



**RCA
CITY OF AUSTIN
RECOMMENDATION FOR COUNCIL ACTION**

**AGENDA ITEM NO.: 12
AGENDA DATE: Thu 02/10/2005
PAGE: 1 of 3**

SUBJECT: Approve an ordinance setting taximeter rates of fare and repealing Ordinance No. 991216-31.

AMOUNT & SOURCE OF FUNDING: N/A

FISCAL NOTE: There is no unanticipated fiscal impact. A fiscal note is not required.

REQUESTING DEPARTMENT: Public Works

DIRECTOR'S AUTHORIZATION: Sondra Creighton

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: Morris Poe, 974-1562; Laura Bohl, 974-7064

PRIOR COUNCIL ACTION: N/A

BOARD AND COMMISSION ACTION: Recommended by the Urban Transportation Commission.

PURCHASING: N/A

MBE / WBE: N/A

American Yellow Checker Cab Company and Austin Cab Company have jointly filed an application to increase the taximeter rates of fare.

In 1999, the City Council approved a plan to increase the taximeter rate in four phases over a 5-year period. The last phase of the plan was implemented in December 2003 increasing the current meter rate to: \$1.75 for the first 1/7th mile (initial drop fee), \$0.25 for each additional 1/7th mile, and a waiting time fee of \$22.50 per hour. The cost of a 6-mile taxi trip increased under the plan by 17% from \$10.25 to \$12.00, excluding waiting time as a result of the implementation of the four phases approved by Council in 1999.

The taxicab franchise holders have proposed a 5-year plan as described in the following chart. The element of the fare structure to be changed each year is shown in bold print. The impact of the change on the fare for a 1-mile, 6-mile, and 20-mile trip is included in the chart. The average taxicab trip in Austin is about 6 miles. The sample trip fares do not include any fee for waiting/delay time because the amount of waiting/delay time for a trip is not predictable.

Franchise Holder Proposed 5 Year Plan to Increase Taximeter Rates of Fare										
Year	Initial Drop Fee	Initial Drop Distance	Additional Mile Rate	Waiting Time Rate / Hr.	1 mile Trip Fee*	% Incr.	6 mile Trip Fee*	% Incr.	20 mile Trip Fee*	% Incr.
2005	\$2.00	1/4 mile	\$0.25 ea addit. 1/8 mile	\$22.50	\$3.50	7.7%	\$13.50	12.5%	\$41.50	13.7%
2006			no change							
2007	\$2.00	1/4 mile	\$0.25 ea addit. 1/8 mile	\$25.00	\$3.50		\$13.50		\$41.50	



**RCA
CITY OF AUSTIN
RECOMMENDATION FOR COUNCIL ACTION**

**AGENDA ITEM NO.: 12
AGENDA DATE: Thu 02/10/2005
PAGE: 2 of 3**

2008	\$2.00	1/8 mile	\$0.25 ea addit. 1/8 mile	\$25.00	\$3.75	7.0%	\$13.75	1.9%	\$41.75	0.6%
2009	\$2.00	1/8 mile	\$0.25 ea addit. 1/8 mile	\$27.00	\$3.75		\$13.75		\$41.75	

*no waiting time fee included

As required by the City Code, the applicants have provided information describing the changes in costs since the last rate increase to justify the proposed change. Since 1999, the South Urban Area Consumer Price Index increased 12.7%. During the same time period, other taxicab industry related operating costs have increased 14.3%. The most noticeable industry related operating cost increase has been the cost of fuel.

The following table compares the current Austin taxicab fare and the final phase proposed taxicab fare for a 1-mile trip and a 6-mile trip to other Texas cities and cities across the nation.

