



**City Council Questions and Answers for  
Thursday, October 17, 2013**

These questions and answers are related to the  
Austin City Council meeting that will convene at 10:00 AM on  
Thursday, October 17, 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 5:00 p.m. the Tuesday before the Council meeting. The final report is distributed at noon to City Council the Wednesday before the council meeting.*

## QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL

1. Agenda Items # 2, # 3, and # 73
  - a. QUESTION: Staff's memo of Oct. 8 has answered the question of the average annual rate increase equivalency on water and waste water rates of the various impact fee scenarios for the next 10 years. Please also provide, if available, estimated water and waste water increases expected from other drivers over the next 10 years, e.g. the planned revenue sustainability reserve fund surcharge fee to be phased in. COUNCIL MEMBER MORRISON
  - b. ANSWER: First, the Council memo of October 8th, had a section titled Impact to Rates. The title Impact to Rates is probably not as appropriate as would be Rate Equivalency of Revenue From Impact Fees. There is no rate increase impact due to the proposed impact fee changes. The proposed impact fee revisions will increase the revenue that Austin Water receives from impact fees. This additional revenue from the proposed impact fees will actually reduce the need for additional water and wastewater rate increases in the future as the impact fee revenue will offset the cost of capital infrastructure for growth. This section tried to briefly describe the average annual rate equivalency of the various impact fee scenarios over the next 10 years. However, I believe there is confusion over the term rate equivalency. The rate equivalency is the water and wastewater rate increase that would generate the same amount of revenue as the amount of impact fee revenue collected from the various options. Thus, the rate equivalency would be the expected rate that the proposed impact fee revenue would offset proposed water and wastewater rates in the future. Over the next 10 years, it is estimated that Austin Water will collect \$282 million, or an average annual amount of \$28.2 million, from a combination of impact fees and water and wastewater rates to fund the growth projects in the proposed impact fee program. This average annual amount of \$28.2 million represents a 4.6% water and wastewater rate increase equivalency. In other words, if Austin Water did not have impact fees at all, we would have to raise rates by 4.6% to recover \$28.2 million annually over the next 10 years to pay for the growth related capital projects. The water and wastewater rate increase of 4.6% would not have to be on an annual basis, but a one-time increase that would remain in effect. The various impact fee options provide for different scenarios of how the \$282 million will be collected from either the development from impact fees, or through service revenue from water and wastewater ratepayers. Each of the options is estimated to collect \$282 million, only the breakdown changes between impact fees to developers or water and wastewater rates to ratepayers.

At the impact fees currently in place, it is estimated that Austin Water could collect approximately \$106 million in impact fees over the next 10 years, or an annual average of \$10.6 million per year. The remaining \$175 million of the total \$282 million would be collected from ratepayers. The current impact fees would cover 1.7% and the ratepayers would cover 2.9% to recover the 4.6% rate equivalency of growth costs. At Austin Water's recommended fee option 4i, it is estimated that Austin Water could collect approximately \$187 million in impact fees over the next 10 years, or an annual average of \$18.7 million per year. The remaining \$95 million of the total \$282 million would be collected from ratepayers. The impact fees would cover 3.0% and the ratepayers would cover 1.6% to recover the 4.6% rate equivalency of growth costs. At the maximum allowable fee option 5, it is estimated that Austin Water could collect approximately \$282 million in impact fees over the next 10 years, or an annual average of \$28.2 million per year. The growth costs would be entirely borne by the development entity while no growth costs would be collected from ratepayers. The impact fees would cover 4.6% and the ratepayers would cover 0.0% to recover the 4.6% rate equivalency of growth costs. Bottom line, the proposed impact fee update has increased the maximum allowable fees significantly. In any option that Council chooses, significantly more impact fee revenue will be collected from the development entity, which will reduce the need for water and wastewater rate increases in the future. The significant amount of additional impact fees in the future will benefit all water and wastewater ratepayers by paying for a larger portion (Option 4i) of the cost of growth capital or by paying for all (Option 5) of the cost of growth capital. While the impact fee updates are calculated on a 10-year basis according to State law, the revenue would likely be spread out over a significantly longer period.

