM]

not certain. But I am hoping that we can do it within six months to a year. I don't know what's realistic.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm going to go ahead and -- as I read councilmember tovo's puts in a date.

>> Kitchen: Okay. Let's do that, then.

>> Mayor Adler: I didn't put it in mine and I'm not opposed to having one. I just know we had given deadlines and they brought it back to us and there's still been questions and I wanted to try to get out of that.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: I think it's a good conversation to have. We'll let councilmember tovo tee that up. Councilmember Fuentes?

>> Fuentes: Thank you, mayor. I wanted to share my full support for a postponement and really appreciate the amendment that you've laid out, or the language that you've proposed, because we need to include our homelessness strategy office. We also need to ensure that our downtown community court advisory group is engaged on the issue, as that is the function of their board and we all have appointees and we want to make sure that every representative from throughout the city have a

[3:38:41 PM]

say, because we know that when dacc was first founded nearly 20 years ago our way of handling and responding and serving our unhoused neighbors has changed significantly, and especially in these last few years and the last year with the incredible investment that both the city and the county have made towards reducing homelessness. It is time for us to take a look at and rethink how we do our systems of care when it comes to serving our unhoused. This is a great opportunity for us to have those conversations to ensure that we're not duplicating services that we really are working hand in hand with all of the partners and providers, and within our systems. And so I support the postponement. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Did you want to say something?

>> Mayor, I appreciate this discussion. One suggestion might be if it's going to involve the location at some point but before we even have that conversation, really have a work session with the council around these

[3:39:42 PM]

conversations that we're having right now around the operations, etc. And so one recommendation might be to set a time certain for that work session to happen, be able to have staff prepare what those themes and topics and questions that we would want to bring back to council and we could have that in the coming months, but then withdraw this item because we would likely result from that conversation potentially a new location, or a new idea about how to move forward.

>> Mayor Adler: I think there's merit in that.

>> Mayor, councilmember harper-madison has her hand up.

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah, councilmember harper-madison.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you. I appreciate it.

[Clearing throat] Chair, I'd like to know whether or not there's somebody in the room who can speak to -- I heard a statistic the other day and I don't know whether or not it's true -- can speak to how frequently people miss their

[3:40:43 PM]

court dates? Is there anybody in the room who can speak to attendance rate?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. Pete Valdez is with us.

>> Good afternoon, councilmembers, Pete Valdez, director of the community court. So, regarding our appearance rates of the individuals that receive citations that come to the community court, historically that number's at about 50%. It's always been at about 50% for this -- for the population that we serve the most, which are individuals experiencing homelessness. As you can imagine, coming to court isn't going to be a priority for these individuals. That being said, in 2016 when we became part of the homeless outreach street team we did so so that we could proactively engage these individuals before they got in trouble. And in some cases, when they already have citations that were

[3:41:44 PM]

delinquent or pending so that we could inform them about those pending citations before they became warrants. And again, to avoid the arrest.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you. I appreciate you offering that clarity. Chair, in addition to offering my full support for the request for postponement, I'd like to know if some of the information that we can get back would help to assess -- to your point about satellite offices. If we had more locations, I wonder if that would help appearance rates?

>> So, I'd like to say that the focus should really be on the social service component and not the court component. I should tell you that in fiscal year 2013 we were processing about 16,000 cases -- court cases. In the last two years, we've only processed 900 cases total.

[3:42:45 PM]

And again, that doesn't mean that we're not proactively engaging these individuals, because it gives us more of an opportunity to do so without the enforcement piece. So I would say if we were going to a

satellite model, the focus of those satellites should be on case management versus creating courts that are satellites. The majority of the people that we are serving today are coming to the court voluntarily. Through the pandemic we were seeing about 70 people a day when we were at the library. Today we're seeing about 35 people a day. And all of these people are walking in voluntarily. They are not coming there because they have court cases. They are going there because they want to see a case manager for social services. So satellites should not be an

[3:43:46 PM]

instead of, a home base. A home base is going to be necessary and a home base that is going to be central and convenient for the population that we're serving.

>> Harper-madison: I really appreciate you offering that clarity. That's what I was thinking, but I didn't articulate it well. I was having a conversation about the dacc and the services that are provided and how frequently people rely on these services. I was thinking it but I didn't say it. So, thank you for offering that clarity. I would like to ask you, when you say a home base, do you have an opinion on what the home base -- what is the most convenient for folks, especially given, you know, none of us are a monolith, including people experiencing homelessness, people experiencing mental health issues, including the population of people that are being served. What do you think the most appropriate home base is?

>> We have always been downtown. It is where people know that we are located. And based on the last point in time count that was done by

[3:44:48 PM]

E.C.H.O., the concentration of individuals experiencing homelessness is still downtown. So we should be located where that concentration is.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Thank you, Mr. Valdez. I would like to lay out my amendment as well, but I want to thank you. This has been an extraordinarily long process. You've always been downtown until the last couple temporary locations, the one that the manager committed was temporary at 1 Texas center. I appreciate your work. You saw 70 people a day each day of the pandemic. You were one of our very few city offices that stayed open to in-person transactions through that period of time, and the total number was huge, of the number of people you served. And so I just want to start by

[3:45:49 PM]

appreciating you because in the course of this conversation, after a multiyear process of asking our staff to identify a permanent location, we've now come around to postponing the decision on that, but also asking to rethink the whole model. So I think it's important for the community to know that the work that you do has been successful, that if we're taking a look at it today, or asking our city manager to take a look at it, it is not because the work has been -- it is to make it more efficient and to make it more streamlined, or to better set you up for success, but not in my opinion, because there has been any concern about the work that you're providing. I think you provide an extraordinary service to the people of Austin and our neighbors experiencing homelessness as well as the others who are not experiencing homelessness but are at your court for citation.

>> Thank you.

>> Tovo: So, I'm certainly

[3:46:51 PM]

supportive of postponing this. I do think it needs -- we need to resolve this question one way or another so mine does have a time limit. It also has some background in the beginning of the motion sheet. And I Thi that's important because we're now starting to circle around to some of the same things we've already directed. We've directed the manager to explore the idea of satellites, they've provided us with information. We've asked the manager to provide us with information about what costs in the building, square footage, things of that sort. We have already directed the manager to provide us -- to work with Travis county on potential collaborations. And I think they have some information for us back about that conversation. We failed on Tuesday to have the presentation that I think would have answered some of these questions, which is fine. I was part of the support that we have it today instead of Tuesday. If we're postponing I don't think we need to do it today either, but we should do it. There are points of confusion about some of the services and

[3:47:51 PM]

the conversations. And that would help us moving forward. So my amendment -- I don't know how it squares with the suggestion to do a work session, but it does provide some background. And then it incorporates some of the work and acknowledges that you have already done some of the work that was being directed in the mayor's amendment and asks that this come back to us also identifying some of the findings -- responding to some of the findings and on budgetary needs we had asked you to take a look at last year. It also, I think, importantly would put the dacc as the convener, as the folks who have the expertise in this area. They should convene the focus groups and not just be a stakeholder in groups someone else organizes. And the innovation office might be a good partner to Leann because they not

only have the experience working on homelessness issues, but as the innovation office if we're looking at potential system

[3:48:53 PM]

improvements, I would suspect that they might be a good critical P to include to provide improvements. It's important that the dacc be at the head of the focus group conveners. And I did say an expectation of concluding this process work within three months, which I think is possible based on the work that our staff has already done, thinking through the satellite offices. I think we've already gotten down the road on that conversation. I don't know, Mr. Valdez, I did highlight this in my motion sheet because I wasn't sure if that's realistic or not. But to some extent you've done some of this thinking about satellite locations and estimates of space in those satellite locations and my assumption is that city facilities throughout the city, we would use those. That would be the way to do the satellite offices efficiently using city facilities that we

[3:49:54 PM]

already own, whether those are neighborhood centers, community centers, or libraries. I would suggest they be everywhere throughout the city in every council district so that we're really providing that service on the ground to individuals who need it throughout the whole geographic area of the city, or at least regionally -- north, south, east, west.

>> Yes, we did start the work on looking into what that would look like. We've also -- for clarity purposes, we have already engaged our advisory board on both the jurisdiction question as well as the facilities question. So they've been engaged the entire time on both issues.

>> Tovo: Thank you. Mr. Valdez, you did say something that I want to underscore. There have been a lot questions about where the home base needs to be. And it's my understanding that most of the individuals who come in, at least for -- with citations -- do still -- are

[3:50:55 PM]

still residing within the downtown area. Is that your understanding as well?

>> That is our experience based on the people we see. I should clarify that this is for our walk-in services. So we have our intensive case management, which are clinicians carrying caseloads of individuals they're getting into housing. Those individuals are working in the community already. So you could say that a form of satellites already exists from that perspective.

>> Tovo: And as I understand -- and I remember we funded some vehicles for you in the last budget, in part because of the need, because your case managers are in the field around the city working with their clients.

>> That's right. For every case manager that we have working in the community, they have to have their own city vehicle to be able to be flexible and work with all the individuals on their caseload.

>> Tovo: And thanks, too, I

[3:51:56 PM]

think it was judge coffee, it may have been you. Apologies if I mentioned this, but I appreciated the emphasis on the fact that the folks who are walking into the dacc are doing so because they want to change their lives and are doing so voluntarily because they want to seek those services. And I think it's important that whatever building they land in, that it be a wonderful public building. I have to say some of the emails we got suggesting that our beautiful historic building shouldn't be a site -- because it is historic and beautiful -- was concerning to me. I think every one of our city civic buildings should be a building that is -- that we can be proud of. And wherever we serve our neighbors, whether they're housed or unhoused, we should take pride in those locations and make sure it's well-located and accessible to people, and that it provides a welcoming and convenient space. That's what we're called to do as public servants, so I appreciate that wherever you land, you're providing that

[3:53:00 PM]

welcoming, accessible, and very helpful service.

>> We definitely try to do that. Thank you.

>> Tovo: And I do think that it needs to be downtown. I certainly support this notion that the home base might be appropriately smaller with the satellites. We've already initiated that direction and I think my edit to the mayor's captures that facet of it. So, mayor, that's my -- that is my amendment. I'll note one other point of it, and that is the last point, which is we've had multiple conversations on this dais about 1 Texas center. That is our best opportunity to get affordable housing -- significant affordable housing in the south central waterfront. We set a goal on this council. Not everybody on the dais now was on the dais then, but the majority of us were on this dais when we set a goal of 20% of the housing created in the south central waterfront overlay be affordable. And that is our one and only city-owned tract. If we're going to achieve that 20% goal or even get close we're

[3:54:00 PM]

going to need to use that piece of city-owned land to get significant housing on it. That was one reason why last budget cycle I brought forward the direction that you all passed to make sure that we were moving forward with getting a permanent location for the dacc so we could have certainty about when we could start redeveloping 1 Texas center. The postponement today is appropriate but I want to make sure we continue to move forward on thinking about how we're going to use 1 Texas center regardless of what else is there. We need to get started and get a real plan for how we're going to achieve that affordable housing on 1 Texas center. That is why this is in here, too. It's linked to the decision we're making now about taking a pause on the permanent location for the dacc and taking a look at some improvements that could be made.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo, I really appreciate you bringing this amendment and I think you brought up some really good topics. I'm thinking that with what the

[3:55:01 PM]

manager proposed, maybe there's a chance for us to actually sit down sooner than three months to really hear back from staff initially, but to make sure that all related issues are raised, including the dacc and its location. And I think in that context with we could say let's talk about what happens at 1 Texas center as part of that conversation, because it could be that it intersects with some members on the dais wanting to keep the court there. But I think that it might be a way for us to be able to do that. You've raised some issues in here that I think are strong and relate to the item as it was noticed. Matter of fact, most of the amendments that you put in here are things that I would support. The one that I would have difficulty supporting as it's written as an amendment but

[3:56:03 PM]

could support in the context of setting the work session is asking for the council to decide that the primary use of 1 Texas center would be for housing, because I'm not sure we're there yet and haven't quite had, I think, the conversation set up for that. In the first paragraph, as you lay it out, the resolution that 2020-044 relation, I really appreciate your leadership in bringing that forward. It talked about 1 Texas center and asking staff to take a look at a range of community benefits. It didn't identify housing, or the court, or any particular benefit, it just said a range of benefits. It did say that it wanted to take a look at building with synergies with the redevelopment of the statesman track. And I don't know what that is, but we should certainly make that part of the conversation.