TAXIMETER RATE COMPARISON - 1 Mile Trip Fee

State	City	Initial Drop Fee	Initial Drop Distance	Additional Mile Rate	Waiting Time	1 Mile Trip Fee
AZ	Tucson	\$4.50	1/5 mi	\$0.30 ea addl 1/5 mi	\$20 / hr.	\$5.70
AZ	Phoenix	\$3.80	1/6 mi	\$0.30 ea addl 1/6 mi	\$20 / hr.	\$5.30
TX	Houston - night	\$3.50	1/11 mi	\$0.30 ea addl 2/11 mi	\$18 / hr.	\$5.00
CA	San Francisco	\$2.85	1/5 mi	\$0.45 ea addl 1/5 mi	\$27 / hr.	\$4.65
OH	Columbus	\$2.50	1/5 mi	\$0.25 ea addl 1/10 mi	\$24 / hr.	\$4.50
MO	St. Louis	\$2.50	1/10 mi	\$0.20 ea addl 1/10 mi	\$20 / hr.	\$4.30
OR	Portland	\$2.50	1/18 mi	\$0.10 ea addl 1/18 mi	\$30 / hr.	\$4.20
CA	Oakland	\$2.00	1/8 mi	\$0.30 ea addl 1/8 mi	\$24 / hr.	\$4.10
IN	Indianapolis	\$2.50	1/5 mi	\$0.40 ea addl 1/5 mi	\$24 / hr.	\$4.10
NV	Reno	\$2.10	1/7 mi	\$0.33 ea addl 1/7 mi	\$21 / hr.	\$4.08
NM	Albuquerque	\$2.20	1/10 mi	\$0.20 ea addl 1/10 mi	\$24 / hr.	\$4.00
TX	Houston - day	\$2.50	1/11 mi	\$0.30 ea addl 2/11 mi	\$18 / hr.	\$4.00
LA	New Orleans	\$2.50	1/8 mi	\$0.20 ea addl 1/8 mi	\$18 / hr.	\$3.90
NE	Omaha	\$1.95	1/6 mi	\$0.30 ea addl 1/6 mi	\$20 / hr.	\$3.45
AL	Birmingham	\$2.25	1/4 mi	\$0.40 ea addl 1/4 mi	\$18 / hr.	\$3.45
NC	Charlotte	\$1.80	1/6 mi	\$0.30 ea addl 1/6 mi	\$24 / hr.	\$3.30
TX	San Antonio	\$1.70	1/6 mi	\$0.30 ea addl 1/6 mi	\$18 / hr.	\$3.20
TX	Dallas	\$2.00	1/4 mi	\$0.40 ea addl 1/4 mi	\$16 / hr.	\$3.20
TX	Fort Worth	\$2.00	1/4 mi	\$0.40 ea addl 1/4 mi	\$16 / hr.	\$3.20
TX	Lubbock	\$1.85	1/10 mi	\$0.15 ea addl 1/10	\$15 / hr.	\$3.20
TN	Memphis	\$1.60	1/8 mi	\$0.20 ea addl 1/8 mi	\$20 / hr.	\$3.00
MD	Baltimore	\$1.50	1/6 mi	\$0.20 ea addl 1/6 mi	\$24 / hr.	\$2.50