**Projected Rate Increases of Other Cost Drivers:** Austin Water has not specifically identified the rate impacts of all future cost drivers. In our last 5-year financial forecast presented in April 2013, Austin Water's costs were projected to increase from a total of \$520 million in 2013 to a total of \$650 million in 2018. This is a \$130 million or 25% increase in total requirements over the next 5 years. These cost increases include a \$59 million increase in operations and maintenance, a \$43 million increase in debt service, and a \$28 million increase in transfers out. Projected combined utility rate increases are approximately 17% over the next 5 years to cover these expected cost increases. Any additional revenue from the updated impact fees will offset a portion of these cost increases, which reduces the need for Austin Water to increase water and wastewater rates. The current impact fees would offset 1.7% of the increased costs in the future. Austin Water's recommended impact fee option 4i would offset 3.0% of the increased costs in the future. The maximum allowable impact fee option 5 would offset 4.6% of the increased costs in the future.

## 2. Agenda Item # 4

- a. QUESTION: How do the election day and early voting polling places differ from past elections, specifically the last comparable state election in November 2011? MAYOR PRO TEM COLE

b. ANSWER: See attachment

3. Agenda Item # 6

a. QUESTION: 1) How are the neighborhoods/projects prioritized? 2) How many requests are in the queue, and 3) how many projects is the City able to do in a typical year? COUNCIL MEMBER SPELMAN

b. ANSWER: 1) The Local Area Traffic Management (LATM) program is request-based. The Transportation Department then conducts traffic studies to determine existing traffic speed and volume trends, looking specifically for adverse levels of speeding. At this time only requests for relief from adverse levels of speeding along individual street segments are being accepted. 2) We currently have 22 sites in the queue with many requests being evaluated (over 100). 3) We can design and construct 12 to 15 in a year depending on the type of traffic calming devices.

4. Agenda Item # 13

a. QUESTION: This item doubles the city's contribution to the Austin-San Antonio Corridor Council (ASACC) in part due to an expansion in the organization's mission. 1) what is the expansion in mission of the ASACC, 2) has furthering the efforts of the Texas River Cities (TRC) Plug-in Electric Vehicle Initiative Plan been considered as a project or partner service, 3) Has the City of San Antonio approved its membership funding already? MAYOR PRO TEM COLE

b. ANSWER: 1) The Corridor Council has initiated and coordinated a series of infrastructure funding requests at the state and Federal level for the financing of, in particular, a number of transportation mobility projects (highway and transit). We also staff the Lone Star Rail Project and the related Project Connect with the City of Austin. We are also being called upon to do more in the arenas of economic development, greenspace development, and high technology efforts such as our Digital Convergence Initiative. Growth in the Austin-San Antonio Corridor is making it essential to expand these efforts to keep pace with the increased population growth without sacrificing quality of life for our residents. 2) The initial organizational meeting of the Texas River Cities (TRC) project was convened in our offices in San Marcos and we continue as a promotional partner on the venture; we have also acted as interface on the project with CleanTx, Solar San Antonio, Texas Greenbelt Project, and recently drafted a grant proposal related to the project to the Federal Economic Development Administration. 3) The city of San Antonio has not yet approved the increase.

5. Agenda Item # 16

a. QUESTION: 1) How many miles of fence does the city have to replace due to

people cutting through it, versus regular maintenance? 2) What type of fence is used around the preserve? 3) Does the agreement with the federal government require us to fence the preserve? COUNCIL MEMBER SPELMAN

- b. ANSWER: 1) This contract calls for the replacement of 22,685 linear feet of fencing at three different locations. The fencing is very old and weathered and is in need of replacement. 2) Barbed Wire was installed but has worn and is loose in places which provides easy access. 3) The BCCP Habitat Conservation Plan authorized by our federal permit requires us to upgrade boundary fences as soon as practical to control human access. We are in our tenth year of fencing or re-fencing all BCP boundaries.