[3:57:03 PM]

I agree with you, we should have a serious conversation about what to do with 1 Texas center, I just don't know if we're ready to decide that today. We really weren't noticed decide that question today, but I think that if we're going to let staff pull down, I think, this item, but to come back to us with a date certain when we could have that work session, then everybody on the council can reach out to you to indicate all the issues that we should raise in that form. And then there once we see those issues and have a discussion, we might have a real good idea whether you can come back in three months or nine months, depending what are the questions that we ask to be solved. But I do agree with councilmember tovo that if we could get a date certain now to move this forward, I think we

[3:58:04 PM]

should try to do that.

>> Mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I think I need to understand what you're suggesting. But first I want to address the 1 Texas center question. We passed a south central waterfront vision plan which specifically addresses 1 Texas center as having affordable housing. In all of our tourist discussions we've talked about affordable housing on that site. You're right, the resolution I brought talked about community benefits, but it was community benefits as articulated in the south central waterfront, which was affordable housing, in addition to other uses on that tract. We've also gotten back memos from the staff talking about funding options for the affordable housing on 1 Texas center. So I think if we want to pause and take a very concrete vote on whether that's the direction, we certainly could. But I do think the council has, in multiple ways and multiple conversations, affirmed that that was part of the intent for 1 Texas center. I hear your question about whether or not we're noticed for

[3:59:05 PM]

this. As I look over the notice for 13 and 14 it's about reimbursing ourselves from proceeds of certificates of obligation. It's about increasing appropriations for the municipal building renovations. None of those speak to operational issues either, so we're already a little bit beyond what we were posted for. But I think -- I feel like -- I'm pretty comfortable with that since it's direction and not an amendment to an action. And so I'm as comfortable with the 1 Texas center direction as I am with the direction you brought about the operational having said that I think it's -- we could schedule a work session -- I hope we will -- to have this conversation. And I think we should. If we're asking the folks to convene other stakeholders and to get serious about what satellite locations are going to look like, I don't want to wait for those conversations

[4:00:05 PM]

happen. I want to see forward progress. This has been multiple years and now they're being asked to tweak -- to take a look at the operational system for improvements, so I think that work should just begin.

>> Mayor Adler: So I hear what you say and in order for me to be able to vote on items 13 and 14, whether or not to spend money to use this location involves a certain use of programming. To know whether we need 500 square feet or 5,000 square feet, I need to know what that body is going to be doing. If we're talking about considering changing how that body works and where its caseworkers are, whether they're downtown or more distributed, that's going to change the programming. I can't vote on 13 and 14 and 34 until I know the programming, and those

[4:01:07 PM]

questions go to how much space do we need as opposed to a decision today that would direct us to say one Texas center should be primarily affordable housing, which we could do but have not done. The water front plant talks to a wide range of uses. It talks about synergies with one particular tract. We haven't had discussions about those uses. I would feel uncomfortable with we were going to decide at this meeting whether or not it was going to be affordable housing, it be in order for someone to say, no, I think it should be the home for the dac. I would be uncomfortable without having provided notice

[4:02:07 PM]

to the neighborhood around it immediately. One of the things I like that the manager proposed -- by pulling us down and asking for a work session that we would be setting up with a date certain where we could bring in all the issues, we don't have to decide that legal question and I don't have to rule on whether it's a posting requirement or has to be a posting requirement recognizing there's going to be disagreement.

>> Tovo: I think -- I don't know this to be true but perhaps this gets back to the conversations we have had about how to best use the city-owned tracts downtown and whether or not to use them for affordable housing. I'm not going to restate what I said but we have in so many ways in so many conversations talked about affordable housing on that tract, and I am going to hope there are three other colleagues or eventually six

[4:03:07 PM]

but three others who will help me put this on the agenda if we can resolve it if there's any question. But I think we should make sure the south central water front does not just develop as high luxury housing. We need to step up. If we're going to ask other tracts to step up I think we ought to be able to use our city-owned tract to do the same. So I will just bring that forward separately.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there objection to ask the manager to see if you can tomorrow or by Monday get a date certain that we can have a work session on this issue? Colleagues can go to the message board or to you to say these are issues we want to have discussed and you can bring this to ifc -- it's not a choice.

[4:04:07 PM]

You could do both if you wanted to, to say as part of the conversation I think we need to talk about what we do with one Texas center.

>> Tovo: I want to bring it to ifc. That wasn't regarded as definitive so I'm going to bring that as ifc. I would say back to the original point I am concerned about delaying -- if we're going to ask them to convene other stakeholders to talk about operations. I wonder if that work shouldn't get started. They're able to do that absent any direction. Just scheduling the work session sounds good.

>> Mayor Adler: I agree. People's thoughts on that plan of attack. Council member kitchen and council member Kelly?

>> Kitchen: I'm fine with that plan of attack. I would encourage ---ING and I think, city manager, what we're encouraging is that we initiate the conversations that we've identified about what is the

[4:05:10 PM]

best future for the dac as well as the entities that have offered to lend expertise or be a resource R if them. I think I'm hearing us say we're setting out a path for council to consider these various things but dac has authorized to go ahead and begin this kind of analysis within their own scope immediately. Is that correct.

>> Absolutely. As part of background to cure rating the work itself, that kind of engagement with other stakeholders would be important so we can have --

>> Mayor Adler: I agree with that timing as well. That would be good information to get back to the council. I would like you to take -- I don't know. It's not judicial notice, managerial notice. At the very least we want these things addressed.

[4:06:12 PM]

Council member Kelly? And then mayor pro tem. >>Melissa: I want to make it clear, I am in support of moving the downtown Austin community court. It's just ensure wherever it does go people don't have a misconception it will make their neighborhood an awful place. It won't do that at all. I'm strongly in favor of that. If I can help you with that ifc, please reach out to my office and let me know.

>> Tovo: Thank you and thank you for making the point about the operations and about how successfully the downtown Austin community court has worked with neighbors and neighbors using the services.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem?

>> Alter: I have questions for staff. We talked about the lease and the facilities master plan. In order for us to move from

[4:07:12 PM]

lease to own properties, one Texas center is a lynch pin in the process, whether the location for the offices or the staging place or whatnot. And we really can't lose sight of that. We do need to have staff downtown, and it is not easy to buy properties downtown and do other things, and I'm not saying we don't have a considerable amount of affordable housing. It's my understanding the plans do have that. But they also have city office space there. I want to make sure that we're not losing touch with that, and there is quite an elaborate plan of sequencing and timing that the staff have been working on for quite some time that is derailed by this process in some significant ways with fiscal implications. I want to invite -- can you

[4:08:12 PM]

provide us little more of the context that we need to know at this point and think about -- we're going to continue this discussion and not close it out. But I don't want us to walk away thinking we can just make one Texas center all residential and we've solved all our problems. You may not have been implying this

>> Tovo: I was not. It says a primary use.

>> Alter: You may not have meant that but that is what I heard. I think we need to be clear so staff have some sense of where to go. I would invite you to provide some context. The amount of money we can save and move to debt financing, et cetera is pretty extraordinary given our challenges. It's probably greater now and if we don't move in that direction soon it's going to cost even more.

>> I appreciate it. I appreciate the conversation, and I really look forward to having a work session to talk

[4:09:13 PM]

about these issues more. I think these are things we've been talking in one-off conversations here and there and I think a work session is a great opportunity to address it all together. There has been discussion of using it as affordable housing, also for municipal office space as part of the long-term goals of getting out of lease space which is expensive over time and moving into city-owned space. We've seen success with the planning development center and the Austin energy building and trying to get another municipal building of that quality in the downtown area to provide owned office space so we can start moving out of our leases. It's a tangled web of how we make that work and certainly getting staff, getting our current staff out of one Texas center as quickly as possible so we can then plan for the redevelopment of that site is part of that, and so we are doing things right now.

[4:10:14 PM]

We're working with Austin energy on the old headquarters of how to get people out of the one Texas center. We need to get the dacc out of one Texas center. That's a conversation we have to have with the city council, of course, but that's where staff is going on this. We have been pushing on this hard. I apologize if we've been pushing too much. That's because we've taken direction from council saying we want dacc in a permanent facility by may of 2023. That's going be very difficult. This is something we've been talking about for years. This is not the first location we've proposed. There's been a lot of controversy about where we relocate the dacc. Some of the goals council has given to staff probably aren't going to be achievable.

[4:11:14 PM]

We're going to keep doing our best to achieve them, but it is all tied up. If we can't find a place to put the dacc sooner than later it's going to delay the ability to redevelop the one Texas center site. And there's timing of when the spaces we're leasing, when do the leases end. I can anticipate we'll have to extend some of the leases because the timing won't work out as we initially anticipated. That's okay. I want everybody to hear it's a complicated equation of how we're going to make all this work, lot of moving pieces and I think a work session where we can put it on the right table is the right direction.

>> Alter: Thank you. Is there anything else you would like us to know about the work that staff have done and I would also extend that to the director of our court as well.

>> I guess I'll say and I'll let Kim speak too. We embrace the new direction.

[4:12:14 PM]

We're excited about doing the work. It's different than the direction council has given us previously. I don't know where council will land on it. I don't think it's achievable in three months. I don't mean that to be controversial or disrespectful. It's very expansive. I would embrace doing it. But focus groups -- focus groups are a research tool where you bring in a professional researcher who does focus groups. They have a specific purpose. You design them. You bring in a professional. You work with them to design them. You set them up. It takes time. I think it's the right tool for this conversation but doing focus group with city department stakeholders, centers like the center for court innovation -- it will take time to do those. And I think that's the right approach. From there we're talking about doing a comprehensive review about how the court operates.

[4:13:15 PM]

That will take time. Once we have recommendations about how we think the court might operate better or differently that will inform the space we need and might be totally different space than what we've been looking at. It's been multiple years trying to find space for the court as it currently operates. This is good direction but will take a substantial amount of time trying to manage expectations.

>> Alter: If the municipal building is not used -- it seems like the renovations have to happen -- some of the renovations need to happen anyway, right.

>> Yeah. Part of our planning, that's a building -- if you haven't visited, it's beautiful on the outside. On the inside it needs TLC. There's all kinds of issues with it. It has asbestos issues. Lot of talk about the 27 million. We think the building in its -- currently it's a wonderful building but old.

[4:14:18 PM]

It needs about \$22 million of renovations and another 5 million to make additional changes for the court. Looking at the municipal court building we would still want to proceed with trying to move financial services department employees into the building over to TLC as part of the broader strategic facilities.

>> A: That's?

>> Town Lake Center. Sorry for the acronyms. That's part of the plan. We're working on it currently. The facility needs renovations to the tune of \$22 million even if we don't do anything else, getting it up to modern day code. Then discussion about what we want to do with the spaces.

>> Alter: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member

[4:15:22 PM]

vela?

>> Vela: I toured it the other day. I have a question for you. So sorry.

>> Alter: I meant to ask about Mr. Valdez to come up, if he had anything else to add. We can do it after you're done.

>> Vela: Thank you, mayor pro tem. Criminal defense attorney -- I've been to the prior address on 6th and red river. It's a beautiful location at the first floor. Just -- I was impressed. Also as part -- in my inaugust -- not inauguration but on boarding with the city we went to human resources on the -- I can't remember -- sixth floor. It seems like an excellent building in good shape.

[4:16:24 PM]

Was that your assessment or what is your assessment.

>> The building over here -- one Texas center?

>> Vela: I'm sorry. One Texas center.

>> One Texas center. It's not a great facility. Our plan would be to remove it and rebuild new municipal spaces there and affordable housing uses there. You know, renovating it could also be done. I think it could be on the first floor. It's -- maybe decent facility. There's been renovations there but when you get inside the building there's a lot O weird angles, not the most conducive for office space. So it's not T ideal facility for what we would want to do with that space. We think a complete -- tear down and rebuild, particularly in line with the south central water front vision and style of building is something -- what would be our recommended approach.

>> Vela: What's the age of one

[4:17:25 PM]

Texas center.

>> Let me look that up. People are guessing the '80s, but we can look that up for you really quick.

>> Vela: While she's looking that up, I appreciate the mayor pro tem's comment. I was going to make the same comment, I -- we have, again, in my view -- I'm not a real estate professional or anything like that - a perfectly functional office building there at one Texas center that seems to be underused -- or seems

to be -- I know we've moved a lot of folks out of there. Again, from my not professional point of view, I sure feel like we could terminate leases and put folks back in there. Again, I say this in the context of the three and a half per cent revenue caps, looking forward to tough budget years and just really trying to pinch every penny we can so that we can work on, you know, parks and housing and?

>> Right.

