

City Council Regular Meeting Transcript – 04/10/2014

Title: ATXN2

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 4/10/2014 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 4/10/2014

Transcript Generated by SnapStream Enterprise TV Server

=====

[07:43:31]

>> mayor leffingwell: Good morning. I'm austin mayor lee leffingwell. A quorum is present so I'm to -- I'm going to call this meeting of austin city council to order on april 10, 2014. The time is 1:51 p.M. We're meeting in the council chambers, sthawl city hall 301 west 2nd street, austin, texas. I'll go to the changes and corrections for today's agenda. First items 9, 10, 12 and 13, are postponed until april 17, 2014. On item no. 32, add as a second co-sponsor council member chris riley. On item 33 add co-sponsors -- council member chris riley, mayor pro tem sheryl cole, and just for information, staff is not supposed to post an item on the agenda until you have at least two sponsors. That's a rule. Council member tovo. I don't want to get into a discussion about it -- >> tovo: I did have co-sponsors. It was, I believe, a typographical error on the council agenda. We had co-sponsors on time last week. Unders unders tood. Items no. 52 and 53, note that at their 4:00 p.M. Time certain a request to postpone these items till april 17, 2014 will be made. The time certain items for today, we were scheduled for a briefing, but that is now postponed until april 17, 2014. General citizens communication will be rescheduled for next week. Everyone who was signed up to speak at this meeting

[07:45:32]

will be rescheduled for april 17, 2014. At 2:00 p.M. We'll take up our zoning matters, and at 3:00 p.M. The austin housing and finance corporation meeting will take place after a temporary recess in the council meeting -- correction, the austin housing finance corporation meeting will be postponed until april 17, 2014 also. At 4:00 p.M. We have our public hearings, and at 5:30 live music and proclamations. Excuse me, I'm checking something here. The consent agenda today is items 1 through 35, with several items that are pulled off. I will now read item no. 23, which are appointments and waivers to our boards and commissions. That item will remain on the consent agenda. To the downtown commission jim nix is mayor leffingwell's nominee and to the asian american quality of life advisory commission, richard jung is mayor leffingwell's nominee. Approve a waiver of the requirement in of the city code for the service of richard jung on the asian american quality of life advisory commission. Items pulled off consent, item no. 4 is pulled by myself. Item 26 pulled by council member spelman and tovo. Item 32 is pulled by council

[07:47:32]

member morrison. Items 34 and 35 are pulled off consent due to speakers. So I believe we have one speaker on the consent agenda, will macleod, is will here? You have three minutes. >> Good afternoon, mayor, council. Will macleod, long time no see. I'm here today posing items 24, 25, 26 and 27, 28, 30 and 34. A lot of them have to do with the waivers, fee waivers for permits. Why do we even have fee waivers -- fees to begin with if we keep waiving and waiving and waiving? I don't know about you but I'm taxed enough already, and I find it very appalling that we're just giving these waivers left and right while everyone else, well, they have to pay retirement. I thought there was transparency. I digress. The code amendment -- criteria relates to s.M.A.R.T housing project. I have a problem with this, because not all persons with disabilities can walk a half a mile. Let's reduce that to a quarter of -- a quarter of a mile, like they do in houston. Maybe the city of austin doesn't want persons with disabilities living in their community. I don't know about that. And item no.27 is approve a resolution amending the city's state legislative agenda to include support

[07:49:33]

for legislation, increases the statewide minimum wage, or authorizes municipal governments to enact higher minimum wage. Okay, simple economics here. When you raise the minimum wage, guess what the businesses -- private businesses are going to do? Are they going to say, oh, that's okay, we're just going to pay our workers more money? No, they're going to start laying off people. You know what? I would like to see a resolution from the city to repeal obamacare, because that's really hurting jobs right now. That's cutting people's workforce hours from 30 hours a week down to 25. Congressional budget office doesn't seem to think that makes any difference, it doesn't apply. Well, since when does the congressional budget office speak the truth? I don't see them -- I can't count on my president to speak the truth and uphold the constitution, much less this congressional budget office telling us what's right. I think private businesses should set their wages. I'm tired of this government intervention, okay? I am a taxpayer. You are a public servant. You're supposed to answer to me, not the other way around. That's why we have a constitutional republic, and I would kindly appreciate it if you vote no on 27 and modify no.26 to where it includes a quarter of a mile instead of a half a mile, so people don't have to walk up steep hills. Thank you very much. >> Mayor leffingwell: Okay that's all the speakers I have on the consent agenda. Council member morrison? >> Morrison: I believe there was one other change in corrections -- >> I'm signed up to speak on no.4. >> Mayor leffingwell: That item has been pulled off consent. >> Okay. >> Morrison: One other item, to add myself as a co-sponsor. >> Mayor leffingwell: If I didn't say that, the clerk will note that on item 34 is

[07:51:34]

amended to add council member morrison as a co-sponsor. >> Morrison: Thank you. >> Mayor leffingwell: So I'll entertain a motion to approve the agenda. >> Approval. >> Mayor leffingwell: Council member spelman seconds. I'm voting no on items 24 and 33. So all in favor of the motion to approve the consent agenda say aye. >> Aye. >> Mayor leffingwell: Aye. Opposed say no. That passes on a vote of 7-

0. So without objection, council, we will now go into recess for approximately 30 minutes.

[08:30:52]