6. Agenda Item # 18

- a. QUESTION: The item provides for a service contract for the Aviation Dept to convert paper records to electronic format. Please provide an overview of what other departments have similar conversion requirements, how the requirement has been or will be handled, and whether there has been any coordination of these services and capabilities across the enterprise.  
COUNCIL MEMBER MORRISON
- b. ANSWER: The Office of the City Clerk has worked with multiple City departments on document scanning projects, in support of storing the resulting digital documents, images, and metadata in the City's centralized enterprise document management system, EDIMS. Examples include the Office of Vital Records in the Health and Human Services department, the Purchasing department, Watershed Protection, and the Office of the City Clerk. In providing guidance to departments, the OCC's goal is to promote common standards of quality control, document handling, indexing, and document classification in order to ensure that documents are managed consistently across the City in compliance with records retention, classification, storage, retrieval, and other records/document control requirements. The challenge has been that, to date, City departments address their document scanning and indexing needs individually and on an ad hoc basis, depending on the scope of their needs and the hardware, software, personnel, and other resources available to the departments. For example, the Office of Vital Records (HHSD) brought temporary workers onsite and leased equipment to scan and index roughly 750,000 birth and death certificates. The Purchasing department purchased their own scanners to process a backfile of over 30K documents and uses this equipment on an ongoing basis to process their documents. The Watershed Protection Department adopted a similar approach, using purchased scanners and temporary staff. The Office of the City Clerk handles its day to day scanning with regular staff and internally purchased scanners. In addition to the Aviation department, the Austin Public Library, Public Works, and Human Resources departments have significant immediate scanning needs. The Library is planning on doing their scanning and document conversion in-house with existing staff and equipment, while Human Resources has already started its document conversion process, and is

relying mostly on temporary workers scanning their documents on site, with an eye toward outsourced document scanning for later groups of records. The Office of the City Clerk has worked closely with the Aviation department to help define requirements, quality control standards, document handling procedures and other requirements and best practices for conducting their document scanning program. The Clerk's Office supports the proposed approach and would like to note that the selected vendor, Open Text, is also the vendor from whom the City purchased the EDIMS system. For future departmental scanning needs, the Clerk's Office strongly endorses a unified, coordinated plan to provide standardized scanning services, with oversight from the Clerk's Office, that would be available for departments to use as they come on board with the EDIMS project or other document control systems. OCC would support including a plan for such a program in its FY2015 budget request.

7. Agenda Item # 23

- a. QUESTION: What is the cost per hour to operate the helicopter? COUNCIL MEMBER SPELMAN
- b. ANSWER: The hourly cost of operating the helicopter is between \$450 and \$500. This includes parts, repairs, maintenance, overhaul, insurance and fuel. The cost for fueling the helicopter is between \$150 and \$200 per hour.

8. Agenda Item # 31

- a. QUESTION: 1) How many citations, criminal incidents and arrests were there in the 6 months before the trials were opened 24 hours? 2)How many have there been since the trials were open 24 hours? 3) Please break down the criminal incident data into violent crimes, property crimes and everything else. COUNCIL MEMBER SPELMAN
- b. ANSWER: 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 (512) 974-2210 OR (512) 974-2445 TDD.*



**Council Question and Answer**

<b>Related To</b>	<b>Agenda Items # 4</b>	<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>October 17, 2013</b>
-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------	-------------------------

**Additional Answer Information**

**Travis County:**

**All Travis County precincts will be considered a Vote Center allowing any registered Travis County voter to vote at any location on Election Day. Specific changes in Election Day sites between the November 2012 and November 2013 Election are:**

Precinct 317 in 2012 was located at 601 Camp Craft Road and in 2013 will be located at 1305 Quaker Ridge Road  
 Precinct 324 was located at 13222 Highway 71 West and is now located at 4000 Galleria Pkwy

**Early voting Sites that are open on Election Day**

Travis County added Travis County Airport Blvd Offices located at 5501 Airport Blvd and removed Highland Mall located at 6001 Airport Blvd and Lamar Plaza Shopping Center located at 1150 South Lamar Blvd.