[4:18:26 PM]

>> Vela: -- And homelessness and crime prevention and all those things. So I would be, again, in support of a delay to kind of work some more of these things out and figure out exactly what we want to do. Again, just another quick comment. I did have an opportunity to go into the municipal building and give a quick walk around. That's a gorgeous building. Its architecture, its location. I did not realize until I saw the plaques outside the building that that was a site of the first Texas capitol. It's an extremely historic building, historic location, and to me, that site just lends itself to some kind of adaptive reuse.

>> Yeah.

Vela: I think about -- again, these are not on point but the -- in San Antonio. I think about the ferry building in San Francisco. I think of an art museum.

[4:19:26 PM]

I don't believe the city of Austin has an art museum. The other thing in thinking about the municipal building I think those uses could attract private funds, whereas city office buildings -- no one will donate money to build a city Austin building but I think we could get a donation to turn it into a museum. Foot court is the wrong word -- but some kind of more cultural, public venue. And I would like to explore those types of opportunities.

>> Alter: Can I finish hearing from Mr. Valdez.

>> We're having an extended conversation on something we're noticed to talk about. If you want to add further comments, then I'm going to announce that this item is withdrawn. Manager, if by tomorrow or

[4:20:27 PM]

Monday you can have us schedule when that work session would be on our calendars, that would be great.

>> I don't have any other comments except to say thank you for the opportunity to speak today and I look forward to present any additional information you would like.

>> Mayor Adler: The record will reflect that items 13, 14, 34 are withdrawn

>> Tovo: Mayor? I had an opportunity yesterday to talk to council member vela about some of his ideas. I think having cultural institutions downtown is absolutely what we want to encourage. That reminded me of the on going conversation we've had with tra vis county to support their adaptive reuse of the palm school.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's add that to the list.

>> Tovo: That continues to be a priority of mine and I know others share that.

[4:21:31 PM]

Boy, I look forward, council member vela, to you help us raise private funding R if that if that's the direction they want to go.

>> Mayor Adler: So noted. Everybody should just identify all the issues they want to make sure we hit in that work session. We're going to continue moving through the agenda. 37 was postponed. That gets us up to 52, 55, 57 and two zoning cases. 52 -- council member alter, you pulled this one.

>> Alter: I did. 52 is kind of a bundle of contracts for youth programs through aph. In the Q and a I asked for details on the 17 contracts in terms of the amount of money that we were offering and what the programs we were covering

[4:22:33 PM]

in the process -- discovered there was a significant funding cut that aid programs for our youth. About a third if you really look at it a little bit differently than what we're looking at in here because there were some covid adjustments. I passed out the sheet that was provided in the Q and a earlier today. But I want to share some facts as I understand them at this point. First of all, council is consistently directed through our annual budget adoption and prior resolutions that we wanted to invest in aisd's prime time victory tutorial and parent specialist program amounts. We've specified those and specified they should be on going amounts. For a number of years the dollar amount has been over 1.6 million annually for the prime time program. Were to approve this item it would mean a reduction in our

[4:23:34 PM]

historical amount of funding by a third. Flt and there's no way I can imagine where such an outcome would not result in a cut of services for kids and I can't imagine where that would not result in whole campuses being removed from the program. This was not clear until we saw the responses back in the Q and A and were able to compare the award amounts with what had previously been awarded. The numbers on that chart give a rather false impression about the magnitude of cuts to prime time. Last year their negotiated contract amount was much lower than the most historically significant amount -- comparing it would minimize how significant a reduction this would be at a time our children need these services. I know that our staff support kids and programs.

[4:24:35 PM]

I know they were doing best to provide services with limited funds. I'm not able to support an item that would lead to such cuts without additional information and conversation. I want to be clear that the prime time after school programs provide out of school time at title I schools. There are zero schools in district ten served by this program. This is not a parochial concern I have. It's a concern about doing right by our kids, which is a goal I know you all share. It serves eight schools in district one, four in district two, seven in district three, two schools in district five and three in district nine. I do believe that we can arrive at a solution that gets everyone what they're awarded through this process, but I need to take some time to better understand the implications of the cuts to the aid programs and I need to be

[4:25:38 PM]

sure we don't have other pots that can be used to make sure our children are not harmed by these cuts. I have in our conversations -- we learned that staff has said aid has sometimes underspent their awards. I'm not convinced that makes the case for this outcome. Some of those were during COVID and other years were relatively small margin, and even those -- this award amount would give aid less than they were spending on the services even in years impacted by COVID when they had the highest dollar amount of unspent funds. I would like to request we postpone this item today so we can discuss this further. If any of my colleagues would like to join me in that discussion with staff and aid to save time I think postponing would be best. I would welcome your involvement in that process. I'd like to postpone it just

[4:26:38 PM]

two weeks to the April 7th agenda.

>> Mayor Adler: Motion made. Seconded by council member Kitchen. No. Council member Kelly will second it. Discussion on the amendment? Council member Pool?

>> Pool: So the postponement is only for the funds going to prime time, or is it for all of the entities on this chart?

>> Alter: I think it needs to be for all of the entities. I don't wish to reduce other contracts' amounts of money, but I -- there's so much here that I haven't been able to resolve. I'm not really comfortable postponing just one contract. The item is for all 17.

>> Pool: What I was thinking

[4:27:40 PM]

is rather than postpoing can we work on the piece -- if they need an additional boost of funds we can allocate that, but I'm concerned about holding up even if it's only for two weeks all of the disbursal. It takes a while to get all these sent out.

>> We do have the director up here to speak to the implications of the postponement.

>> Pool: Thanks.

>> Thank you, city manager. Yes, you are exactly right, council member pool. There is a process to get the funds deployed into community and anytime we can save to make sure we're providing resources so that kids can be served will bereatly appreciated. One other commento point out that this -- these awards are

[4:28:41 PM]

the result of a competitive solicitation. And if you look at the funding being allocated to aid across their applications, they are being awarded 44 per cent of the total funds available for these services.

>> Pool: That's great. Thanks for that. I would go back to the question to the mayor pro tem. Is there a way we could pursue the questions that she has and try to resolve them but not slow down the deployment of these funds because it will have a much larger impact than just on the one fund that is being -- that you have the

questions on. >> Alter: I don't want to fight this to death but I'm not sure what the two-week impact is. These contract discussions are nowhere near done. They couldn't tell me the performance indicators, even in a gross sense for the contracts

[4:29:42 PM]

when we asked that. So I mean I think there's a lot of conversations that can happen. We're still going to be giving awards to all these organizations. Again, I would personally prefer to find other pot of money if we decide we want to add it. Our concern is that this has been provided as a line item of a continuing amount of money specifically for these programs. It is unclear from the record that we were able to look at from the public health committee that even the health committee had said put that pot of money into the competition. You know, I don't think there was a vote on that. I don't think it was clear if these funds were there. It may be out of this portion of funds. Maybe we don't have enough portion of funds in the pot in the first place. I don't have answers to these questions at this point in time. Aisd wasn't aware this was on the agenda until we brought it to their attention. We were giving an rca -- just

[4:30:46 PM]

the names of the organizations. I don't know what else I'm going to find about these contracts as we move forward. I guess we could, you know, consider negotiating the other ones and not executing, but I don't know what I'm going to discover in the next two weeks since I've discovered quite a bit today that gave me a lot of pause. I don't know if the other organizations knew this was on the agenda today. Again, I want to give as much funding as we can to youth programs. These are all great organizations. But something -- I just need more information here.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member kitchen?

>> Kitchen: I respect the desire for more information. That makes sense. And asking for time for that, but at the same time I'm partial to council member

[4:31:46 PM]

pool's suggestion because I do think it's important to -- for a couple of things. I have always supported dollars to the school district and would continue to do so. I also support these other organizations that are listed here, and most importantly, I think it's important to remember that this is a process that is not a council process; it is a competitive process that goes through our public health department. And I respect that process. Now, it is our -- it is our duty to feel comfortable with that process and understand the results of it so we need the time to do that. I don't think it's appropriate to intervene without doing so by saying that there's either some problem with the process or we have decided that -- you know, for policy reasons we want a certain entity to have certain dollars. What I'm kind of uncomfortable with is putting all these

[4:32:47 PM]

agencies through a competitive process and then saying we're uncomfortable with the result without doing that based on -- ban some discussion about something wrong with the process. You know, I mean, we've had lots of conversations over the years about how important it was to have an objective process through our public health department that really looks at -- that really looks at, you know, criteria and results and those kinds of thin. . And I'm understanding that, may Yo pro tem, you may feel like that process wasn't accomplished appropriately. That's fine. That's the questions we should ask. I want to allow for the time to do that. But I also want to be really careful that what we're doing here is respecting the competitive process that we've put in place with the public health department and if it doesn't produce the results we want for a particular entity, then let's add more money and let's specify that we want

[4:33:48 PM]

that entity to have more money. But I'm uncomfortable saying that the rest of these entities have to wait. So I would feel more comfortable with council member pool's suggestion about moving forward with the proposal from our city staff, examining what we want to do with the school district, and then I'm happy to, you know, suggest more dollars if that's appropriate. I'm uncomfortable suggesting taking away from other entities that have gone through the process.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member Fuentes.

>> I would like to hear from our director.

>> Thank you, council member. After I made my first statement -- good to have your phone handy. Staff have been communicating with me. And because the start date for the contracts is set for July 1st, we can accommodate the

[4:34:50 PM]

timeline if council feels they need time to discuss. We would love to have this wrapped up by April 7th so we can continue to move forward the negotiation process -- sometimes it's long and we want to give organizations time they need to make sure they're comfortable with the terms and performance measures we're requiring of them.

>> Thank you. And with that I'm supportive of a postponement. I think it's important to look at it. I would like to look more at the process. Mayor pro tem, I would like to join you. This might offer budget direction. I'm interested in how we solicit and the performance measures in place. I think it's worth to have the conversation in the upcoming process. I want to take a look at equity and know we have one school district getting 44 per cent of the youth program funding. I think that begs the question

[4:35:51 PM]

of equity. We have several school districts in the city of Austin. We need to ensure we're supporting as many of us have youth and children in our districts that go to other districts as well. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: I think it's important, manager -- and I appreciate the colleagues willing to get in there and to help develop the information, let the information develop, get circulated among council members as it gets developed so we're all staying current. Before I ask if people are okay to just moving this to the 7th, which is the question I'll ask in a second -- council member pool, council member Renteria, and kitchen.

>> Pool: I wanted to follow up about the groups and the competitive process. Are you intending to reengage with everybody that's on the list or -- my understanding is

[4:36:51 PM]

it was just the one program that was at question here. I mean, I -- a, I don't think you can do that in two weeks. And B, that's going to send a shock of lack of awareness and fright through all of these organizations and I'm given to understand that aid just became aware of this. We've been contacted that they're on the edge of their seat about this. Are we looking at revisiting every entity that's on here, or are we focusing on the prime time program with aid? I have brought budget writers to expand its involvement and the moneys that have gone to that program in my time here on council, so obviously I support this. So is it one or all.

>> If I may, I think the goal is to provide clarity to council about questions.

[4:37:52 PM]

>> Pool: Let's make that very clear. But I wanted to let the director clarify. Our -- we put this forward. If there are questions from council we want to make sure we're able to clarify. Director stirrup.

>> Thank you, city manager. It is our intention to engage with the council. Preliminary notifications have already been made to all of the awardees. They are aware of their funding amounts, while they may not have been aware it was going to be on today's agenda. The sooner we can let this up -- I imagine that now we have a couple of other agencies on the edge of their seats wondering what's going to happen moving forward. The idea would be to meet with the selected council members and inform them about the process to the point where they feel comfortable and hopefully move forward on the 7th.

>> Pool: Thanks so much.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member

[4:38:54 PM]

Renteria?

>> Renteria: I agree with my colleagues -- you know, years back we decided we were going to adopt this procedure because we didn't want to decide who's going to take and lose on these projects, that we decided that it would be best to do -- to let our staff go through the -- to negotiate the contract with with -- that they needed. So we adopted that policy and I'll be very concerned if we want to change the policy. You know, we had all kinds of options at the beginning. You know, we could have gone into word politics. That was suggested by some of the -- previous -- past members, that they wanted to do that and just divide all the money evenly, like Laredo does -- their city council. It's disaster, what they have to go through because there's always conflicts and not enough money to get things done.

[4:39:55 PM]

So we decided to put it all in a big pot and decided to let the staff decide what would be the best projects to go -- move forward with council's recommendations. So I believe that once we negotiate contracts and let people know that that's the amount they're going to get, I'm sure that they'll already anticipate how to use that money. So I would be very concerned if we do any kind of delays on these projects, but if the will of the council wants to wait until another week or two, then I have no problem with it.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member kitchen?