>> Mayor Leffingwell: We are out of recess and now we'll take up those items pulled on the consent agenda beginning with item number 4, which I pulled off consent and we do have one speaker, bill oaky. You will have three minutes. >> Thank you, councilmembers. I submitted a detailed set of recommendations to each of your offices and what I'm asking you to do is establish some defined criteria to measure these requests for spending the budget surplus. It's too vague as it's currently written and I am also asking for specific language for future councils that states in writing that saving and investing the money for taxpayers is one of the options for a budget surplus and that it can be used to off set a potential tax increase in the next year's budget or it could remain in the reserves which also helps the taxpayers. And the other thing that I would really like for you to consider, and this is kind of a new idea, is that I'd like to you put language in there that allows for you to potentially transfer money from a budget surplus over to the water utility. Because this year the water utility is in serious financial trouble and there's a possibility of a rate increase which I believe the ratepayers would perceive to some extent as punishment for doing a good job on water conservation. And so I can't think of a better way to use this budget surplus. I'm aware it needs a legal analysis, but I hope we don't have a jacob's well situation where you could crawl down into the fall but you'll die trying to find your way back there the other direction. It seems like it should be permissible. And basically without going

[08:32:53]

into a lot of detail on all of my recommendations, I just think that the budget surplus should not be spent except for critical needs. And so I did agree with the public safety provision and that if it earns additional revenue then that's a viable prospect for spending the surplus, and I want to thank mayor leffingwell and councilmember kathie tovo and her assistant for the great, wonderful feedback and help in my efforts to revise this policy and tighten the language. Both of you have been most accommodating and I'm sure the taxpayers will appreciate that as well. And I'm inviting everyone to go to austinaffordability.com and learn how to make austin more affordable. The tag line is let's put the public's ability to pay into austin's planning process. Thank you very much. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Thank you, mr. Oakey. I agree with a lot of what you said and in fact have already su publicly that we take a look at possibly rebating back to the water utilities some of the money they transfer -- I don't know about the legal issues involved, that's something we have to look into, but I think that's something we have to have on the table as we go into budget discussions for next year. So the -- actually I think the policy as drafted was very good and, however, the precedent has been set around this place for a while to occasionally make minor tweaks to good resolutions, and if there is a resolution for approval on the table, I would like to offer a couple of friendly amendments. Councilmember martinez moves approval.

[08:34:54]

Councilmember spelman seconds. And so first -- I'll offer it as a friendly amendment, but this would be a

change to item 3-2 i, and the change would be change it to read there is verifiable evidence that significant costs or risks associated with delaying funding until the new budget cycle; or. That would be my first friendly amendment just making that small change this would basically tighten it up. Instead of saying there is, this would say there's very verifiable evidence to show there are significant costs or risks associated. >> Mayor? >> Mayor Leffingwell: Yes. >> So you would be replacing currently with that language. >> Mayor Leffingwell: It would now read: There is verifiable evidence of significant costs or risks associated, dot, dot, dot. Is that acceptable? >> Spelman: Sure. >> Mayor Leffingwell: And the second suggestion I would offer is under item 3 iii where it begins, costs and increases are fully off set, I tried to look at a number of different ways to try to make that not quite so vague and put some hard evidence into it and so forth and I finally decided probably the best solution for me would be to delete the entire paragraph. Because I think if -- if it is truly, there are costs involved and bring in a lot

[08:36:55]

of revenue or it would cost a lot of money to develop it, that would be covered under 1 I and 2 i. So my offering would be to change 3 iii to delete 3 iii and renumber the rest of the section. Councilmember Riley. >> Riley: Mayor, that paragraph is one that was proposed by staff, and I see Mr. Vaneu and I wonder if you could share your thoughts as to why that paragraph was suggested. My understanding is that related in particular to grant opportunities and was based on experiences in which the city was able to procure a grant and the language was simply intended to enable us to accept the grant midyear. Is that correct? >> Well, I think the -- one of the items that came to mind when we did this one and I think a couple years ago we amended the planning department's budget to add 12 FTEs AND COMBINED WITH That was some fee increases in the planning department sufficient to off set the COST OF THOSE FTEs. So it was a specific program need and they brought forward a proposal to increase development fees and off set the costs. It was all one package. And that those revenues really couldn't be used for anything else. We did use an example in here, you know, such as grant funds because it was a convenient way for us to talk about a situation where like when you get grant money, you are only going to use it for this specific program, not something else, but this policy is intended to to be the general fund. So it wouldn't apply to grants anyway and that's one thing to consider about would this policy apply to everything, but the grant funds are considered a separate source of funding for the general fund. That said, they are an example of a funding source that can only be used for the specific purpose. But I think the thing that you would potentially be

[08:38:56]

limiting yourself by in regards to this is if there was a short-term rental, I think the short-term rental was something that came to council mid budget year and it was going to be off set by the fees charged on short-term rentals. That would be something that would have to be done without that third paragraph. >> Riley: I think I remember the situation you were describing where we talked about an adjustment to fees for purposes of adding more staff for development review and that was at a time we realized we had a real problem in developmental review with processing of permits and so on and staff advised us they had looked at our fees in relation to the comparable fees in other cities and determined

it would make some sense to adjust ours upward to enable us to hire more staff to process those permits more efficiently. And I think that was a very smart move and I'm very glad that we made that move and I think it made a lot of sense but I'm not sure without that language in paragraph 3 how we would justify some change like that because it's not -- it's not necessarily relating to a natural disaster. I suppose you could argue that it relates -- that -- that slow processing of permits very phiable costs or risks, but that seems like a little bit of an awkward fit. Really the paragraph as proposed fits that situation very well and I think demonstrates why that's -- why it might make some sense to keep language like that. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember, that was already accepted as a friendly amendment. We're now talking about 3 iii. >> Riley: That's right, mayor, that's exactly the language time talking about. The language in 3 iii is the language that ed was