TAXIMETER RATE COMPARISON - 6 Mile Trip Fee

State	City	Initial Drop Fee	Initial Drop Distance	Additional Mile Rate	Waiting Time	6 Mile Trip Fee*
OH	Columbus	\$2.50	1/5 mi	\$0.25 ea addl 1/10 mi	\$24 / hr.	\$17.00
CA	Oakland	\$2.00	1/8 mi	\$0.30 ea addl 1/8 mi	\$24 / hr.	\$16.10
CA	San Francisco	\$2.85	1/5 mi	\$0.45 ea addl 1/5 mi	\$27 / hr.	\$15.90
NV	Reno	\$2.10	1/7 mi	\$0.33 ea addl 1/7 mi	\$21 / hr.	\$15.63
AZ	Phoenix	\$3.80	1/6 mi	\$0.30 ea addl 1/6 mi	\$20 / hr.	\$14.30
MO	St. Louis	\$2.50	1/10 mi	\$0.20 ea addl 1/10 mi	\$20 / hr.	\$14.30
IN	Indianapolis	\$2.50	1/5 mi	\$0.40 ea addl 1/5 mi	\$24 / hr.	\$14.10
NM	Albuquerque	\$2.20	1/10 mi	\$0.20 ea addl 1/10 mi	\$24 / hr.	\$14.00
TX	Houston – night	\$3.50	1/11 mi	\$0.30 ea addl 2/11 mi	\$18 / hr.	\$13.40
AZ	Tucson	\$4.50	1/5 mi	\$0.30 ea addl 1/5 mi	\$20 / hr.	\$13.20
OR	Portland	\$2.50	1/18 mi	\$0.10 ea addl 1/18 mi	\$30 / hr.	\$13.20
NE	Omaha	\$1.95	1/6 mi	\$0.30 ea addl 1/6 mi	\$20 / hr.	\$12.45
TX	Houston – day	\$2.50	1/11 mi	\$0.30 ea addl 2/11 mi	\$18 / hr.	\$12.40
NC	Charlotte	\$1.80	1/6 mi	\$0.30 ea addl 1/6 mi	\$24 / hr.	\$12.30
TX	San Antonio	\$1.70	1/6 mi	\$0.30 ea addl 1/6 mi	\$18 / hr.	\$12.20
LA	New Orleans	\$2.50	1/8 mi	\$0.20 ea addl 1/8 mi	\$18 / hr.	\$11.90
AL	Birmingham	\$2.25	1/4 mi	\$0.40 ea addl 1/4 mi	\$18 / hr.	\$11.45
TX	Dallas	\$2.00	1/4 mi	\$0.40 ea addl 1/4 mi	\$16 / hr.	\$11.20
TX	Fort Worth	\$2.00	1/4 mi	\$0.40 ea addl 1/4 mi	\$16 / hr.	\$11.20
TN	Memphis	\$1.60	1/8 mi	\$0.20 ea addl 1/8 mi	\$20 / hr.	\$11.00
TX	Lubbock	\$1.85	1/10 mi	\$0.15 ea addl 1/10	\$15 / hr.	\$10.70
MD	Baltimore	\$1.50	1/6 mi	\$0.20 ea addl 1/6 mi	\$24 / hr.	\$8.50

*no waiting time fee included

Roy’s Taxi supports increasing the taximeter rates of fare but, does not support the plan proposed by the other franchise holders. Roy’s Taxi suggests that other fees should be added to the proposed rate structure changes, i.e., additional passenger fee, fuel surcharge, and/or a night surcharge.

The Public Works Department invited taxi drivers to attend a meeting on December 6, 2004 to comment on the proposed rate change. The consensus of the few drivers that attended the meeting was to support the proposal if they get assurances from the franchise holders that franchise fees will not increase.

The Urban Transportation Commission considered the proposed rate change on December 20, 2004. After hearing comments from taxi drivers and franchise holders, the Commission unanimously voted 7 – 0 – 2 absent to approve the proposed rates of fare.

The Public Works Department recommends approval of the proposed rate structure.

ORDINANCE NO.

AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING TAXIMETER RATES OF FARE AND REPEALING ORDINANCE 991216-31.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

PART 1. The City council adopts the taximeter rates of fare upon the recommendation of the city manager.

PART 2. From February 21, 2005 through midnight on February 20, 2007 the following rates apply:

For the first ¼ mile or fraction	\$2.00
For each additional 1/8 mile or fraction	\$0.25
For each 40 seconds or fraction of waiting time (\$22.50/hour)	\$0.25

From February 21, 2007 through midnight on February 20, 2008, the following rates apply:

For the first ¼ mile or fraction	\$2.00
For each additional 1/8 mile or fraction	\$0.25
For each additional 36 seconds or fraction of waiting time (\$25.00/hour)	\$0.25

From February 21, 2008 through midnight on February 20, 2009, the following rates apply:

For the first 1/8 mile or fraction	\$2.00
For each additional 1/8 mile or fraction	\$0.25
For each additional 36 seconds or fraction of waiting time (\$25.00/hour)	\$0.25