>> Kitchen: I'm okay waiting two weeks based on what the director said. But I have one question and then one comment. So director, stirrup. Is this a zero-sum game in the sense that if the will of the

[4:40:55 PM]

council was to add dollars to these aid projects -- would we have to subtract from someone else on this list.

>> We would have to identify where those dollars would come from

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Since the agencies have already been notified. That would not be the preferred --

>> Kitchen: Okay. I'm not going to be supportive of notifying any of these other agencies if they're being awarded less. I would be supportive of considering additional dollars for the aid programs if it's justified just on data and analysis, which, you know, I've been supportive of these projects so I can imagine that

that can readily be done. As council member Renteria mentioned, the process is important here and I want us to be -- to honor the process and I want us to respect the

[4:41:56 PM]

process that our staff has gone through for this analysis. And again, as I said, as a policy matter, I'm willing to consider more dollars because these are certainly very important programs that I've always supported but so are the other programs that are on this list. So the other thing that I would comment on -- please provide information to all of us. If there's going to be a proposal for a change, I think it might require a work session conversation because I'm going to want to understand the basis beside it. Again, not going to support taking dollars away from anyone else.

>> Mayor Adler: As you develop the information -- I appreciate my colleagues that are going to be at the front lines and engaged in that -- two questions. These awards represent a change. What's the justification for that change? And if there would be a change to the changed awards, what is

[4:42:57 PM]

that following from? I mean, at a high level without knowing any of the details of this work, this is the first time we've re-let these contracts in a long time and I would hope that every time we do this kind of work we're actually doing a real job of just not continuing with the past contracts but actually taking a look at what our present needs are, our present priorities are, where the equities are now as compared to where they were before. So I would hope that none of our contractees go into this process with an expectation that in the next round they're be treated the same way they were before because that was a long time ago that was decided. So I just wanted to say that. Mayor pro tem?

>> Alter: Thank you. I want to clarify a few things. First of all, it's not my

[4:43:58 PM]

intention to cut anyone -- other programs' funding. As we do all the time, you sometimes discover something about something you cared about and worked about that you were not able to get answers to your questions sufficiently in time for a vote and you ask for a postponement so you can clarify things. In this case and in this instance, you know, we were trying to unpack how the competitive process worked and there was a piece that had to do with with how much money you spent. It seemed like the formula didn't work well for the school district who was not able to spend all the money in covid and they were being judged based on that and how they were putting it together and we couldn't get our questions answered to understand how that worked and it was a huge jump down, everyone though

the rating in the competitive process was high. And I need to understand that process. I strongly would love for us to

[4:44:59 PM]

find other money. I have some ideas where other money is, but I couldn't very welcome forward today with a proposal and say let's pass these but let's give X more to this program because I don't know what would be appropriate because I don't have a full picture of the questions. But this is a competitive process. I've advocated for a competitive process. There is question of if it was known of these funds going to the school district, which is different than other programs as an entity and has had different support than other programs over the years and different commitments and budget commitments that said it was on going support, et cetera -- in a very different way than these others, whether that was handled appropriately. And so my focus in my conversation is on that but without understanding the process I didn't think it was fair for me to say that I don't know what I'm going to

[4:46:01 PM]

discover. It is my hope we'll find ways if that is merited. Like couch kitchen said, it -- council member kitchen said, it should be based on data. I was not able to get that information. Want to reiterate not one of my schools in my district is a recipient. This is not a parochial concern. This is an understanding of the programs and what they contribute to the community and the kind of situation that our students and schools find themselves in at this point in time coming out of covid -- it's really dire and to give them less than they've spent in the past, you know, based on some of these weird things just doesn't sit right.

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. Council member tovo?

>> Tovo: I don't want to say a lot other than to think mayor pro tem alter to note this.

[4:47:02 PM]

We have had a lot of opportunities to speak about the after school programs. I remember the years where they were about to cut programs at multiple real high need schools until we came up the funding. so I'm strongly supportive of the programs. I appreciate the approach you're taking to go about getting the data that we need to figure out what to do next. I think our staffs are working together. But certainly if not, well, shs -- they are already are. I'm strongly supportive of continuing this. You know, we've -- I think that -- it's a very valid conversation to have about how we're supporting school districts throughout the city of Austin boundaries and I know that our staff have provided us with lots of that

information in the past because it comes up periodically and, you know, I'm really proud that we are also supporting creative action programs at multiple school districts, I believe, and have other programs at different school districts -- understanding and acknowledging

[4:48:03 PM]

that each school district within the city of Austin is not in the same financial position because some are subject to recapture and some are not. Aisd -- I think they are the highest -- the school district that sends the most money back to the state of any other school district in the entire state of Texas, though they have a high number of -- high percentage of students who are really, really in need of that support. So that's all. Thank you. Again, mayor pro tem, look forward to the next step.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's take a vote. Vote is to postpone item 52 for the next city council meeting. Those in favor, raise your hand. Those opposed? Council member Harper Madison, did you vote yes? It was unanimous. That gets us to item 55. Council member Kelly, do you want to make your motion?

[4:49:11 PM]

.

>> We have the amendment brought forward on item 55.

>> Mayor Adler: We do.

>> So I would like to make a motion to move for passage of item 55 with those amendments. Is that how -- or do we consider the amendments next? I'm sorry.

>> Mayor Adler: You can do it that way, or you can make your motion and then they can make your amendments to your motion.

>> I adore their amendments. I think they're helpful and would like to accept them. I want to make a clarification that we're accepting the most recent amendment that you posted to the message board that does not include public banking. Is that correct, council member tovo?

>> Tovo: Council member Kelly, thank you so much for accepting those. It was supposed to include public banks as a whereas but not for the result. Let me make sure that happened

[4:50:11 PM]

because we did have some version criminal confusion. Why don't we start there. I actually don't see that passage, so I need to probably add that back in. But it was as a whereas and not be a further result.

>> That's acceptable. My understanding was that -- in the -- if we had put that in the be it resolved it would not be germane to the language we posted it for.

>> Mayor Adler: I see it on line 33 on page 32.

>> Can you remind us which amendments we're talking about?

[4:51:32 PM]

.

>> If we think we're talking about the amendment ins the back-up, it's -- at the top says item 55 tovo amendment. Was posted today.

>> I don't think I've seen that one.

>> Along with council member pool's amendment as well.

>> We haven't gotten to that one yet.

>> Kitchen: Yes, we did.

>> Sorry.

>> Mayor Adler: Has everybody seen council member pool's amendment to 55? We know what that one is?

>> Alter: I don't know where tovo's is yet.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's turn to council member tovo's amendment. I think that was sent by the clerk by e-mail as well. Let's see if we can find out what time that was sent out to everybody.

>> Kitchen: Mayor, I see it. At 9:57 A.M.

>> Mayor Adler: 9:57 A.M.?

[4:52:33 PM]

>> Kitchen: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you, council member kitchen.

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes

>> Tovo: Council member Kelly, thank you for calming my attention. I did notice something that is amiss. I've -- for the reasons you've said that it did not fit in the posting, I put it as a whereas, but an important bullet got left off. That is about the creation of the public bank. The whereas at line 33 should also have in addition to creation of wallet-based platform creation of local currency, et cetera, the next should be creation of a public bank. It is a whereas.

>> Is it okay to keep it off?

>> Tovo: It was my intention to have it in. It was an editing error.

[4:53:34 PM]

Do you want to accept it as it is and I'll make a separate amendment.

>> Let's accept it as is and you can make a motion to do the next amendment. >>Steve: --

>> Tovo: Will do.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member Kelly makes a motion which is her item 55 with the pool amendment and tovo amendment as posted and sent out to council offices at 9:57. Is there a second to that motion? Council member kitchen seconds that motion. Discussion? Council member Kelly, do you want to discuss it first.

>> I just want to thank everyone for their thoughtful contributions. I'll glad we're able to have this discussion about the city and exploring these option to see what we might be able to do or not do. I appreciated the feedback I've gotten and the amendments my

[4:54:34 PM]

colleagues have brought forward.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Council member vela?

>> Vela: I appreciate council member pool's amendment and her research regarding the government financial accountability office recommendations regarding the use of crypto by public institutions. I'm a skeptic and generally speaking of unregulated currencies. That said, this is something we need to take a look at that there is a big push here locally for. I will be supporting the resolution to see what staff says to see what they think and to see where we move forward from this point.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member pool?

>> Pool: Thanks. I talked a little bit Tuesday about folks in our community

[4:55:34 PM]

who have been helping us understand the broader implications of crypto. Several folks wrote to me with comments and suggestions on the two items. I so appreciate that. I want to thank Courtney Rosenthal. She works as a principal software engineer for a multinational company in broad band telecommunications sector and she is quite appropriately serving as the district seven appointee to the library commission. Thanks for your essential input and insights, Courtney. I dug into the information that our cfo provided from the government finance officer's association. The finance officer's

[4:56:35 PM]

association advises government not to accept crypto because of -- it is an anonymous, foreign currency. It lacks underlying substantive value. It's volatile in nature, which could cause loss of principle and it's potentially ill-liquid. And further, accord doing the international -- according to the international monetary fund, consumer risks remain substantial given lack of oversight. The finance officer association sees it as volatile as well. Sees it as an unstable product and notes such products are not typically authorized by state laws as an allowable investment vehicle for governments. An example of this is state laws generally do not allow investing in foreign currencies

[4:57:35 PM]

or equities. Crypto cannot be continued viable for receivables or payable purposes because there's no known way to assess its value. It can't be processed through normal banking operations. There are thousands of versions of crypto currency, all with similar and different attributes and risks, including a substantial risk of loss through the conversion to dollars. Governments can only use legal tender and products based on legal tender for receivables, payables, and investments like checks and payment cards, electronic payments, or ach's, wire transfers, and U.S. Currency. And so all of this foregoing are the reasons behind the government finance officials association that governments

[4:58:36 PM]

should abstain from using crypto for receivables, for payables, or investing in these products. I have a couple of questions but I will step questions, but I will hand the mic off, if you could circle back around to me, mayor, for some questions.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember kitchen, then councilmember Ellis.

>> Kitchen: I, too, as councilmember Kelly said, appreciate the amendment. I think it improves what we're trying to do here. And I'm not here today to debate the yes or no of use of cryptocurrency. That's not before us today, I don't think. I agree that there are lots and lots of considerations and lots of cautions that have to be considered. And so my support for this does not signal whether I'm in favor or against the use of

[4:59:38 PM]

cryptocurrency. What it signals is the importance of having a full-on discussion as a council and an analysis by our staff. So, I'd prefer not to use the time to debate whether it's a good thing or a bad thing, and just recognize that I think it's really important and I appreciate councilmember Kelly taking the amendments, because I think those amendments point out the range of things we need to look at and really highlight the cautions and the concerns that are out there to make sure that we fully analyze that with regard to anything that might come back to us. And so I just wanted to caution us to stay focused on the fact that this is a process for analysis, not for action.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Ellis.

>> Ellis: Thank you, mayor. With the understanding that this is a fact-finding mission, I'm supportive of us having the information come back to us as a

[5:00:39 PM]

council. My belief is that our biggest responsibility is proper stewardship of the public dollar. And so I am apprehensive to do anything that would jeopardize our bond rating and limit our ability to be able to purchase land and buildings, and improve roads and things of that nature. That's a basic, core function of the city process and the things that we need to be providing to our community. So I am very curious to see what information comes back to us, but I don't know that there's a threshold that would convince me later on down the road that we should be transferring public dollars into what is a volatile and unregulated market at this point.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Renteria.

>> Renteria: I'm also very skeptical. I don't trust Bitcoin. I do have staff members that have invested in it. Not to say that they made any

[5:01:40 PM]

money off of it. Some have not and the other ones have, so. But I'm very interested to find out more information, especially about the blockchain part of it, if we can actually get a ledger out there and really help out our homeless population, being able to get their personal information that's in there in case they end up losing all their possessions. So, I'm going to go ahead and support this, but I just want to let people know that I will not support the Bitcoin part of it if it comes back, unless they have a very strong argument that it's going to be a big plus for the city with no liability and no loss.

>> Mayor Adler: I guess for me, similar to what councilmember kitchen said, I'm encouraged, councilmember Kelly,

[5:02:41 PM]

by the way that you have framed this, which is a fact-finding mission. Quite frankly, you know, and you can tell to a degree just by looking at the debate that's happening, there's a lot that we all don't know. And there's a lot that we all assume. And many people in the community are using words interchangeably that are very different from one another. But this is in so many places discussed at this point that us understanding it is a really important thing. There's a huge difference, maybe, between investing public funds in cryptocurrency and receiving a cryptocurrency donation that might come from a third party, which we're not able to do at this point. Would we want to be able to do that and then convert it into dollars? I don't know the answer to that. There are implications and issues associated with that.