[08:40:57]

describing that was based on our experience when we wanted to add staff for purposes of processing permits and we would do that by making adjustment to our fees to off set the costs. We did that midyear. I think it was actually long overdue and I would have been very sorry to have to wait even for months longer in order to make an adjustment like that. I really think we need to have the flexibility to make appropriate adjustments to staffing when that -- and I'm fine with that being done midyear when the costs can be off set by new revenue. So I would support retaining the language as I've drafted by staff. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Okay, well, mr. Manino when we had discussion with you I understood this was basically your recommendation was this would work well with that paragraph deleted. So I'm a little confused about what your position is now. >> I think my response to staff was by removing this it makes the policy stricter than it currently is and I didn't necessarily have a concern with making the policy stricter than it currently is, but it would potentially create the situation where there are some things like the planning and development review item that you would have to find some other clause in this policy to fit it under. So maybe under clause 2 where it says by not adding the planning staff we're creating a significant risk to the city or creating a cost because we're not collecting the revenues if we were to do this amendment. You would have to find another clause for it to fit under, but I think by removing it, it does create -- makes the bar a notch higher. So if the intent is to make the bar higher for midyear budget amendments, I think that achieves it. >> Mayor Leffingwell: And that was the intent because

[08:42:57]

there is -- if it is a significant cost or a significant risk, it would come in under another. If it's not significant, then -- not verifiably significant, then it wouldn't. I just felt this was a way of strengthening, tightening it up a little bit. Councilmember martinez. >> Martinez: I agree with the mayor and councilmember riley, but I do agree that language that was added in 2 i, having verifiable evidence could certainly fit a midyear budget adjustment for planning development review if we determine that we have a spike in inspections and commensurate with the fees that are raised, not making this adjustment creates -- it's verifiable evidence and potentially creates a risk of harming our local economy, slowing down the process for small businesses. So I actually do see where -- I can't see where a scenario would come up as long as we have verifiable evidence and significant costs or risks associated, how that

wouldn't be captured under that. >> I agree and that was my understanding from talking with your staff, mayor, essentially if it's an extraordinary circumstance, if it's a natural disaster, a public health emergency, if there's a significant cost or risk associated with delaying, then that item would be able to move forward, revenues notwithstanding. It may have revenues associated, if not. If it doesn't meet the criteria, even if it has revenues associated with it may be it would be more prudent to have that decision wait until the budget process if it's not critical even if there's revenue associated with it, maybe it's more prudent to wait until the budget cycle. That was the understanding from staff and I think removing number 3 would accomplish that and staff would not have aversion to removing number 3 but it puts the bar up another in which as to what would be allowable. And I think there's been two that I can think of, the

[08:44:57]

planning item and short-term -- >> Martinez: Mayor, we discussed in the work session, I think the language that you added to 2 I is exactly what was thrown out that if we could try to eliminate some subjectist, and I know we have haven't eliminated it, but putting language like verifiable evidence I think the intent is to create at least a little less subjectivity. I'll support this in the policy but if we want to vote it or or down. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember spelman. >> Spelman: You mentioned grant awards don't count and I presume that's because grants are put into -- rather than the general fund. >> In grant funds. >> Spelman: But whether we actually spend them, don't we have to transfer them out of grant funds into the -- for example, if they are for salaries? >> No, the salaries get paid out of the grant funds that are established. >> Spelman: Okay. If we are accepting grant funds is still -- and although this is intended for purposes of the general fund, the general fund is not specifically referenced in this amendment, in this amendment anywhere. >> It's referenced in the title so our financial policies are organized as general policies, general fund policies and then we have some specific policies for our enterprise operation. This policy currently is under the general fund section and the revised language would be under the general fund section. >> Spelman: For example, significant costs or risks to fail to accept a \$14,000 grant from department of public safety, it still wouldn't fit under this, we couldn't have -- we could just accept the money who has nothing to do with general fund. >> That's correct. >> Spelman: I'm okay with it, mayor. >> Mayor Leffingwell: So that's incorporated into the motion and that's all I have.

[08:46:58]

Mayor pro tem. >> Cole: We had significant discussions in work session I believe briefly in audit and finance about bond proceeds and the fact that they would not be covered by this policy. I just want to ensure that is the case and that you considered that. >> We did consider that and yes, midyear amendments to appropriate additional funds out of bond dollars or for other capital needs were not envisioned. The only way they would be covered under this policy is if we were proposing to take money from our general fund and transfer them to a capital prom, but bond proceeds would not be in that category. >> Cole: Okay, we just had some discussion and confusion about that so I wanted to clear that up. >> Mayor Leffingwell: All right. Ready to vote? All in favor of the motion as amended say aye. >>

Aye. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Opposed say no. Passes on a vote of 7-0. And that brings us to item number 26 which was pulled by councilman spelman and tovo. We have two speakers. Do you want to go to speakers first, councilmember tovo? All right. Stewart hirsch. >> Thank you, mayor and members of the council. My name is stewart harry hirsch and like most in austin I rent. I'm here to support the city council resolution to consider a smart housing code amendment before next budget year guide affordable housing investment of federal, city and state resources. You've heard from some that you should continue the current policy of city staff making decisions on transit oriented policies. With stakeholder meetings occurring before any guideline changes. But the city council is the appropriate body for making

[08:48:59]

policy decisions on how to balance goals of serving the poorest among us, involving affected neighborhoods and housing investment decisions, increasing opportunities for the poor to live in more neighborhoods rather than fewer neighborhoods, and making sure that pedestrians and people with disabilities access housing that meets smart standards. Please pass the draft resolution and initiate the community conversation on investment of our scarce affordable housing resources for pedestrians and people with disabilities who need housing and public transit that they can truly access. Thank you very much for your consideration. And I'm happy to answer any questions you may have of me. >> Mayor Leffingwell: One question by councilmember spelman. >> Spelman: I agree with everything you said. At the work session betsy spencer suggested she believes the takeup rate on smart housing as dropped over the last few worries. Fewer developers are taking advantage of smart housing. Her concern was that we need to do take a broader look at the entire program. Do you think that's a good idea? >> I think it's a good idea because I think the takeup rate has been declining since 2008 so I totally embrace the idea of revisiting smart housing altogether. I also think short term we really need to talk about whether we're providing affordable housing for those of us who may be pedestrians or with disabilities, not being able to physically get from what that housing is built to the nearest transit stop. >> Spelman: In that case we agree. Thank you, sir. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Child. >> Riley: Sir, you've been around since the inception of the smart housing program and you are an active participant in many discussions around smart housing so I just wanted to ask you since there has been discussion recently about what we meant by including the five elements, the