Minutes

**Urban Transportation Commission
Monday, December 20, 2004; 6:00 P.M.
505 Barton Springs Road, One Texas Center
8TH Floor Conference Room**

Members Present:

Michelle Brinkman
Dana Lockler
Andrew W. Clements
Patrick Goetz
Dan Rozycki
Greg Sapire
Carl H. Tepper

Members Absent:

Rodney Ahart
Michael Dahmus

Public Works Staff Present:

Richard Kroger
Morris Poe
Leanne Vaughn

Ms. Brinkman opened the Urban Transportation Commission meeting at 6:06 p.m.

A. Citizens Communications

There were no citizens wishing to speak.

B. Taximeter Rate Change

Mr. Morris Poe, Public Service Manager with the Public Works Department, stated Austin Cab and American Yellow Checker Cab Company jointly filed an application to increase the taxicab meter rate. He said it was back in 1999 when the City Council last approved a rate change. At that time they approved a five-year plan increasing different elements of the fare each year, which equated to about a 17% increase over the five-year period.

Mr. Poe stated the franchise holders have again proposed a five-year plan. He then reviewed the proposed plan that had been sent to the Commissioners. Included in the information is a comparison of rates to other cities in Texas and across the nation. He stated the cost of tires, fuel, and maintenance also played a part in this proposed increase.

Mr. Poe stated Roy's Taxi supports the increase but would prefer that there be more of an increase granted to the drivers, possibly by adding an additional passenger fee. He further stated they met with some drivers earlier in the month and they supported the increase, but

their major concern was that they want to make sure they receive most of the increase and that the companies do not increase their franchise fees to the drivers.

Mr. Poe stated the Department recommends the approval.

There were seven cab drivers that spoke on this issue. They discussed issues such as their fear of losing passengers because of raising the rates, the cost of fuel, and competition with Capital Metro bus services. There was also a cab driver that suggested there should be changes in the cab service, making it more upscale. He suggested that it be written into an ordinance that customers in paying cabs should cover the toll fees; that there should be a higher standard for drivers; that there should be a difference in day rates and evening rates for drivers, a surcharge for night driving; that there should be a charge for additional passengers; and there should be a surcharge for the drivers that work the five major holidays since they are away from their families on those days. Of the seven speakers, five were in favor of the rate increase.

Motion by: Carl Tepper
Seconded by: Dan Rozycki

Motion: To support staff's recommendation for the new rate structure.

Ayes: Brinkman/Clements/Goetz//Lockler/Rozycki/Sapire/Tepper
Nays: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Ahart/Dahmus

C. C20-04-0010 Discussion and Action on the Proposed Transit-Oriented Development Code Amendments

Mr. Goetz stated that staff was directed by City Council to come up with some type of land use plan for areas that are around proposed transit stations. He stated he feels the city has been anxious to come up with something like this because we need a better transit system in the city. What has come along recently is the commuter rail plan and city staff has done a pretty good job of preparing a land use plan specifically for the commuter rail stations. He feels the skeleton plan will apply to any type of transit related development.

Ms. Jana McCann, Urban Design Officer, and Mr. Ricardo Soliz, Principal Planner, both with the Neighborhood Planning and Zoning Department, presented the amendments. Ms. McCann stated that in July of this year Council passed a resolution for staff to develop the regulations that would be applied to areas around enhanced transit stations. This not only includes the rail stations that are being proposed as part of the commuter rail system, but also some park and ride stations that are not yet served by rail. She said a lot of the principals they are looking at adopting through an ordinance, which needs to go to council on January 27, 2005, have to do with good design and linking land use and transportation. She said they are not doing land use plans with the ordinance, the ordinance will set the stage for a more intensive planning process that will occur around each of the seven adopted stations in the first phase of this commuter rail plus park and ride stations.