[5:03:41 PM]

The exciting thing that you begin to see in cryptocurrency is that it's developing. So putting aside for a second the pure speculation, and quite frankly I was approached a lot as other mayors were around the country to do a city coin. And I was not as keen on participating at this point on the speculative nature of this vertical technology as I am excited at the prospect of looking at what the applications might be that could be developed on top of the protocols. That's a really exciting proposition. And if, in fact, that can happen, then we may very well have tokens, or coins that have intrinsic value that is not

[5:04:42 PM]

dependent on speculation because there's use cases. You know, we're not there yet in an established way, but this is something that's being developed. And the more we understand it, the better we understand what the potential might be, that can't be anything but a positive for a city. So I appreciate that your resolution doesn't tell us to do anything. It doesn't endorse anything, other than we should

become as knowledgeable as we can on this. And I appreciate that tenor. Thank you. Councilmember tovo and then the mayor pro tem.

>> Tovo: Thanks. I do need to make an amendment to put back the bullet that was -- I think what happened -- well, it doesn't matter, but it was being moved from one section to another and inadvertently the public piece got struck. So, I would like to make an amendment that after line 36 and

[5:05:43 PM]

again, this is just in the whereas, it simply is expressing that these are things that should be considered and that would say the creation of a public bank wholly owned by the city.

>> Mayor Adler: Been a motion to amend this motion. To amend the resolution. Is there a second? Motion to amend. Councilmember pool seconds that. Councilmember tovo, because it's in the whereas clause it doesn't direct anything, it suggests we should be looking at this. Will you be bringing an ifc or something else so that we can make sure that that kind of analysis happens?

>> Tovo: Mayor, I think that we probably don't need to because it's also included as a -- it's included in your lineup in the be it further resolveds, so it's already in your resolution as something we're asking them to look at, either in my amendments or yours, or both.

[5:06:43 PM]

It ended up in that one, too.

>> Mayor Adler: Sounds good.

>> Mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> As we discuss it, I don't think it's within the posting, which is about Bitcoin and cryptocurrencies and it does not include a public bank. So the other two things, digital wallet-based payments and local complementary currency would come in cryptocurrency, but I'm not sure I'm the only one who would think this, but the point of cryptocurrency is that it doesn't involve banking.

>> And I would say that was the reason I couldn't support it with the rest of what you were saying, because legal said it was outside of the posting. So while I do believe that it's a good idea if you want to bring that forward separately, I would prefer not to include it in this resolution.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Yeah, I completely understand your perspective and respect it. I guess I'm still going to put forward my amendment. And I appreciate always our

[5:07:46 PM]

legal counsel, even when I'm proposing something they don't agree with. We meander a lot in whereases and I'm comfortable doing so on this one.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Kelly.

>> Kelly: Can I just ask, because I'm really new to this, if we did put something into a resolution that was outside of the posting language, what sort of consequences we could face, or if there is any pushback from anything? Does that make sense, how I'm asking that? Thank you.

>> That's a good question, councilmember. The reason that we have the posting language and the agenda is to comply with the Texas open meetings act, which is to allow the public to know what the councilmembers are going to be talking about. That's the point of it. We want to make sure the public is familiar and aware before you have a meeting up here and talk about things so the public will know to come and comment and raise things. And that's the reason we are careful about the posting language and try and make sure you comply with it so we don't get challenges that come

[5:08:47 PM]

forward.

>> Kelly: I certainly want to avoid any challenges we may have, so, thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: I know a couple of us did talk about public banking on Tuesday, so the concept was out there. But it isn't in the caption. And I would be happy to work with my colleagues to bring that as an ifc if that would ease our way going forward here, and then we can decide on this item and go to the blockchain and then finish up our meeting today.

>> Mayor Adler: My hope would be that the inclusion -- and I included it after you raised that issue and the amendments that I saw to put it in the next one -- gives us an actionable item that would have us able to take a look at that and maybe we'd rely on it there. We can avoid the controversy here.

>> Tovo: Mayor, it's not directing any action. Whereases don't direct action.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

[5:09:51 PM]

It's been moved and seconded.councilmember kitchen.

>> Kitchen: I'm confused. So, councilmember tovo, it is in 57 also, right?

>> Tovo: It is.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So, in 57 is where we're talking about we could really use it to take action. Not certain we have to have it in 55. It might be best if we just move forward? That would be my suggestion. I want to support it. I want to support it in a way that everybody understands we can act on it. And I understand we can act on it in 57. I don't think it's necessary to 55.

>> Mayor Adler: We could take a vote. Do you want to take a vote? Let's take a vote. Those in favor of including the amendment, please raise your hand. Councilmembers alter, Renteria,

[5:10:52 PM]

Fuentes, tovo. Those opposed? Four others. Councilmember pool abstains.

>> I'm also abstaining, I'm just confused about this.

>> Harper-madison: Hey, Moir, mayor,my hand was raised. I wanted to get some clarity from legal before I cast a vote one way or the other.

>> Mayor Adler: Go ahead, ask your question.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you. I appreciate it. I wondered, as I was listening to my colleagues have the discussion, I wondered if it's possible for us to -- (coughing) -- Excuse me -- for us to divide the question.

>> Mayor Adler: This question is pretty -- it is not dividable. This amendment only goes to adding that phrase "The creation of a public bank wholly owned by the city." To include that or not.

>> Harper-madison: In which case, I would rather abstain on the amendment, but speak to the -- ask that question of legal for the original item, the

[5:11:53 PM]

original motion.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. We'll get to that. On the amendment you abstain. I count four people in favor, four people against, and three abstentions. The amendment does not pass. So, let's continue on. We have the main motion in front of us. Any further discussion? Mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: Thank you. I appreciate this -- the spirit with which this and resolution 57 were brought forward. I appreciate the staff giving us a sense of the impact this would have on their workload. I'm really uncomfortable with the notion of us accepting payments in crypto anytime soon. I'd be happy to

take a donation. And I'm pretty sure if somebody offered a sizable donation in crypto to the city we'd figure out a way to accept it without this direction. And rather than try to split it,

[5:12:54 PM]

I'm just going to abstain on 55 because I want to give my colleagues -- I don't want to vote against you getting more information, but I don't really feel comfortable with the need to get more information. But I do respect your desire to do so. And depending on where the amendments go on 57 I will be supporting 57 because I think that's really about the web 3 applications. And I think the combination of the technology companies and the city, who has knowledge of the challenges we have could present interesting applications outside of the cryptocurrency realm for the technology. I'm going to be abstaining on this one.

>> Mayor Adler: Are we ready to vote on item 57? Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: For the -- essentially the same reasons the mayor pro tem has voiced, I plan to abstain on item 55.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember Kelly.

[5:13:56 PM]

>> Kelly: If councilmember tovo would like to speak first, then I would like to let her do that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Thank you. Likewise, I am also going to abstain but I want to say how much I appreciate the spirit in which you brought this forward and that you not only addressed some of the objections in the original resolution that you brought forward, but you were also open and accepting of the amendments that all of us made. I'm just, again, for many of the same reasons as some others, I'm not able to support this.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Are we ready to take a vote?

>> Kelly: Can I -- closing?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Kelly: Thank you. Mayor, thank you. Councilmember kitchen, councilmember Fuentes, thank you for helping cosponsor this item. I really appreciated your thoughtfulness when we were crafting it and your feedback. I also appreciate that councilmember pool and councilmember tovo, while you are abstaining, you did contribute something very significant to the resolution and I do appreciate that. Like many of you, I'm also skeptical. I believe councilmember Renteria and also councilmember pool expressed that.

[5:14:56 PM]

But this is just a study. I believe it will provide more information to the community so when this question comes back to us, we can point to a document that tells them whether or not we can accomplish these things. I want to thank councilmember Ellis and councilmember vela for the support as well. And I can appreciate your abstention as well, mayor pro tem.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Harper-madison.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember harper-madison.

>> Harper-madison: Back to my original question about hoping to hear from legal about the ability to divide the question, it's between the to be it resolveds. Is that a possibility?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, we could divide this motion if you wanted to divide it.

>> Harper-madison: That's the question I'm asking. And I'd like very much if we had the opportunity for legal to weigh in on what the implications of doing so are.

>> Mayor Adler: What do you want to divide, councilmember harper-madison?

>> Harper-madison: The two be it resolveds. Numbers 1-4 and the second be it

[5:15:57 PM]

resolved that city manager shall include in the fact-finding study an analysis of what would be required for the city to accept a donation. I'd like to divide those two items.

>> Mayor Adler: We can do that. We're going to take a vote on each of the two clauses separately.

>> Harper-madison: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: We do that as a matter of course when someone wants to divide a question. Any discussion before we vote on the first be it resolved clause? Those in favor of the first be it resolved clause, please raise your hand. I count kitchen, Fuentes, Ellis, Renteria, vela, Kelly, and me. Those opposed to the first be it resolved clause, please raise your hand. And I didn't see if you raised your hand, councilmember harper-madison.

>> Harper-madison: I did. Thank you, chair.

>> Mayor Adler: That gives us eight. Those opposed? Those abstaining? The three, mayor pro tem, pool, and tovo. 8-0-3, the first resolved clause

[5:16:59 PM]

passes. Let's take a vote on the second be it resolved clause. Those in favor of the second be it resolved clause, please raise your hand. Kitchen, Fuentes, Ellis, Renteria, vela, Kelly, and me. That's 7. Those opposed to the second be it resolved clause? Those abstaining on the second be it resolved clause? Mayor pro tem, pool. I didn't see how councilmember tovo or harper-madison were voting on that question.

>> Harper-madison: I was in the affirmative.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So, 8-0-3, the second be it resolved clause passes as well. So the resolution passes. Okay.

[5:17:59 PM]

That gets us up, then, to item 57. Colleagues, I would move passage of item number 57, inclusive of councilmember pool's amendment. Is there a second to that? Councilmember Ellis seconds that. I took councilmember pool's amendment to this resolution which was really focused not on web 3, more broadly, more generally. Web 3 is blockchain. It's kind of like a three dimensional spreadsheet in and of itself. That's all it is. It doesn't use energy. It's a technology. Now, there are some applications that you can then apply to that that use energy, but not all of them do.

[5:19:05 PM]

It's kind of like having a cell phone that has the technology to be a phone, but we don't have many apps for that phone. And this is a resolution that says our city ought to be about trying to help develop, in our city, not the city necessarily, but in our city developing the technologies in hopes that things can be developed that can improve people's -- the quality of people's lives. Again, that's all this motion is. It's been moved and seconded. Discussion? Yes, mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: I would like to move my two amendments to this item. I posted them on the message board and subsequent posts. The first amendment is insert the following after line 39. Be it further resolved the city manager is directed to ensure that the implementation of this resolution does not preclude nor de-prioritize investments in basic digital services and technology needs that support the city's core functions.

[5:20:06 PM]

The second amendment is insert the following line after line 7. And this is something that my commissioner on the science and telecommunications commission recommended. Whereas web 3 is being developed around the world as a successor to web 2 with the goal of providing greater capabilities and reliability through reduction of single points of failure and.

>> Mayor Adler: And I had meant to make those part of my motion as well. I support these. Does anybody have an objection to these two amendments being added? Hearing none, those two amendments are added. Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: Mayor, I had also distributed some amendments and actually spoke to most of them on Tuesday as well. And I can tell you the lines.

[5:21:07 PM]

15-21 have additional whereases, I struck the whereas three 2-3, and apologies, 32-34 was not read. 60-62 there's additional language. Oh, goodness. And then there is an additional be it further resolved, 87-91.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Can I ask you a couple questions about that?

>> Tovo: Sure.

>> Mayor Adler: And I appreciated the opportunity to be able to speak to everybody while I was out of town on this on Tuesday. It was hard. I was having trouble hearing as it was coming in, but I

[5:22:09 PM]

appreciate that. I had tried to incorporate the amendments that you have in the version that was before us now, the version three. In the first two whereases you speak to the centralized autonomous organizations, Dow Dao organizations as we've had some people speak here today. I agree that Dao should be part of the efforts to develop new innovations, but the way that I handled that was on page 29 to add dos in the description of the organizations that would be involved. Only because I don't know that we should be prioritizing or favors daos over nonprofits like DIV, inc. Which is trying really hard. It's another organization trying to promote this area. But they're really focused on

[5:23:13 PM]

diversity and inclusion and equity, or any other type of organization like capital factory that could lead to innovation. So I'd really like the resolution to remain neutral to the type of technology organizations we support. So, in trying to hit your intent and your desire, I added it to the whereas here in Austin

capital factory, stacks, DIV, inc., women of color, de-centralized autonomous organizations and many others are working to expand development of innovation. So my hope was is that by calling them out we would achieve what your purpose was.