[08:51:01]

s-m-a-r-t, there's been suggestion if you had some of those elements that maybe we could do without some of the others. My understanding was that we really expected to see all five of the elements of smart housing. Is that your understanding as well? >> Yes, sir. Paul hilgers used to call me the godfather of smart housing because no harm would come to freddy as long as our mother was alive. I brought the 2004 housing guide which you all had in your hands, your predecessors did when you adopted smart housing and the question we used to ask is there a bus route within a quarter mile with peak hour service every 20 minutes or less. So that used to be the gate keeper standard. You couldn't apply for austin housing finance money, you couldn't apply for fee waivers, fast track review, all the other

benefits unless you meet that criterion or establish with public works and capital metro how if that wasn't in place today, it would be in place by the time your development was built and so if you couldn't meet that standard, those cases never before you. I think it's still worth a conversation whether that's still appropriate. I think it is for those of us that might have to rely on public transportation and I welcome the conversation on that. >> Riley: Why do you think it's so important to have affordable housing located conveniently to transit? >> Because some of the poorest among us don't own cars and so their only ability to get around is public transportation and if there are no sidewalks or the sidewalks are not accessible from where you come out of the housing on private property to where you access that bus stop or that transit stop, then you have to be a -- you have to participate in the para olympics to be able to get from here to there. And when we have such scarce resources and have such competition for those scarce resources, I think we should be selective about who gets to play and who gets to compete. >> Riley: Thanks very

[08:53:02]

much. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Next speaker is will McCloud. Will McCloud. Will McCloud is not here. So councilmember spelman and/or tovo. Councilmember spelman. >> Spelman: Mayor, I have a proposed amendment but I think it might be better if we have a motion on the table first. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Right. And so now would be the time. >> Riley: I'll move approval. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember riley moves approval, councilmember martinez seconds. >> Spelman: Now that a main motion is on the table, I've proposed an amendment to it which I'm handing out. This is consistent with my question for mr. Hirsch and with our conversation on tuesday. It seems to me that we're missing an opportunity if we only look at one piece of smart housing given the sma and r may be if not failing at least staggering given where we were when we first started this experiment back IN THE 1990s, BACK WHEN Fredo's mother was alive. Whereas the number of units built under smart housing has diminished in recent years suggesting the program no longer provides benefits it once did. Whereas out reach to developers who built or considered building may identify opportunities for program improvement thus increasing participation. This seems to me this is encompassing the basic idea that smart housing is not what once was and we ought to look at it to improve takeup rate. The second amendment is be it resolved in the version that was circulated by councilmember riley a couple of days ago and this would add the key part here is that it would add the phrase

[08:55:02]

engage stakeholders in a conversation on the benefits and costs to developers of building under smart housing and on the effects of amending this transit criteria. Transit criteria is here. It has to be I believe part of what we're discussing. We would be assessing something broader since we're already going to be engaging the stakeholders, we might as well talk about broad subjects, not just the narrow subject of the t criteria. >> Mayor Leffingwell: So your amendment is deleting on the proposed amendment. Is that part of your amendment? >> Spelman: Yes, but only because it makes the words run a little more clearly. That doesn't remove anything from the original investigation, it just adds a little bit. >> Mayor Leffingwell: I just wanted to make sure I had the code right. Deleting that language and adding the

language on the benefits and costs. All right? Is that acceptable to the maker? >> Riley: Very much so. >> Mayor Leffingwell: And the second, so that's incorporated into the motion. And that would be adding the two whereases, deleting language in line 1 and adding language in lines 3 and 4 of the second resolved. >> Spelman: And the last line too, mayor. >> Mayor Leffingwell: In the -- yes, in the next to last line. Further discussion? Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: I just distributed an amendment, this is the same one, it still has the last date on it. This is the same one I distributed at our last hearing. While I appreciate the changes that have been made to this to make it -- to exclude the tax credit program, this still would be -- this still would affect our smart housing developments, proposed developments as well as our g.O. Bond developments. We had a discussion on tuesday about the accident to which is this is currently a problem and we had asked staff if they could provide some data to show whether our past smart housing developments have -- would meet this criteria and also how our g.O. Bond

[08:57:03]

developments that we have invested public funds in, how they would score on this proposed criteria. And it's my understanding that staff have -- have provided -- do have a map that they can show us that provides some insight. And I know we have transportation staff here as well. >> Good amp, betsy spencer. I believe the response was provided to all of you with that map in it. And on that map I can explain there's three data points basically that we were able to put on that map. So on that first you will see -- do all of you have the map with you? I apologize. Okay. So the yellow dot for the projects that have been funded by the 2006 g.O. Bond allocation. The small black dots is the information from cap metro for bus stops. And then around each bus stop is a half mile radius -- the gray, the gray shading around so for each bus stop there is a half mile radius c that surrounds each of the bus stops. In the final piece on there is there sidewalk information as we have from the transportation department. It's just an overlay of sidewalks. So that's the information that we were able to pull together, so this is just an effort to show and demonstrate where the investment has been made by the g.O. Bonds in relation to bus stops and sidewalks. It in no way is making the statement regarding the accessibility of the bus -- of the sidewalk or the condition of the sidewalk is just showing you based on a file that we received sidewalks, bus stops and where we have invested the g.O. Bonds for multi-family projects. >> Tovo: Is it possible to get a copy up on the screen? I can share mine.