Ms. McCann spoke briefly on the kind of approach they are taking with these amendments and then referred to a copy of the ordinance that had been provided the Commission. She stated that the City Council specifically requested this commission, the Planning

Commission, the Design Commission, and the Zoning and Platting Commission review these amendments, and said they have a very fast paced schedule to get these amendments to all the Commissions before being presented to the City Council in late January.

Ms. McCann pointed out the seven station locations that the Capital Metro board adopted. This ordinance will also address future stations, and possibly stations that are proposed by the commuter rail district, and is not specifically Capital Metro limited.

Ms. McCann stated their approach is to first examine what is on the ground in the area, what are the current regulations that are in effect, and look at the area from ¼ to ½ mile around the particular station platforms. She said even bus areas would have bus-loading platforms. She said when they look at the areas around the stations it is to see what is an easy walk to the station, and then to define an area where a transit-oriented development (TOD) district might apply. She said in the first phase they are trying to increase residential and employment density around each station, and to make these areas great destinations. Ms. McCann stated the second phase will probably occur before the train arrives in 2008.

Ms. McCann stated the first step is to identify the boundaries of the TOD and say this is the overlay zone in which certain uses will be prohibited and there will be a higher design standard applied in that area on a few key issues such as parking. Then Capital Metro and the City of Austin will hopefully partner to provide the consultant that will do the stationary plan, which is step two.

Mr. Soliz stated he manages the neighborhood planning process for the City. He said the neighborhood plans that have been adopted by City Council are the result of close work with the Planning Commission. Thus far 28 neighborhood plans have been adopted, and four fall within the TOD stations. He stated the job of the neighborhood planners is to see how the neighborhood plans and the TOD stations coincide. Mr. Soliz then described the types of zones around the stations, gateway zone, midway zone and the transition zone.

Mr. Soliz stated in phase one they can concentrate their efforts and think about prohibiting the auto related uses, the things that are not so transit oriented, mainly because they are so rushed to get this to Council by January. In phase two they will work with the stakeholders, similar to the neighborhood planning process.

Ms. McCann then referred to the proposed TOD topology handout and discussed the different types of TOD's. She stated within the different TOD types there will be different scale zones. She stated the zone directly around the station is where they want the highest density, great streetscaping, mixed-use buildings and the most transit orientation possible. She stated the midway zone is the next zone and in it they are scaling back, with decreased heights. This zone is usually abutting single-family residential. Ms. McCann stated in step two, where these zones would apply, it creates the parameters that can be adjusted during the station area planning process.

Ms. McCann stated at the end of the station area planning process they will have the plan adopted by the City Council, the Capital Metro Board, and/or the Transit Agency Board, and then it will be adopted as a TOD based district, a new district. The TOD based district will strip out the underlying zoning so there will no longer be the old type zoning, and the new zoning will be tied to the result of that station area plan. All development within a TOD will have to uphold the station area plan.

Ms. McCann then described the proposed TOD Development standards, such as the special provisions for ground floor pedestrian spaces, which includes having entrances facing the street, minimum first floor heights, and ground floor glazing. She said one of the key elements is regulating exactly where surface parking is allowed. She then discussed the differences between step one and step two of the standards.

Ms. McCann discussed another handout called *Proposed Development Intensities per TOD Type and Zone*. That handout had information about additional building height that can be achieved with a development bonus, such as affordable housing. She explained that if a specific amount of affordable housing is included in the development, additional floors will be allowed in the development.

Mr. Goetz stated he feels the staff has done a great job with these plans. He said the problem with using existing train tracks is you cannot control what kind of development happened there in the last 50-60 years. You end up with situations where there is single family housing that they cannot make part of the plan that is very close to the train station. He feels we still need to work on a rail plan that services the urban core in a proper way, such as having it go down Lamar Boulevard where no one will complain about higher density. He feels this is a problem with the rail solution, not with city staff's work.

Ms. Brinkman wondered why the Highland Mall station was removed from the plan. She stated this seemed the logical location for a station, with ample parking that could be used as a park and ride location, and is also a destination for many. She felt the Lamar and Justin location does not have any available parking, they have not acquired any land at this location and therefore it is a less desirable location.