>> Tovo: That's fine. Am assume the next whereas -- I'm looking at the next whereas. Did you have a concern about the next whereas, the city of Austin seeks to foster a supporting ecosystem for dos and other technology firms? That seems to be neutral as well. It's not ex-inclusive to any --

-- exclusive -->> Mayor Adler: Supporting

[5:24:20 PM]

organizations like capital factory, organizations like stacks, like DIV, inc. My hope was by adding it to that whereas clause, because that talks about ecosystems and cultures that lead to new applications of blockchain technologies, the intent was to include both those but not to call them out, but to recognize we want to do that for a variety of organizations.

>> Tovo: I don't see them as mutually exclusive. So the whereas from 19-21 I think adds to it because it emphasizes that we want to specifically support in addition to the ones that you've just identified in 28-31 we also really want to make sure that we're creating a supportive ecosystem for those that prioritize and use cooperative, democratic management practices. I don't see that as in conflict with your whereas.

>> Mayor Adler: Only in conflict in that it prioritizes one set of organizations and

[5:25:21 PM]

their values over the other sets of organizations and their values. I don't have a special whereas clause for DIV, inc. Which is trying to ensure that in this new technology that's developing we don't have a technology that's mostly, you know, white males, that at the very grassroots of the development of this technology it promotes diversity and inclusion. That was my only thing.

>> Tovo: We may have a disagreement. I don't see those as in conflict at all. I will withdraw 15-18 because you've incorporated it into 28-31. But I would like to move approval of the whereas from 19-21 because I think it is additive. I don't see it as supplanting your earlier point.

>> Mayor Adler: We'll take a vote on that. There's a whereas you've taken out where it says cities such as

[5:26:21 PM]

Miami and New York have begun to partner with cryptocurrencies in the effort to generate revenue as well as promote financial investment in their cities. That's a whereas clause. It's a factual matter. It's just true. But I'm not going to object to you striking that just because it comes with baggage and it's not necessary for passage.

>> Tovo: I removed it, I think it was the same whereas that was in councilmember Kelly's and I removed it because in our conversation -- I suggested removing it. In our conversation on Tuesday you said yours was not intending to focus on cryptocurrencies and that whereas did. That was my thought. We could also keep it in, but with the language I suggested in councilmember Kelly's.

>> He just agreed to leave it out.

>> Mayor Adler: I just agreed to take it out.

>> Tovo: I understand, I'm just explaining my rationale.

>> Mayor Adler: We'll take it out so people don't have to deal with the baggage associated with that. It speaks on cryptocurrencies. On the next one, whereas

[5:27:22 PM]

blockchain technologies have known power consumption challenges that should be researched to determine environmental impact, I don't agree with that because there's nothing in the blockchain technology that leads to environmental challenges. In cryptocurrency when they're trying to establish the security associated with that and they've set up the system to be able to solve for the mining of coins, there's a considerable energy impact. There are also arguments to say that that's an important thing to do if it's renewable energies because it gives a shedable load, which is part of the investigation ultimately that staff needs to do. I've heard both those arguments. I haven't heard anybody I trust that or that feels impartial weigh those two factors. I hope that's part of the analysis of councilmember Kelly's resolution. And I think that it's covered there. So I can't agree to this whereas

[5:28:25 PM]

because I think it's not correct.

>> Tovo: My staff had a conversation with someone and we've asked him to address this and discuss the relationship between blockchain and cryptocurrency -- excuse me, blockchain and cryptocurrency, and the power consumption challenges and potential environmental impact. And based on what I've read and learned, and I'm legions away from being an expert, it seems appropriate to investigate the environmental impacts. But I'll ask him at the appropriate time to address that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. It seems to me if this is more tied to crypto, then it belongs in the others. I'm ready to start learning today. Whereas the city of Austin seeks to explore public bank, public platforms,

supported by web 3 technologies. Now therefore -- I'm okay with that whereas clause. Does anybody object to that whereas clause being included? Hearing none, that is.

[5:29:26 PM]

So I think the votes we have to take is the whereas clause on the second whereas clause concerning dos. That one gets called out. Any discussion on that one?

>> Tovo: Mayor, we have some more. We have a little bit of divergence on the be it further resolved.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So in the be it resolved question, you were saying strike the support and study and then the conversation we had on Tuesday I was talking about how in many instances there's nothing to study yet because we're talking about technologies that haven't been developed. And the purpose -- main purpose of this resolution was to support the development of technologies. Once those technologies get developed, then we can decide which ones we want to use or not use. And I would imagine there would be a lot of study of that. But the first part of it is just

[5:30:28 PM]

to develop the applications on top of the technologies and on top of the protocols. In the conversation that we had, as best as I could hear it, you were asking for maybe there was another word other than study that might work. I think you said at one point. So I went back to look at it to see if it could incorporate both the language that you had wanted. And I was looking at version three. Let me see if I can find it here. So, it was to support the creation and development of blockchain technologies and financial innovations, and study

[5:31:28 PM]

which innovations could benefit austinites and city government. So my goal in putting in that language was to include both the support for the development of new technologies, which is what I had, as well as yours studying which innovations could benefit the Austin city government. And I thought that got us both what we wanted.

>> Tovo: What is concerning to me is what we mean by supporting the creation and development of those technologies. Because taken literally you're directing the manager to support the creation and development of technologies that could, without limitation, include things like smart contracts, document notarization, cryptocurrencies. You know, I'm just not ready to say manager, go forward and support support the development and creation of all those things. See what I'm saying? I think maybe you don't mean it as literally as it sounds here on the paper, but I think my

[5:32:33 PM]

perspective is perhaps overly shaped by the conversation we're having about the municipal building and the literalness with which people have taken that direction. So, I just do think it's important that we not be telling the manager at this stage to support the development and creation of that laundry list of things, because we're not really quite there yet. So -- could you say something like foster an environment that is supportive or something? We want to foster an environment that is supportive of the development and creation of these technologies, but I'm not ready to tell the manager that he should be supporting the creation and development of those things. Does that mean our staff are going to be developing and creating it, or is it more like the manager is going to support the development and creation of those things out in the community? To me, that's a big difference.

[5:33:34 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: It's potentially all of that. There's no budget amendment that comes with this. But that goes to the very thrust of the resolution, which is to say that we want our community to be involved in developing these technologies and we want to be involved in that. Foster the creation of -- I don't know what that looks like. If the staff or if our innovation office wanted to do a hackathon to test technology, and they did that, or if they wanted to do a hackathon together with the program that's here in the summer with 10 or 15 thousand people, I'd want them to be able to participate in that. And as we give them the

[5:34:36 PM]

authority to do that. To me, that goes beyond just fostering an environment of support.

>> Tovo: You've addressed that in the next paragraph, you've said the manager is directed to consider supporting, participating in or organizing the facilitating of the creation and development of blockchain through hackathons, accelerators, incubators. That to me gives the manager the discretion to -- I'm not sure what facilitating of the creation means here. But I'm comfortable with saying the manager could consider supporting, participating, or organizing those kinds of activities. It seems to me a more directive step in the previous resolved to tell him to support the creation and development of technologies that might include cryptocurrency.

>> Mayor Adler: I hear that and to a degree those clauses both have it. I appreciate your support for the one that says direct to consider supporting, participating, and organizing. I think that covers that. This one tried to list the kinds

[5:35:37 PM]

of things because a lot of people don't know the kinds of things that might be involved in future development.

>> Tovo: Could we merge them? What about merging them? What about having your language, the manager is directed to consider supporting, participating, etc. With applications that could include without limitation those, and having your bullet points at that next whereas?

>> Mayor Adler: We would add then to the second be it resolved clause, the fourth one, with applications developed? I don't want to lose the financial innovations component, because that picked up your banks and platforms and the

[5:36:38 PM]

like. And I just don't see a substantive change, honestly, between those.

>> Tovo: I really do. But what about having -- I could -- I would -- one suggestion would be to have your hackathon paragraph and then say these blockchain technologies and financial innovations could include without limitation those related to, and then your bullet points.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Tovo: I think that accomplishes it without directing him to develop and create them.

>> Mayor Adler: These blockchain . . .

>> Tovo: Technologies and financial -- and then just picks up the rest of your sentence, could include -- or --

>> Mayor Adler: These

[5:37:38 PM]

blockchain technologies --

>> Tovo: And financial innovations --

>> Mayor Adler: And financial innovations --

>> Tovo: That benefit austinities -- I think your language about that benefits austinities and city government.

>> Mayor Adler: That benefit austinities and city government -- government --

>> Tovo: Could include without limitation those related to, bullet points.

>> Mayor Adler: Could include without limitation, and then the list. Okay. I'll accept that. For the life of me I can't tell the difference.

>> Tovo: Okay. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: So, the third be it resolved clause is going to come out. The next be it resolved clause, supporting, participating, organizing, the creation of blockchain technologies through activities such as without limitation hackathons, accelerators, incubations, contest challenges and prizes, blockchain technologies and financial innovations -- that

[5:38:45 PM]

could benefit austinnites and city government could include without limitation those related to, and then it has all of the bullet points that were up above in the prior be it resolved clause. Mayor pro tem.

>> Alter: I need to go outside in a second, but if you could just repeat the first part of it before -- just the combined sentence, not --

>> Mayor Adler: The city manager is directed to consider supporting, participating in or organizing, facilitating of the creation of blockchain technologies through activities such as without limitation hackathons, accelerators, incubators, and prizes. These blockchain technologies and financial innovations that benefit austinities and the city

[5:39:46 PM]

government could benefit -- which innovations could benefit austinities and city government could include without limitation, the bullet points.

>> Alter: Thank you. Now that you say it, I do see the difference.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any objection to that change being made? Hearing none, that change is made.

>> You're taking out lines 87-89 on page 4 of councilmember tovo's -- is that what you're taking out?

>> Mayor Adler: I was back to version three. So I'm looking at version three here, which is mine.

>> And removing --

>> Mayor Adler: From 46 to 73 --

>> You're removing that.

>> Mayor Adler: Comes out. And what gets put back in is some of that language.

[5:40:50 PM]

Most of that language gets put back in, but it's being put back in --

>> I've got that, I'm sorry. So on councilmember tovo's amendment lines 87-91 have you not gotten to that yet, or are you . . . ?

>> No.

>> Mayor Adler: We haven't gotten to that yet.

>> I'm going to have to go out there for a little bit. I'll be back shortly. So either we can reconsider or you can wait for me to vote.

>> Mayor Adler: Do you want us to stop this discussion now, or do you want us to get up to a vote and then wait until you come back?

>> Alter: That's fine. If you want to get up to a vote and wait, or you can vote and reconsider it so I can be seen voting. That's fine.

>> Mayor Adler: We can wait.

>> Alter: There's not a huge number of folks there, so I think it will be shorter.

>> Mayor Adler: We'll wait to vote until you come back. We'll see if we can get it to that place.

[5:41:50 PM]

All right. So the next one is blockchain technologies have known power consumption challenges. And you wanted to have staff speak to that.

>> Tovo: Mayor, we have 87-91 still to resolve. I don't know if you're accepting that as friendly.

>> Mayor Adler: I don't want to accept that. Again, it's prioritizing dos and I think they're great but I wouldn't prioritize daos over DIV, inc. DIV, inc. Is a higher priority for me than Dao, but they're both high priorities, as is capital factory's priorities. So no, I think that unfairly puts a thumb on the scale and I'm trying to be more neutral than that. So that one will require a vote

[5:42:52 PM]

as well. Okay. So the first vote we have is the whereas clause at 19-21. And again, I think we've included dos at this point and shouldn't be prioritizing one form over other forms. And I'd appreciate if it stayed

more neutral. Councilmember tovo moves the amendment on 19-21. Let's take a vote. Those in favor of the amendment, please raise your hand. Pool and tovo. Those opposed, please raise your hand. I said we were going to keep going through this and try to get to a place where we have a vote. We're not going to take a final vote on this until Alison comes back. That amendment does not pass. The next one is -- I accepted

[5:43:55 PM]

your strikeout on cryptocurrencies. That gets us to 42-43, the amendment. I think you had staff here to speak to that.

>> Tovo: Yes. I'd like to invite Mr. Calana from the office of innovation to talk about whether blockchain relies on energy consumption. I'm going to ask you to explain.