[08:59:18]

So I had heard from some individuals who were looking at past projects that were especially fended through our g.O. Bond project many were located close to bus stops and it looked from my cursory view of the map, it looked as if that has been the case. >> Yes, ma'am. >> Tovo: So there has been a lot of discussion at our work session and in our past discussion about this agenda item. There's been a lot of discussion about the t in smart housing and transportation generally as taking a thing -- of it being less of a consideration and I wonder if you could talk, miss spencer, about how valued a criterion it is in your staff assessment of proposals as they come forward. >> I would say it's a very important part, all are equally weighted. It has not been a recent occurrence we have relaxed the standards. In 2008 the department utilized the guidelines to a half mile radius to a bus stop. So it's not been a new thing. All

five areas are equally important and actually in the last probably two years really taken a look to make sure that there actually is a route. As best we can, not just as the crow flies. A much more concerted effort on that in the last two years. But the guidance was given to us 2008. It's not been a recent thing. That was because the incentive had -- there wasn't a lot of development and perhaps mr. Hirsch can speak to that but the development had dropped off and there weren't many applications that were making it through. So in effort to ensure that there was affordable housing for folks, there was a relaxation to that guideline. >> Tovo: But in the last couple of years it has been -- you have -- >> and we've actually denied smart housing requests

[09:01:18]

because of that. >> Tovo: But I'm thankful to you, appreciative, rather, of you going through that because I think there has been a lot of discussion that suggests transportation and access to public transportation hasn't been a value staff has brought to the review and I think we all share the view and I want to be very clear that it seems to me the staff has been -- has that as an important value as you look at these applications. As I look at this map, I'm concerned about the absent sidewalks because that would suggest to me it's going to be very difficult to find locations in town that are going to meet the proposed criteria that's before us. I don't know who the appropriate staff member is to speak to that. And again, I want to emphasize I am fully supportive of making sure that families and individuals who are living in housing that we have supported through public investment have access to public transportation if that's the option they choose to use, and also that they have an accessible path for getting there. But it should be a consideration for us here to whether this policy is really going to prevent the construction and development of affordable housing as we move forward. As I look at this map, I get really concerned when I see the extent of the absent sidewalks in our city. Could someone from -- I don't know miss spencer, if you want -- am I accurately interpreting -- >> I do not feel comfortable speaking to the sidewalks .>> Tovo: I WONDER IF Anyone from the transportation department. >> Good afternoon. Howard lazarus, public works department. The map you see is the base map that shows the missing sidewalks as drawn from the sidewalk master plan. In that plan when it was presented to council several years ago, we had about \$800 million of missing sidewalks and about \$120 million noncompliant sidewalks. The bond moneys that we've

[09:03:19]

had since that point in time are used towards addressing noncompliant sidewalks. There's a metric within the plans that prioritizes the work we have to do and certainly access to affordable housing is one of the metrics that's in there. As are access to transit and then some opportunities to adjust the scores based on other factors. That document has been our guide and where we have focused work to fill in the missing sidewalks and recent ordinances we have had more sidewalks and a program with capital metro to address accessibility of their sidewalks which is two million a year for five years. We've married those two programs to increase the accessibility from corridors into neighborhoods. As we go forward to answer your question directly with that background that there are new affordable housing projects brought forward, we certainly have the flexibility and ability to adapt where we were to work in concert

with those projects. >> Tovo: That to me though would suggest a slightly different sequence than the one year considering here. What we have before us is a proposal that would not allow the allocation of housing dollars to areas of town that don't have that infrastructure in place. What I think I hear you saying is that you have the ability within public works to prioritize how you spend your funds, how you spend your limited sidewalk funds given the need and you can direct those sidewalk dollars to areas where we have -- where we know we're going to have public investment in affordable housing and those -- and those families that are going to live in those units access to public transit. >> That's absolutely correct. >> Tovo: So -- thank you very much.

[09:05:22]

So before you, I have, as I mentioned, distributed an amendment that I believe would be a more appropriate step at this point. We have -- we have gotten a lot of information from staff, but I don't think we have really to me as we discussed on Tuesday, there might be multiple recommendations for how we might -- hold alternatives for how we might address this situation and what we've just heard from our public works director is that the sidewalk investments can follow the housing. If we have to limit ourselves in terms of making investments, making decisions about affordable housing to the areas that already have sidewalks in place we're going to be challenged in doing that because of all the red. And in the places that are not red, that has sidewalks, I don't believe staff was able to come to assessment of how many of those are accessible. Even in areas where we have sidewalks noted as present, I don't believe they had the time to -- to analyze whether or not those sidewalks are accessible. So as I've said on the couple times we've talked about this before, I think we really need -- I agree we need to have a stakeholder conversation about this for all of the reasons that we've discussed. But I am very concerned that if we initiate a code amendment we're setting ourselves on a path that is eventually going to result in creating impediments to the construction of affordable housing rather than encouraging it. And I know we all share a goal of encouraging as much affordable housing as we can, of diverse types in all types of town and that's really going to be a challenge if we adopt this as a policy and set out the path of a code amendment. We can do all the things we've talked about, we can have that discussion, we can have the stakeholders come in and talk to us about ways to better encourage the location near transit rich areas, but we really do need to have that conversation before we arrive at a solution.

[09:07:25]

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Have you made a proposal or do you intend to? >> Tovo: Thanks. I move approval of the amendments before you. I'm going to suggest them as friendly amendments. And they would remove the first be it therefore resolved and replace it and then edit the second be it further resolved as follows, as indicated on this paper. Basically it's removing the initiation of the code amendment and replacing it with language that directs the city manager to gather input from stakeholders. And then in the last be it further resolved I've done basically the same thing. Ask the city manager instead of returning with a code amendment to return with a summarization of stakeholder feedback. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Do you except all of those as friendly? >> Riley: I don't accept any of those. You can propose

-- >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember riley, go ahead. >> Riley: I would like to speak to that motion. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: I would like to make this as a formal amendment and I'm including those because they stand or fall together. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Motion by councilmember tovo to amend the existing already amended motion, seconded by councilmember morrison. Councilmember riley. >> Riley: I would like to speak to the motion. The main up shot of the motion would be to change the resolution from one initiating and code amendment to one that simply seeks input without initiating any amendment at all. And that defeats -- that defeats the purpose -- the main purpose of the amendment. I can't support it. And I want to say a few words about why I think the amendment is important. And just for context on that, I think it would be helpful to speak a little more concretely in regard to a couple projects that we've seen just recently that for me kind of raised questions about the way that the smart housing housing program is currently working.

