



**City Council Questions and Answers for
Thursday, February 14, 2013**

These questions and answers are related to the
Austin City Council meeting that will convene at 10:00 AM on
Thursday, February 14, 2013 at Austin City Hall
301 W. Second Street, Austin, TX



**Mayor Lee Leffingwell
Mayor Pro Tem Sheryl Cole
Council Member Chris Riley, Place 1
Council Member Mike Martinez, Place 2
Council Member Kathie Tovo, Place 3
Council Member Laura Morrison, Place 4
Council Member William Spelman, Place 5**

The City Council Questions and Answers Report was derived from a need to provide City Council Members an opportunity to solicit clarifying information from City Departments as it relates to requests for council action. After a City Council Regular Meeting agenda has been published, Council Members will have the opportunity to ask questions of departments via the City Manager's Agenda Office. This process continues until the final report is distributed at noon to City Council the Wednesday before the council meeting.


QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL


1. Agenda Items # 14-19
 - a. QUESTION: It's my understanding that council agenda items 14-19 for this week are conditional commitments based on award of tax credits from TDHCA with the assumed limitation that only two will actually require that funding to achieve leveraging. The wording does not specify that this applies only to the 2013 Competitive 9% Housing Tax Credit awards. Does the current wording obligate/commit the city to these funding levels should these projects secure tax credits in future years or through the non-competitive 4% or similar tax credit programs? MAYOR PRO TEM COLE
 - b. ANSWER: These conditional commitments are specifically for the 2013 funding round, 9% allocation; Not the 4% process.
2. Agenda Item # 30
 - a. QUESTION: Is this being coordinated with the travel time project CAMPO is working on? COUNCIL MEMBER SPELMAN
 - b. ANSWER: Austin Transportation Department is coordinating with CAMPO on their travel time project. CAMPO has shared their scope with ATD staff and we anticipate participation on the project's technical advisory committee to continue coordinating closely. This amendment will allow us to take the travel time and adjust the traffic signals accordingly to keep the traffic moving.
3. Agenda Item # 44
 - a. QUESTION: Have all 6 tracts been sold? If not, will the City wait to receive payment from all six lot owners before beginning work? What are the total project costs? Will the City be reimbursed for all costs? Does this item have a fiscal note? (If not, why not?) Has the City provided any other developer/lot owners with variance to allow alternative means of compliance in a similar situation? COUNCIL MEMBER TOVO
 - b. ANSWER: Please see attachment.
4. Agenda Item # 46
 - a. QUESTION: The proposed ordinance would only allow Council to approve projects and transactions in excess of \$100 million. In the last 100 years, how

many transactions (and which) have exceeded that amount? COUNCIL
MEMBER TOVO

b. ANSWER: Please see attachment.

END OF REPORT - ATTACHMENTS TO FOLLOW

 *The City of Austin is committed to compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.
Reasonable modifications and equal access to communications will be provided upon request.*

 *For assistance please call 974-2210 OR 974-2445 TDD.*



Council Question and Answer

Related To	Agenda Item # 44	Meeting Date	February 14, 2013
-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------

Additional Answer Information

Have all 6 tracts been sold?

Two of the six properties listed in Exhibit A, 1010 and 1110 Ogden Dr., have been sold. The four remaining properties, 1008, 1011, 1101, and 1103 Ogden Dr. are owned by the developer.

If not, will the City wait to receive payment from all six lot owners before beginning work?

The City will not begin work until funding is received in an amount that will cover the project as proposed.

What are the total project costs?

The Watershed Protection Department does not have a project designed at this time. The project will be designed so that costs don't exceed the total amount received.

Will the City be reimbursed for all costs?

Funds for a water quality project will not be expended until funds are received. Reimbursement will not be necessary.

Does this item have a fiscal note? (If not, why not?)

At this time, there is no fiscal impact for this Item from Council. Upon approval, the Watershed Protection Department would come back to amend the Budget or include as part of the next Budget cycle as funds are received and the Department is ready to proceed with work. Since funds have not been received at this point, there is no fiscal impact and a fiscal note is not required. Additional City funds are not expected to be used for this project.

Has the City provided any other developer/lot owners with variance to allow alternative means of compliance in a similar situation?

No, though projects in the urban watersheds do have this option under existing code section 25-8-214 (Optional Payment Instead of Structural Controls in Urban Watersheds.)



Council Question and Answer

Related To	Agenda Item # 46	Meeting Date	February 14, 2013
-------------------	------------------	---------------------	-------------------

Additional Answer Information

There are only a few categories of “projects and transactions in excess of \$100M.” These would include long term purchase power agreements, construction or purchase of power plants, and major upgrades to power plants during the past few decades. A list of “projects and transactions” which have exceeded in part or in total \$100M are provided below. Staff was able to do a quick research of data back to 1996; it’s likely that archived data would show cumulative purchases over time could exceed \$100M for all the transactions related to Decker and Holly power plants. In our assessment, there would not be any such projects or transactions over \$100M prior to that (e.g., Seaholm).

CIP Project	Time Period in Database	Amount	Comment
STP Purchase	1988-1989	855,888,566.88	STP Unit 1 & 2 Structure and Equipment and Land
FPP Purchase	1979-1980	207,150,719.04	FPP Structure and Equipment and Land
STP Capital Improvements	1996-2012	130,833,425.41	In this time period the largest yearly amount was \$16,286,885.52 in 1999
FPP Capital Improvements	1996-2012	103,773,596.80	In this time period the largest yearly amount was \$15,465,648.38 in 2010
FPP Units 1 & 2 Scrubbers Project	2005-2012	197,086,078.14	In this time period the largest yearly amount was \$56,468,741.51 in 2010
Sand Hill Combined Cycle	2001-2012	179,853,929.13	In this time period the largest yearly amount was \$68,107,555.06 in 2002

RCA Date	Item #	Description	Capacity/Type/Term	Amount
09/25/2003	28	RES/Sweetwater	53MW Wind; 12 yr (RCA was for up to 20 yr)	\$92M
05/27/2004	48	RES (Amendment 2)/Sweetwater	40MW Wind; 12 yr	\$18M (revised total contract \$110M)
12/16/2004	3	Sweetwater (Formerly RES; Amendment 4)/Sweetwater	Adds 35 MW Wind, and monies for higher production from original 93MW; 12 yr	\$58M (revised total contract \$168M)
04/06/2006	20	RES	225MW Wind; 20 yr	\$685M
08/21/2008	2	Nacogdoches Power	100MW Biomass; 20 yr	\$2,300M
03/05/2009	16	Gemini/Webberville	30MW Solar; 25 yr	\$250M
08/18/2011	2	MAP Royalty/ Coastal Wind	91MW Wind; 25 yr	\$325M
08/18/2011	3	Duke Energy/Coastal Wind	200MW Wind; 25 yr	\$820M