>> Thank you, councilmember. If I'm understanding the question, and the line of discussion here, all applications built on blockchain do write their transactions to the chain. All those transactions have to go through the consensus mechanism which does involve energy usage, in the case of many chains, especially those built on proof of work

[5:44:55 PM]

mechanisms like Bitcoin. They do involve significant levels of energy consumption. So any application that does rely on blockchain is associated with, at this point, pretty high levels of energy consumption. There are some innovations in this area that are working to bring that down.

>> Mayor Adler: I'll accept that. In this conversation, is there a difference between that energy consumption and the energy consumption required to do the mining of coins?

>> They're the same. The mining of coins happens when the consensus algorithm completes its cycle on the block. So they're intertwined.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So I'll accept that whereas clause. And then I accepted the next whereas clause. It's the question now of study and support.

[5:45:58 PM]

You want -- that was the section we took out. Okay. And then it's the be it resolved clause where you're wanting to prioritize dos again, the cooperative and democratic management practices. Do you need a vote on that? This is yours at 87-91.

>> Tovo: I'm taking a look at it to see if there's language that might modify it so that you can accept it. How about will give strong consideration or strong attention, solid attention to? We are a public entity at the end of the day, and so I would like them to really provide strong consideration at least for technologies that are under the city's control or at least under the control of organizations that have cooperative or democratic management. So, stepping away from

[5:47:02 PM]

prioritization and saying something along the lines of the city manager will give strong consideration to blockchain technologies for public use, etc. And I don't think we're at that stage anyway in terms of approval and implementation, so just the city manager will give strong consideration to blockchain technologies for public use that are either, etc., etc.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. I appreciate that change. It makes it better for me, but still I would keep it neutral to things like diversity and inclusion. I mean, there are different organizations that are prioritizing different values. And I'm uncomfortable picking

[5:48:04 PM]

one. They're all laudable for me, and that's why we called out organizations with different kinds of value bases in the organizations that we listed, including dos, at 35 and 36 of your motion. Which was from mine. Councilmember tovo moves to add the city manager will give strong consideration to blockchain technologies for public use that are under the city's control or under the control of organizations operated by democratic or cooperative management practices, which are the dos. Okay. Practices, period. Let's take a vote. Those in favor of the amendment, please raise your hand. Pool and tovo. Those opposed, please raise your hand. Balance of the dais,

[5:49:07 PM]

councilmember harper-madison off the dais and councilmember Renteria off the dais, and councilmember alter off the dais, it does not pass. All right. We're now going to hold this for the mayor pro tem to come back before we vote. Yes, councilmember pool.

>> Pool: Would it be a good time now while we're holding for me to make some comments about the item, just generally in advance of my vote?

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember alter -- pool's amendment was part of the base motion, it was adopted. Sure. Or we could go to the zoning cases.

>> Pool: Oh, zoning. Sure let's shift. Let's go to a different topic.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. Let's go to the zoning cases, see if we can take care of those.

>> Mayor, I think 92 may be in her district, so that may factor into the order we take them in.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's start with 69/70.

[5:50:07 PM]

Thank you. Jerry. Thank you for hanging with us as long as you have.

>> Good evening, council, Jerry rusthoven, planning department. As a heads-up before I get started, both of the cases we have remaining have valid petitions. And so just to let you know. I wanted to make you aware we may need the full council. Item number 69 is the neighborhood plan amendment. Case number 0026.01. The related zoning case, 0100, known as the Grady and brownie mixed use cases, property located at 10615 brownie drive, as well as 1610, 12, 14, middle fiskville road. The applicant is requesting to

[5:51:08 PM]

change the zoning on tract one from sf3 to mf2mp and on tract two, from lrmf to csmp. The staff's recommendation was to approve the track one zoning but on track two to not approve the requested cs zoning and instead add the mu to the existing lr zoning category that is on tract two. The planning commission agreed with the staff recommendation and approved lrmu on track two. This case did go to first reading at the city council. And the city council approved. That was on November 4th. And the city council approved the mf2 zoning which no one seems to disagree about, staff didn't on track one. The council did approve the mp on track two. There is neighborhood opposition

[5:52:09 PM]

to this case, as I stated. There is a valid petition against anything other than the existing zoning, which is sf3 on track one and lr on track two. In addition, one more before I take questions, things have changed since the initial request. The petition is at 29%. The applicant has presented a list of prohibited uses that are included in exhibit G of the staff report. Today I was informed that they would like to make an amendment to those uses. They would remove pedi cab storage and dispatch, bed and breakfast and service station as prohibited uses. And I believe that they would add back in bed and breakfast group two and the assorted daycare services. With that, I'm available for any questions. Again, to approve this zoning case it would take 9 out of 11 councilmembers to approve it.

[5:53:09 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: I'm going to recommend that we not take a vote until Alison comes back on both of these items, but we can discuss it. Councilmember tovo.

>> Tovo: I had a question for Mr. Rusthoven. I couldn't follow the ins and outs of which is in and out.

>> I believe that -- I think they had -- today it's on the list of prohibited uses, the newest list they gave us and I don't believe it was on the list in exhibit G of your backup.

>> Tovo: So --

>> Prohibited uses, daycare limited, general, commercial.

>> Tovo: That was a request of our --

>> Of the applicant. The applicant is offering that.

>> Tovo: Can somebody help me understand? I don't know that we have any neighbors on the line, but can somebody help me understand what the concern was about having daycare?

>> Victoria with railroad design. Those childcare uses, I think that was a mistake that those

[5:54:11 PM]

were put into the prohibited list. I don't believe -- when I was looking over and verifying the list right before the hearing, I don't believe those were intended. I know that the land owners don't have any concerns for childcare uses. So it's fine to remove those from the prohibited list so that they are allowed. Same for pedi cab storage and dispatch. I think that was a mistake.

>> Tovo: So I think what is confusing is sort of the opposite effect here. So they were on the prohibited list, they're being removed from the prohibited list, so they would be permitted uses in this category. Let me just say I want to make sure -- we have so many obstacles against our childcare industry in the city. I don't want to have them on a prohibited list of uses without some thoughtful deliberation on

[5:55:13 PM]

it.

>> To be clear, if you look at exhibit -- I believe it's G in the backup -- you'll see that the salmon-colored column was the neighborhood's input on those particular uses and they said that they did not want to allow them. They said they did not want to allow childcare uses in this development. And the landowner

doesn't have a desire one way or the other. So it's fine to keep them. If the neighborhood wants them prohibited and that's the will of the council, that's fine as well.

>> Tovo: Let me just say I know we're all adjusting to the new format. It's really challenging to have all of the commentary early on and then when we're discussing it we don't have those community members here anymore.

[5:56:13 PM]

So I don't know how we adjust that exactly, but I would -- this is kind of the moment where I would love to invite up one of the neighbors to explain why childcare uses are not something they want to encourage there, because I would think that would be of real value, not just to those who might come and live in the housing that would result from this zoning change, but also I was up at the site yesterday and have been up there in the past as well. There are lots and lots of families in this area on this street.

>> Councilmember, those uses were not prohibited in first reading. Those were added, like tori said, at the request of the neighborhood. Neither the staff nor the applicant honestly is advocating for prohibiting those uses.

>> Tovo: Okay. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. So, the applicant gets five minutes to start off the

[5:57:18 PM]

discussion.

>> Again, Victoria Hasse, on behalf of the landowners of the subject tracts. You can see those tracts in the image before you, outlined in blue and black. They are about a half mile from both the breaker plan as well as Lamar boulevard, both of which are imagine Austin activity corridors. And the site is a little more than a mile away from the Lamar and rundberg neighborhood center. So, yes, we are asking for a future land use amendment on the entirety of both tract one and two to mixed use. And we are asking for a zoning change. We had asked for a zoning change

[5:58:20 PM]

to mf4 for tract one and csmu for tract two. Although I will say as time as progressed and we've gone through neighborhood meetings and commission meetings, there has been a compromise for mf2 on tract one, so long as we can achieve csmu with an added C.O. For tract the subject land area comprises nearly all of block D of the north subdivision section. Blocks G and D are highlighted in red in the plat in

front of you. They're restricted for commercial-only development. This is the 1967 deed restriction that states that for blocks D and G. And it is the reason why the four lots have never developed with single family.

[5:59:21 PM]

Single family is illegal use for the lots because of the deed restriction and could never get funding for development as such. If single family were legal and developed, the sale of those homes would have a direct impact on the houses in the area through comparables. For tract two land is vacant but has development rights that allow for various uses, some of which could generate larger amounts of traffic. Further, it's also important to note that the deed restriction dictates that residential lots can only have one detached dwelling unit by right. Therefore, this 1.8 acres of land can -- may be the only land left in this subdivision to accommodate additional density and residential units. Mf 4 and csmu have allowances

[6:00:21 PM]

lending to maximum of 70 units across the development area. While 70 units on I-35 or any corridor in the city is moderate development considering that most apartment-style developments in Austin right now are at least 100 units or more -- with staff recommendation of mf 2 or tract one and potential for dwelling units is decreased by half which unfortunately also results in a reduction in community benefits. While we know the site can achieve a compatible development for the area the landowner is agreeable to staff recommendation for mf 2 on tract one, so long as we can achieve csmu for tract two which will likely yield 32 units give or take across the entire site. So while you heard earlier approval will take away the last bit of green space, that statement is made on the false

[6:01:22 PM]

assumption that the land doesn't have entitlements for development today. The neighborhood also has concerns for increased traffic with development that is proposed, however when you compare trip generations with the following uses under Ir for the three parcels on middle fiscal road, those produce development that will produce far more traffic. To be clear our client does not want to develop the site with the uses above but without successful zoning of cs -- those uses become an unlikely scenario. This highlights properties nearby that have cs or industrial zoning today. Therefore, the cs base district zoning we're requesting on tract two is consistent with similarly situated properties in the area.

[6:02:23 PM]

The proposed c-o guides to uses within the proposed development as well as nearby. This is a visual. This is my last slide. This is a visual showing how the site is impacted by compatibility. The triggering is outlined in yellow. It will limit to at most 50 to 55 feet on the eastern portion of the site. I remain available if you have any questions. Thank you for your time.

>> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Any discussion? Guys.

>> This is third reading? We passed it already on second reading.

[6:03:28 PM]

>> Yes. It's on for third reading. Previous vote was eight to three. It would need nine votes to pass on third.

>> I see it now. Do I see second reading was approved 11/0 back in November of 2021? .

>> I have it being down 8 to 3. First reading was 8 to 3. Second reading was 11 to 0 and now we're at third reading.

>> Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

>> Uh-huh.

>> Vela: Given the deed restrictions on those sf-3 lots that are closest to the neighborhood, what could possibly -- they are -- let me start over. They are zoned sf-3. Is that correct.

>> Yes.

>> They have a deed

[6:04:29 PM]

restriction not allowing the construction of a residential -- not allowing use for residential. Is that correct.

>> That's my understanding. Given that situation, what could someone build on that property.

>> Given the existing zoning, nothing. They would either need to have the deed restriction removed, which you would have to look at the process. Sometimes that's difficult or you would have to change it to commercial category.

>> Vela: In terms of the city's obligation to zone -- again, I know the city does not enforce deed restrictions but given the existence of the deed restriction and zoning -- is there any legal situation

where the city would be in where zoning the property to an unallowed use and preventing any kind of development of the

[6:05:31 PM]

property -- I mean, is that a situation we've encountered before.

>> The city tries not to recommend staff -- there's council policy back to the '80s that directed us not to recommend or to direct the council. It's a non-binding resolution. It told the council what to do to itself. It said do not approve zoning cases which were in conflict with deed restrictions, specifically CLI when it's restricted to residential only. I have seen that document. It was from the '80s, but it said don't do zoning cases where you know you'll create conflict.

>> Vela: Are we guard to middle fist-fill road -- is

[6:06:32 PM]

that state land, public land? Who holds title to that chunk of land.

>> Council member, I don't know exactly which piece you're -- are you talking about on the road itself.

>> On the other side between?

>> I see. I would presume that would be the state's.

>> Vela: I would too. This property would be the only thing between the neighborhood and I-35.

>> Cronk: On the petition document the state is listed as a property owner. I don't know if it was that specific strip but I would assume it was.