[09:09:26]

The first that I want to -- I'd actually -- I don't often do power points but I have a few slides I would like to share on this subject. >> Mayor Leffingwell: There's a limit of four slides. >> Riley: I think I may have about four or maybe one or two more than that. >> Spelman: I object, mayor. [Laughter] >> Riley: First, first just for context, I [inaudible] and I know many of are familiar with walk score but some of you may not be. That's a tool many people are using nowadays to assess the -- how walkable a particular location is. It's not a perfect tool, but it's about the best one out there. It looks at shops and services within a convenient distance of any particular location. And it gives you a score for that location. It can also give you a composite score for a whole city. What I'm showing are scores for austin. Austin has a walk score of 35 meaning it is -- you below austin is a car dependent city with a walk score of 35. It is the 34th most walkable city in the use. Transit score low at 33. Bike score is better, I'm proud to say up at 45. So the two projects that I want to talk about, the first are the cardinal point project on zimmerman lane that we considered three weeks ago. What caught my attention with that was -- first the walk score is about the same as the city as a whole. What's notable is the transit score. You heard mr. Hirsch talk about the history of the smart housing program and we used to expect it within a quarter mile of good transit service, 20 minutes or more within a quarter mile. This location we have recently approved has a transit score of 9. Far more -- far less transit friendly than the city as a whole. And then on parmer place,

[09:11:27]

february 27, walk score 34, lower than the citywide come pros it transit score of 21. Significantly less transit friendly than the city as a whole. That raised questions to me as to whether we were really taking seriously any expectation that these locations be well served with transit. These are not places that are more transit friendly than the city as a whole. They are in fact for transit dependent. And if you look more carefully at the actual details of that situation, if we could go on to the second slide, at the one alan zimmerman lane to give you more context and help convey what the situation was out there, the project is about .8 miles away from a bus route. And then if you want to take a look at what that -- what a walk to that bus stop would entail if you lived at that project, if you go to the next slide, settings out on zimmerman lane, this is where you were walking setting out to walk from your home to the bus stop,

walking on this street with no shoulder or sidewalks, that would take you to 620. This is where you would be walking along, again, no sidewalks, 55-mile-an-hour traffic. You would be walking along 620 to get to your bus route. When you get to the bus stop, if you get to the next slide, what you would find is there's one northbound bus at 6:00 a.M., Two southbound buses at 5:00 and 6:00 p.M., And that's it. There's no service on the weekends. And remember what mr. Hirsch was telling us about when we first started this program, we expected buses every 20 minutes and now we're at one a day northbound at 6:00 a.M., Two southbound buses at 5:00 and 6:00 p.M. And not on the weekends. That's the extent of your transit service if you are in that location. So it's not a walkable route and once you get there it's not a good bus route. If we can go -- let's skip

[09:13:30]

forward a couple slides to the one at parmer place. This was the one we approved back in february. This one also raised very serious questions for me because whew we heard -- what you see here is -- actually back one slide, I think. Yeah, there we go. This route -- in this case what we heard was staff was -- staff approved this one because they said it's within a half a mile of the bus route. Yes, if you are a crow and you can fly, it is true that it is within -- as the distance a crow flies it is within a half mile. But if like most of us you actually have to walk or stay -- otherwise stay on the ground to get there, the distance is .8 miles. And to get to a bus route. And then let's look at what that route would be like if you tried to walk along it. You would be -- you would find yourself on east parmer lane, I believe that's 45-mile-an-hour traffic, no sidewalks. You would have .6 miles to go there. The next slide, yes, there you see east yager lane, 40 miles an hour. No sidewalks. To get you to the nearest bus stop. Once you get to the bus stop if you manage to get there, what you find is that the buses -- bear in mind this is in far northeast austin. The buses are eastbound only from the location that's already in far east austin, there are only eastbound buses. [One moment, please, for change in captioners]

[09:16:08]

>> so I think there's a problem here. It's especially problematic to me when I look at how we as a council have addressed this issue in the past when I look at our comprehensive plan I see that we as a city have set very lofty and -- set lofty and important goals with respect to land use and housing. And if our housing policy, h-np 4, we specifically said in our comprehensive plan, we emphasized strategies such as coordinating and planning for housing near public transportation networks and employment centers, to reduce household transportation costs and vehicle miles traveled. Under our land use and transportation policies, lntp 3, we said we wanted to promote development in compact senators, long corridors connectedly long roads and trans-it's and designed to encourage bicycling and reduce housing and transportation costs. So how have we taken that policy and integrated it smart s.M.A.R.T housing standards? Our current city code provides nothing in that direction. Our s.M.A.R.T housing code compliance say in section 21-1-703 of our land development code says s.M.A.R.T housing must comply with the transit oriented guidelines adopted by the director. That is it. That is all this council has done in terms of decreeing what we expect to see in terms of affordable housing, and I don't think that that is a very -- a very adequate reflection of the policies that we as a community have adopted in terms of our

expectations of housing in this community. And I think it is -- this is -- I agree fully with mr. Hirsch that this is a policy matter that council needs to speak to. We have not done that in an adequate way, and over time this problem is only going to get worse, because more -- you would expect, as more and more people are interested in locating -- in finding locations in transit oriented developments and along transit corridors, places that are well served by transit, you would expect land costs to go up in those areas because they are in