Mr. Goetz stated all the parking around Highland Mall is private property and he feels the company that owns the mall might object to commuters parking there. He stated if you look at the bigger picture of a rail system going down Lamar Boulevard, then the Justin and Lamar location would be an interchange. He further stated they have to do something for Mueller, which is a problem he has been thinking about for months. He stated that the entire Mueller plan was predicated on having rail service.

Mr. Tepper stated he does not like prohibiting uses. He feels that when you prohibit something you might take out a developer that would have done something original or unusual that we might have liked. Mr. Sapire stated the City could give variances. Mr. Tepper wondered why that should be necessary, he feels free market should build around the stations. Mr. Goetz stated that the argument is that someone may put in an infrastructure that is going to inhibit pedestrian oriented applications and when the final ordinance is put in place there will be an infrastructure in place that no one wants to tear out.

Mr. Soliz stated the prohibited uses are businesses that will not make sense in the area. He further stated those type businesses have also been prohibited by the neighborhoods plans.

There were two citizens who wished to speak on this issue. The first stated that making an area pedestrian accessible was very good, especially for people with special needs. He stated he is legally blind and moved here last year from Minneapolis-St. Paul where he never had to take special transit. Everything was sidewalk accessible with parking in the rear. He feels this is a great plan to start getting people out of their cars by giving them the option of doing their errands without driving and on the way to the transit station.

The other citizen, Mr. Pantin, stated he owns two pieces of property by one of the transit stations, one property developed and the other a vacant lot. He has concerns that the people in the neighborhood, the property owners, were notified about this project one week in advance of the meeting, had no prior notice about these transit station plans, we are in the middle of the holiday season, the City Council will vote on them in a little over a month, and he feels this is moving way too fast.

Mr. Pantin stated the idea of the temporary overlays sound nice but the problem is most of the changes happen right away. The building requirements are tremendous and to do this type of construction is very expensive for a small businessmen. Being forced to have a storefront when you do not want it, and to have 15 foot ceiling and a minimum number of floors are cost prohibitive. Ms. McCann stated these are not required in the first phase.

Mr. Pantin wants this process to slow down, it should be researched further, and they should make time for the owners to have some input, and then come out with a plan. Ms. McCann stated existing use is grand fathered and this only will affect new building. Mr. Pantin stated in his case it will affect the undeveloped property he owns.

Mr. Goetz said the only thing that will be prohibited in the interim are the prohibited uses, otherwise the current zoning applies. Ms. McCann stated some of the building regulations will change, the 15-foot height minimum for the first floor of new construction, one entrance must face the street, ground floor glazing, and the protected sidewalks. These will go into affect when Council passes this ordinance.

Ms. McCann stated part of the idea behind the two-step approach is to be fairly benign. The first step is to establish the geography and then have the assurance of having a robust station area planning process that could actually modify the boundaries of the overall TOD but also the neighborhood intensity zones and address specific landowner issues and be able to address the exceptional things within that station area plan. In step one there is a minimum set of requirements and rest to be determined in step two.

Mr. Rozycki stated there is no guarantee when the station will show up. He said it might be better for the city to build the station first, and then require the property owners to make changes to their property. He stated if the city were to buy up all the land around the stations and then sell it back with stipulations, that would be reasonable.

Mr. Goetz stated that this proposal will increase the value of the property in a couple of years. The property owners will make money and we would like to impose a few requirements for the public good that will guarantee that the City's investment will pay off. Mr. Pantin stated he is not interested in developing his current property and yet his property taxes will go up significantly. He suggested compromising, he would not mind bringing his building to the front of the property, but he is not interested in creating a storefront for his business.

Motion by: Carl Tepper
Seconded by: Dana Lockler

Motion: To move we reject the resolution in question and recommend that more time is given to study the affects of the design criteria of the TOD.