>> Vela: Few comments -- this is empty land next to I-35. It is completely undeveloped now. There's a spot where a lot of

[6:07:33 PM]

people put campaign signs. We went out there recently to do exactly that. There was an abandoned vehicle right there. It's a tract of land where there's some dumping going on so I do have concerns of kind of leaving it as an undeveloped land would tend to promote kind of abandoned cars -- trash dumping, illegal dumping -- those kind of activities. I would note that the deed restrictions against sf-3 really put the owner in a problematic place and I would note that from the landowner's perspective -- from the neighbor's perspective also -- and again, I've handled protests with Travis county appraisal

district. You compare single family to single family, condos to condos -- the property, the worst thing that can happen to your property tax appraisals is

[6:08:34 PM]

a single family home -- a brand new, fancy home. Deed restrictions are not going to allow it. But in our discussion and debate -- some folks are like we would like to see some homes on there, but that would be the worst thing that could happen in terms of appraisals, whereas the condos -- again, my understanding of the Travis county appraisal district you could not compare the appraisals of a condo to appraisals of a single family home. Whatever the cost point of the condos, it should not affect the appraisals within the neighborhood. They would be based on similar properties within the stretch there between kind of breaker, 35, and Lamar. I don't think the kind of -- there's no displacement. Gentrification is on going. The -- I believe that recent

[6:09:34 PM]

property sales in the area are above 300,000. We're looking at some 4 hour

-- \$400,000 lots going into the area. Do we have any idea of what the price point would be.

>> So with -- in today's market a condo unit in this area would probably go for what is comparable to what would go for around \$350,000 with today's market.

>> Vela: Uh-huh. So I -- again, I understand that a lot of the homeowners there are incumbent ohm hone er -- homeowners who purchased much less than \$350,000. I don't think the price point

[6:10:35 PM]

will be that different than the price point for the single family homes. New people moving into the neighborhood will be roughly the same means as people purchasing the condos. So I -- we need more housing. This is going to provide needed housing. It will bring some community benefits with it as well. I'm supportive of the project.

>> Mayor Adler: Ready to make a vote on this item? Council member tovo?

>> Tovo: I had a couple of quick questions for the applicant. I need to clarify the list. I've been communicating with one of the residents who said they did not submit a list of prohibited uses.

>> What was included in our back-up as exhibit G -- that was a spread sheet that we had started communications about a

[6:11:37 PM]

conditional overlay with the neighborhood. They gave us our feedback and their feedback is included in that spread sheet. However, they didn't continue negotiations. Especially after filing a petition that they didn't want any change in the zoning at all. So I can't say that that is what their stance is at this point. That was the feedback that we got from them back in the fall, early fall of last year.

>> Tovo: Okay. Thank you for that clarification. I apologize. I keep closing the document. Can you tell me which of the day care uses that are in exhibit G please.

>> Yes. Let me grab that real quick. So if you're referring to exhibit G, which is a spread sheet, like a table for mat --

>> Tovo: Just the ones that would without any intervention right here right now would remain -- be on the prohibited use list. The daycare.

[6:12:38 PM]

I think it was all of the day daycare, as I?

>> I would say don't prohibit any of them. I mean, I personally agree with you that I don't know why daycare should be prohibited

>> Tovo: I was looking them up in my handy-dandy guide here. As I recall you reading it I think it was daycare, commercial general and unlimited. Yeah. Colleagues, I would like that off the list. I see some hands up and I have another question.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member Kelly and council member pool.

>> I agree with you. I would like to see day care included. There are only ten certified daycares in Austin that work outside operational hours, so I believe if someone wanted to open it up in their home we should be able to provide that

[6:13:40 PM]

flexibility. Thank you.

>> So I'm confused. You were saying daycares are prohibited on the list of prohibitions but Mr. Resthaven said they're not. Can I get clarity? I'm hearing they are and hearing they're not.

>> They weren't included in exhibit G. I was informed -- we got an e-mail asking us to include the newer list. Daycares was one of the additions. Neither the staff or the applicant feel the need to prohibit.

>> I also heard that the neighborhood did not want child care, but then I heard they were fine with child care.

>> Staff has no correspondence with the neighborhood regarding child care or the uses at all. The applicant told us they were meeting with the neighborhood

[6:14:41 PM]

and they came to agreement on some things but in the end came to no agreement.

>> I would support the list of prohibitions to remove anything related to child care because I support having child care where -- as a permitted use.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's see if there's agreement on that. Does anybody object to -- actually, is there a motion to be made on this item?

>> Vela: Motion to remove day care uses --

>> Mayor Adler: So the broader motion. Move approval of the --

>> Vela: Move to approve --

>> Mayor Adler: The compromise is worked out. I guess? How do we say this? Approval on third reading what.

>> It would be if you want to -- move to approve on third reading and have day care -- all day care uses stripped out of the prohibited uses on the list that we were --

>> Mayor Adler: Do we need to

[6:15:42 PM]

say what we're approving on third reading.

>> You're approving -- if you're approving the same thing you approved on second reading?

>> I think we have co's added to the third one.

>> Approving mf two and lrmu zoning on tract two. Does not match the applicant request. The applicant request was for cs and comp. The valid petition says we're opposed to anything other than the existing zoning.

>> Mayor Adler: So again, what's the motion?

>> Vela: I'm going to need a little help. I'm not good with the zoning designation. But the motion would be to approve on third reading mf 2 for the four lots on brownie lane tract one and csmu co for the three lots on middle fist

[6:16:45 PM]

fill road, removing day care from the list of prohibited uses.

>> Mayor Adler: Which is otherwise adopted. That's the motion. Is there a second to that motion? Council member pool seconds the motion. Ready to take a vote?

>> Tovo: So I understand that developer has executed a restrictive covenant with an affordable housing component. Could you describe what that is, please.

>> Yes. The covenant states that 10 per cent of the units will be restricted, income restricted. Five per cent will be at 80 per cent mfi. And five per cent will be 100 per cent mfi

>> Tovo: Does the restricted covenant address what would happen if it becomes rental rather than ownership.

>> I don't believe it specifically addresses that, but understanding is with the

[6:17:45 PM]

restrictive covenant being filed and the units being built, they would continue to be for sale I guess until -- that would be a question for the affordable housing entity that's involved in overseeing and making sure that those units are -- continue to be income restricted and for families that are qualified

>> Tovo: We did get this question -- I think we got this question to you hopefully yesterday. My -- you know, I think since -- I mean, I understand it's not part of the zoning. I'm just considering it as part of my deliberations on a discretionary rezoning. And, you know, often plans change and so if the plan changes from an ownership model to one of rental, it seems to me the restrictive covenant doesn't cover -- doesn't have an affordable housing

[6:18:45 PM]

component. Which would be really unformg gnat. As I weigh all the different factors and considerations that I heard from residents, the fact that the owner was willing to include affordable housing was certainly interesting and useful information to consider within the mix. I know if it's at that level -- if it were rental I would expect the level of affordability to be much lower, to be closer to 60 per cent at the

highest, not 80 and 100 per cent as the ownership units are. At this late date, I'm not sure where we go with that. I don't know if the owner is online and wants to speak to whether there would be a commitment if he or she shifts to rental to provide a level of affordability. I would be interested in knowing that information. I understand it can't be considered as a measure of zoning but it is a point of information I would like an answer to.

>> Let me get with them.

[6:19:49 PM]

>> Mayor? I appreciate council member tovo's concerns. I think, you know, that's valid. There's no restricting -- once zoning is set, it's really up to the builder to decide which way they want to go with the project. I do appreciate those concerns. I would note, however, and just kind of in our prep for this zoning case, that the neighborhood and some of the comments before planning commission were opposed to affordable housing, that they were against any affordable housing component before planning commission because of the idea that, you know, the people that would live there -- something to that effect. This was before I was on council. The first two -- planning commission, the first two hearings. I don't know where the opposition -- how the neighborhood in general would feel about that. II. I would support the addition of the affordable housing but

[6:20:49 PM]

there were some comments to that effect during the planning commission hearing.

>> Tovo: That's interesting, council member. I hadn't heard that. And the concerns I was hearing from nearby residents was one -- concerns about displacement and gentrification. So that surprises me.

>> Vela: Yeah. There was an Austin monitor that covered that hearing where I think one of the planning commissioners -- actually my planning commissioner now who I inherited from my predecessor asked about that. And there was basically, like, you know, what -- basically -- I think the question if I remember correctly is would you support it if it was 100 per cent affordable housing, and the answer was no.

>> Council member tovo, I know that there is a willingness for the landowner to maybe, if necessary, execute a new

[6:21:52 PM]

restrictive covenant with what happens in the scenario you're talking about. We have to figure out how to craft all that. I'm committing that I will stay with you and follow up to completion.

>> Tovo: Thank you. I appreciate that.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's take a vote. Council member Fuentes.

>> I want to thank council member vela for sharing that tidbit. It's hard breaking to hear anyone would be against affordable housing in their neighborhood. Thank you for sharing that.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem?

>> Alter: This has been a challenging case and I voted against it on first reading, particularly due to the requested cf zoning. However I think the uses have been significantly limited in the c-o to provide a variety of uses. This will facilitate uses in

[6:22:54 PM]

the area. When I look closely at the affordability levels I still find them underwhelming, but I know this has been a contentious case. It seems to have been discussed extensively over the last several months and I know council member vela is on the dais and the elected part of that community, so I'll support your motion today, council member vela, but I would urge the community to understand for a case in the future I'll need to see a much more compelling case made for the affordability levels in order to earn my support. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Those in favor, please raise your hand. Those opposed? Seeing it as being unanimous on the dais. Thank you. Thank you. Going back to item 57, council member tovo, there was a different resolution you wanted

[6:23:55 PM]

to propose?

>> Tovo: Yes. I think my fix -- my intended fix to lions 46 created a different issue. I would propose we return to the mayor's language and strike 55, line 55, which is crypto currencies with the assumption and understand thatting the manager is -- that the manager is not going to suddenly be out there directing his staff to create and develop all the things in the bullet points.

>> Mayor Adler: I think that's right and I'm fine with that.

>> Tovo: That would remain -- the result wouldn't have the additions because we no longer need them.

>> Mayor Adler: The third resolve clause would be as it appears on b-3 but crypto currencies will come out. The fourth be it clause will

[6:24:55 PM]

appear on line 75 as line 78 in version three. Yes, mayor pro tem?

>> Alter: I wanted to clarify, there were other things added and where you combine things?

>> Mayor Adler: Those are as they were amended

>> Alter: Okay. So you're unpacking a combination of the be it resolved that is the third and the fourth be it resolved to go back to what you had but removing the crypto currency bullet from the third be it further resolved.

>> Mayor Adler: That's correct. On version three, third clause appears as it is on version three. Except crypto currencies comes out of the list. The fourth be it resolved clause goes back to how it

[6:25:56 PM]

looked on version three. The changes in the other sections are -- those remain.

>> Alter: Ann showed me in the back that one. It's just the unpacking -- you're unpacking the part that you combined.

>> Mayor Adler: Correct

>> Alter: From the third and fourth.

>> Okay. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Council member pool?

>> Pool: Tuesday I talked about block chain and I wanted to reiterate a couple of points. My single concern about block chain is its lack of central authority. It's a ledger. It may be tamper evident and resistance. It's digital, anonymous and unregulated. Significant questions remain and I look forward to answers to the questions. The idea of a digital wallet

[6:26:57 PM]

would work maybe but understanding what it does and doesn't do, how secure it is and principally how to access and use it is essential. And I do have to respond respectfully and I think this was addressed -- block chain and environmental impacts. Statements made today that block chain does not involve significant consumption of power and has no impact on the environment is not accurate. Columbia university climate school -- I have a quote and I'll end by reading it. Globally bit coins' power consumption has dire implications for climate change and achieving the goals of the Paris accord. It translates to about 23 million metric tons of co 2 emissions each year, which is equivalent to the co 2 emissions from the energy use

[6:27:59 PM]

of 2.6 to 2.7 billion homes in one year. It's not helpful to the conversation to pretend that there is no significant environmental and energy consumption impacts related to this new technology because it's important for us to address them straight on. I look forward, city manager, to having those issues addressed straight on. Thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. Anything else? Take a vote on 57. Those in favor, please raise your hand. Those opposed? Those abstaining? Council member pool abstains. The others voting aye. 57 passes. Is there any other motion that we want to make on today's meeting?

[6:29:00 PM]

Only if someone makes a motion. Anybody want to make a motion? Hearing no motion, we've taken care of all our business today, and at 6:29 this meeting is?

>> Excuse me. We have one additional case, another zoning case that we did not get to earlier.

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah. But there's no one making a motion to approve it.

>> I understand. Thank you for that clarification.

>> Mayor Adler: No problem. At 6:29 -- it's 92. There is no motion on 92. I think that's the correct number. No motion on 92. 6:29. City council meeting is now adjourned. Thank you.