[09:18:09]

higher demand. What does that mean? That means the cheaper land is going to be places that are not well served, and if we direct our housing department just to develop housing however they can, we've heard from our director the other day, on tuesday, that they will be opportunists, and they will take the opportunities where they find them and we can fully expect those opportunities to turn up in precisely those areas where we don't want to see additional development, in those places that are not well served with transit. So it's critically important that this council step up, adopt in our code policies that reflect our comprehensive plan and the need to situate housing near transit, and for that reason I think it's very important we reject this amendment and we proceed with a code amendment. So that's why I do not support the proposed amendment to the motion. >> Mayor leffingwell: That that was more than four slides. Council member martinez? >> Martinez: I completely agree. This is a complicated issue and I agree with points council member riley is making. I also understand the concern about proceeding forward with a code amendment but because we have an affordable housing developer in the audience who's done work in austin, I want to ask, walter, if you could briefly share with us our sentiments. I know you had a direct hand in crafting this item in helping us with a lot of language and I appreciate you doing that. But wanted to ask you if you could share with us a few of our experiences as it relates to locating these housing units next to transportation. >> I'm walter moreau, the director at foundation communities. I didn't know you were going to highlight our cardinal point proposal in the four points area but as an illustration of how complicated this can be, I think I wanted to highlight a few things. Our mission is to create housing where families succeed. We want transit options for families we built an m station and tod -- first

[09:20:10]

affordable housing in downpours austin. We have to leverage state and federal tax lawsuits which are now because of fair housing, being driven to higher income areas especially west austin. We love the location of the four points project. There are over 500 retail and service jobs within a mile of our site, so low income folks that work at h.E.B. And wal-mart and home depot and concordia and the other employers in the area, they're driving from a long-distance to get there. That area has zero affordable housing. So we have an incredibly rare opportunity to build some affordable housing in a high -- high-performing schools and where jobs are plentiful. In the meantime we're going to add sidewalks to the street, we're going to work with cap metro to eventually get a route in the 620-2222 area which is kind of a hole on their map. If you adopted a policy that required a quarter mile or half mile bus stop, you're basically saying no affordable housing in west austin. So then you're going against another policy goal to

have affordable house engage all parts of town and you give us the opportunity to leverage the \$35 million a year from the state to build affordable housing. So whatever you craft has to dovetail with the state rules. I'm really nervous about initiating a land development code change because that train starts moving in that direction, and, you know, is there something you can craft that's in between a land development code change and nhcd's director having discretion? There's got to be some middle of the road. This is serious, this is important policy, but there's got to be some exceptions. We don't want unintended consequences. If austin doesn't craft this right, you're basically saying put all the -- the deal that will win will be in the suburbs, and they're even more transit

[09:22:12]

challenged. >> Cole: Mayor? >> Thanks. >> Mayor leffingwell: So council member martinez had the floor. Is that all you have? Council member morrison. >> Morrison: Walter, did you get to attend the forum last week when this was discussed at ut? >> I was out of town, about you our design director was there, and -- >> morrison: Because of one of the things that she mentioned, shelly peticha, was alternatives that could be looked at, for instance, targeting different allocations of funds to make sure that there might be some left over for high-opportunity areas, and -- but acknowledging the goal that we all have of linking housing and transit, targeting the lion's share there. Do you have any comment on that as an option? >> I think on a federal level there's -- you know, they are under fair housing pressure to try to locate affordable housing in all parts of town. >> Morrison: So are we. >> As is the city, as is the state. At the same time transit options and connectivity is hugely important to families and to the community too. So they've got to try to balance those two. , You know, this matter, if our site on zimmerman lane is slated to win tax credits from the state in july, about \$12 million to build 124 units and a learning center, we have to get it zoned, it has to be zoned by august, we've got some nimbe opposition. They would love to latch on to this idea, no, no, no poor people there because there's no transit options. >> Morrison: I -- I guess I'd like to make a comment, because I supported this amendment that council member tovo suggested, which would be to go out and let's talk about alternatives and how do we achieve all of our goals, because I think that, you know, basically in our work that is our

[09:24:13]

responsibility, is balancing the money values, and the money priorities have and that's exactly what we have here, of trying to have all kinds of housing in all parts of town but also linking transportation and housing, clearly a high priority. You know, we have some really good work that's going on now that we've kicked off with our housing transit jobs, to look specifically about how we're going to get programs, to ensure that we have housing along our corridors, and I think the way this is -- the resolution is currently crafted without the amendment, it's clear to me that it weighs one priority above the others. If mr. Hirts said some of poorest among us don't own cars and some of the poorest among us work in areas where there's no transit and those are the jobs they can get and they drive there, and living there would be much more accommodating for them and give them an opportunity to live in that district. This resolution as it's been presented, it does finally add a broader perspective, but literally as an afterthought. It was added as an amendment. And I appreciate the amendment that council member

spelman has added that clarifies that, yeah, we really do want to being look at the whole program, but this is similar to an issue we had last week looking at initiating a code amendment in a way that I thought was premature and weighted the answer, and I think that -- I'm very, very concerned about taking that approach on a regular basis when I think there is absolutely no need to, and it's harmful. I think it's overzealous. I think it is unbalanced and narrow minded, and it's a siloed approach to try to achieve our many high priority values. The way it does now, the way the resolution is now, I believe that it sets one priority above all others, and denigrates the

[09:26:15]

importance of others that we have, and I think that's bad policy making. So I can't support it as it is. I support this amendment. >> Cole: Mayor? >> Mayor leffingwell: Mayor pro tem. >> Cole: I have some questions of walter and also some questions of howard. Walter, you said something that was real concerning to me, and that was the idea that we would, by adopting this resolution, say that affordable housing, especially that that is applying for federal tax credits, would only be located in east austin and not in west austin. Can you clarify that a little more for me? >> The federal credits, housing credits, are awarded by the state of texas. They've been embroiled in a fair housing lawsuit and as a result basically they are funding as directed to high-opportunity areas. So their scoring factors in high income, low poverty and good schools. And it's likely to stay that way for the future years. So it started last year, and for the next foreseeable years, if austin is going to compete for these affordable housing funds, it's going to be on sites that are in -- west of mopac. It's the only way to score competitively versus buda and georgetown and other suburbs. If you adopt a hard-and-fast standard on transit that conflicts with, you know, areas of west austin that don't have the sidewalks or don't have the bus stops, austin is unlikely to win any of the funding. >> Cole: Okay. >> That's confusing. >> Cole: It's not that confusing. I just need to ask a question of council member riley, if I may, mayor, because did you make an exemption for geographic --