Ayes: Lockler/Tepper
Nays: Brinkman/Clements/Goetz/Rozycki/Sapire
Abstain: None
Absent: Ahart/Dahmus

Motion by: Patrick Goetz
Seconded by: Greg Sapire

Motion: Recommend that this move forward but remove weather protection for the sidewalks be removed from the requirements.

Ayes: Brinkman/Goetz/Sapire
Nays: Clements/Lockler/Rozycki/Tepper
Abstain: None
Absent: Ahart/Dahmus

Motion by: Carl Tepper
Seconded by: Dan Rozycki

Motion: Regardless of how the City Council takes action or not on January 27, 2005, we recommend that this continue to be studied.

Ayes: Brinkman/Clements/Goetz//Lockler/Rozycki/Sapire/Tepper
Nays: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Ahart/Dahmus

D. Discuss Proposed Changes to Film Ordinance

Mr. Garry Silagi, Acting Division Manager with Watershed Protection and Development Review Department, presented the changes to the film ordinance. He stated back in August there was an economic impact study that the City requested to look at filming overall within the city. They wanted to see if there was a way to improve our filming aspects, to see if we can bring more people in to film, and encourage those already filming here to continue. One of the things that came out is that the working environment for filming production in Austin, while not necessarily an impediment, could be improved.

Mr. Silagi stated they then looked at the ordinance and the fees generated by the film industry. They compared the amount of money being brought into the city by the film industry against the permitting fees. One item this ordinance is changing is there will no longer be any charge for filming permits. He then went over the changes in the permits, there will now be three types of permits, commercial filming, student filming, and mobile filming. The ordinance will also change the application deadline schedule, security and crowd control, sign-offs, adding the insurance requirements into the code, and requiring area maps of the film locations. Mr. Silagi stated there will also be a non-compliance portion with the code, giving the city authority to shut down the filming if they fail to comply with the permit, with the time frames in the permit, or anything the City sets up as a permit requirement. If the filming company fails to comply with the permit, the City can fine the company a \$500 fee or suspend their work for four days.

There was one citizen who wanted to speak on this ordinance: He is with the Downtown Austin Alliance (DAA) and he stated they worked with staff on this ordinance, and supports these changes. He also stated that in the case where any film makers and other event organizers have trouble getting in touch with any property owners, they can contact the DAA for assistance.

Motion by: Greg Sapire
Seconded by: Dan Rozycki

Motion: To approve the Ordinance as submitted.

Ayes: Brinkman/Clements/Goetz/Rozycki/Sapire/Tepper
Nays: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Ahart/Dahmus

E. Approval of 2005 Commission Work Plan

Ms. Brinkman stated that the approval is of the work plan that was changed at the last meeting.

Motion by: Patrick Goetz
Seconded by: Dan Rozycki

Motion: To adopt the Work Plan as submitted.

Ayes: Brinkman/Clements/Goetz/Rozycki/Sapire/Tepper
Nays: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Ahart/Dahmus

F. Appointment to Pfluger Bridge Committee

Mr. Goetz recommended Mr. Clements to this committee. Mr. Clements stated he had gone to the last meeting and would be happy to accept this appointment.

G. Election of Commission Officers

Motion by: Carl Tepper
Seconded by: Patrick Goetz

Motion: Michelle Brinkman for Chairman, Dana Lockler for Vice-Chairman, and Greg Sapire for Secretary/Parliamentarian.

Ayes: Brinkman/Clements/Goetz//Lockler/Rozycki/Sapire/Tepper
Nays: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Ahart/Dahmus

H. Projected Transportation Projects for City Council Action

There was nothing to discuss on this issue.

I. Approval of Minutes from November 15, 2004 Meeting

There were no changes to the minutes, so Ms. Brinkman stated they stand approved as presented.

J. Committee Reports

Mr. Clements stated the Downtown Commission had a Christmas party.

K. Announcement of Upcoming Events

There were no events to announce.

L. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Michelle Brinkman, Chair
Urban Transportation Commission

Sondra Creighton, P.E., Director
Public Works Department