**Early voting sites added:**

Travis County Airport Blvd Offices located at 5501 Airport Blvd  
 Gus Garcia Recreation Center located at 1201 East Rundberg

**Early voting sites deleted:**

Round Rock ISD Performing Arts Center located at 5800 McNeil Drive  
 Goodwill Industries located at 1015 Norwood Park Blvd  
 Randall's Steiner Ranch, 5145 RM 602 North

**Hays County: No change to Election Day Polling places**

**Williamson County:**

**All City of Austin Williamson County precincts will be considered a Vote Center allowing any registered Williamson County voters to vote at any location on Election Day. Specific changes in Election Day sites between the November 2012 and November 2013 Election are:**

**Election Day sites deleted:**

Round Rock High School, 300 N. Lake Creek Dr.  
 Restoration Covenant, 475 Round Rock W. Dr.  
 Pond Springs Elementary School, 7825 Elkhorn Mountain Tr.  
 Forest North Elementary School, 13414 Broadmeade Ave.  
 Deerpark Middle School, 8849 Anderson Mill Rd  
 Rudledge Elementary School, 11501 Staked Plains Dr.  
 Patsy Sommer Elementary School, 16200 Avery Ranch Blvd.  
 Cedar Valley Middle School, 8139 Racine Trl  
 Purple Sage Elementary School, 11801 Tanglebriar Tr  
 Noel Grisham Middle School, 10805 School House Ln.

**Election Day sites added:**

Kelly Reeves Athletic Complex, 10211 W Parmer Lane  
 La Quinta Inn & Suites, 10701 Lakeline Mall Dr

**Early voting sites deleted:**

Baca Senior Center, 303 W. Bagdad Street

**Early voting sites added:**

McConico Building, 301 W. Bagdad St.

**November 5, 2013 Election Day Vote Center Locations:**

Bethany United Methodist Church, 10010 Anderson Mill Rd  
Clairmont Retirement Comm., 12463 Los Indios Trail  
Kelly Reeves Athletic Complex, 10211 W Parmer Lane  
La Quinta Inn & Suites, 10701 Lakeline Mall Dr  
Lord of Life Lutheran Church, 9700 Neenah Ave  
Northwest Fellowship, 13427 Pond Springs Rd



**Council Question and Answer**

<b>Related To</b>	Agenda Items #31	<b>Meeting Date</b>	October 17, 2013
-------------------	------------------	---------------------	------------------

**Additional Answer Information**

QUESTION: 1) How many citations, criminal incidents and arrests were there in the 6 months before the trails were opened 24 hours? 2)How many have there been since the trails were open 24 hours? 3) Please break down the criminal incident data into violent crimes, property crimes and everything else. COUNCIL MEMBER SPELMAN

<b>Data provided by:</b>	<b>Austin Police Department: Planning Unit</b>
<b>Date delivered:</b>	10/15/2013
<b>Requested by:</b>	Council Member Spelman
<b>Compiled by:</b>	Denise Geleitsmann and Sara Davis
<b>Data requested:</b>	How many criminal incidents and arrests were there in the 6 months before the trails were opened 24 hours and how many since? Please break the incident data into violent crimes, property crimes and everything else.
<b>Notes:</b>	The trail began 24-hour access on June 1, 2013. We provided offenses (criminal incidents) and arrests for December 1, 2012 - May 31, 2013 as compared to June 1, 2013 - October 14, 2013.
	Offenses are categorized into Part 1 Violent offenses, Part 1 Property offenses and all other crime. Part 1 Violent offenses include: murder, rape, robbery and aggravated assault Part 1 Property offenses include burglary, theft and auto theft.
	Offenses and arrests occurring on the trails was defined by a 75 foot buffer around the city's trails.
<b>Sources used:</b>	Versadex

**AUSTIN POLICE DEPARTMENT DATA DISCLAIMER**

1. The data provided is for informational use only and is not considered official APD crime data as in official Texas DPS or FBI crime reports.
2. APD's crime database is continuously updated, so reports run at different times may produce different results. Care should be taken when comparing against other reports as different data collection methods and different data sources may have been used.
3. The Austin Police Department does not assume any liability for any decision made or action taken or not taken by the recipient in reliance upon any information or data provided

**OFFENSES****December 1, 2012 - May 31, 2013**

Part 1 Violent	14
Part 1 Property	263
All Other	1158

**June 1, 2013 - October 14, 2013**

Part 1 Violent	13
Part 1 Property	312
All Other	1021

**ARRESTS****December 1, 2012 - May 31, 2013**

Part 1 Violent	2
Part 1 Property	7
All Other	747

**June 1, 2013 - October 14, 2013**

Part 1 Violent	4
Part 1 Property	10
All Other	562