[09:28:17]

I know that our comprehensive plan, and we've adopted as a council a goal of having all affordable housing dispersed throughout the city, and I certainly don't want us to take a position that limits -- or goes in conflict with that policy. >> Mayor leffingwell: Council member riley. >> Riley: Yes, as we discussed at the work session on tuesday, I did provide language that allows for exceptions with respect to the 9% tax credit projects that mr. Moreau is referring to, that really do have different state standards. I am hopeful about seeing some change to those state standards based on preliminary discussions with representatives with the texas department of housing and community affairs, that mr. Moreau participated in. That's why I'm hopeful about that, and in the meantime I think the exceptions in the -- in the resolution speak to that -- speak to allowing for some flexibility, and, in fact, this is not -- what we're talking about today is not the last word on this issue. If we -- if we approve this amendment today we will go forward with a process that will -- that specifically calls for consideration of potential exceptions or adjustments that would allow for situations in which we have, for instance, an area that may lack transit but has a cluster of jobs and homes that really make -- make dependence on cars less of

an issue, so that a low income family could actually thrive in that sort of a setting, and that -- as we discussed, that was something that was suggested at the -- at the conference on last friday, that if there is some -- that if you have an area that's fairly walkable, then that -- that may well be an acceptable substitute until such time as we -- as we are able to get transit there, and that's certainly consistent with the language we have here and we would -- this

[09:30:17]

would allow for situations like that. I think the important point is that currently our city code -- and our city code does not set any particular expectation about the t requirement of the smart handoutsing program. We set up a program that includes a t, includes some expectation about transit yet this council has said exactly nothing about what we expect from that t. Nothing. And so it could mean -- it could mean anything. It could mean a project located in the city that has a bus service. It is absolutely meaningless, and I think the policy is important enough that this council ought to have -- ought to set some expectations in terms of what we want to see, understanding that there is some value in flexibility for some situations where we don't currently have transit service but families might be able to thrive even without transit service because of -- because of a density -- certainly level of density of shops and services. But I think some -- this council needs to say something about what we expect from that t, because it is an important policy consideration. >> Cole: I totally understand wanting to address the t and I definitely support that. The language that you have in the amendment, the language that says, the code amendment process should consider distinguishing the smart transit requirements from austin projects applying for the competitive 9% tdhca housing tax credit program versus other projects desiring to use city of austin affordable housing funds. Is that the language that you intend to make room for high-opportunity areas, as mr. Moreau described them, that our affordable housing

[09:32:19]

dollars can be used for locating projects? >> Riley: That is one provision that speaks to that possibility. There's also separate language that says the code amendment process should include inclusion of exceptions or adjustments to the half mile requirement and that we intend to work with stakeholders to figure out exactly what that would look like so that we don't jeopardize our prospects for receiving funds in the future. >> Cole: Okay. I'm going to consider, while we continue the discussion, some language that speaks to -- I would like to add some language that speaks to -- >> mayor leffingwell: Right now we have a -- >> cole: We have an amendment. >> Mayor leffingwell: -- proposed amendment to the table. >> Cole: Okay. I have one other question of howard before we do that, before we vote on the amendment. >> Mayor leffingwell: Okay. >> Cole: Howard, you talked about our sidewalk backlog, and I think you used a number like 800 million. >> I did. >> Cole: You did. Has it been your experience -- and maybe just with you and betsy, that we have by and large been able to locate our housing projects throughout the city geographically and yet also been able to locate them in a pedestrian-friendly and accessible location? >> That's probably a better question for ms. Spencer. >> Cole: Okay. >> Yes, ma'am. So if you look at the map that we provided, for the geo bond funded projects they're all on a bus route. If you look at all the little black dots, there's -- I think we've done a pretty good job of making sure that

there was transportation nearby. I'm not going to argue

[09:34:20]

about -- that's -- whether that's been enough or not, but if you look at the go bond fund stuff there's a lot of bus stops by the projects. So I believe we've done a good job. >> Cole: So my concern there was that I didn't want to support a resolution that was going to hinder our ability to locate even a small number of our affordable housing projects geographically or just hinder our ability to put them in. And so it looks like you've been able to conquer both objectives. >> As mr. Moreau stated earlier, if you look at the west side of austin, there are a fair amount of areas where it might be more challenging to have a bus stop close by. The hardest part about all of this for me is it's real hard for us to be very concrete and I know you guys have asked several times, what would be the implication of this? And unfortunately I can't give you a real good answer. There's -- I feel like it could be a problem, but I cannot tell you specifically. This snapshot is a point in time. I don't know what the sidewalks looked like five years ago so I cannot give you a clear answer, had this been in place five years ago or had we met that standard, what would not have been funded. I feel that there could have been an impact. I cannot answer that for you clearly. One of the concerns that I have besides just the tax credits, we talk an awful lot about the tax credits and that's a huge part of the leverage that we get, and the challenges with that is the gap changes every year. A couple years ago transportation was more important. Now geographic dispersion, high opportunity areas is more important. I really can't say in two to three years what will be important in the texas gap. So tying anything to the tax credits or not -- I know you've pulled that out -- there's so much else that we do, and one of the things that concerns me is revitalizing areas. We have projects in some

[09:36:22]

depressed areas that the do not have good public transportation, and if we are left with a program where I cannot assist folks in depressed areas, that hopefully in the future we will have all the things that we want, good transportation, accessible routes. This is who we serve. This is what we do, and so -- but if we are -- when our hands are tied with a program -- and I can't yet get the sidewalks, and I appreciate -- I think howard and I actually probably have a pretty good way now of maybe getting better sidewalks. I don't have the bus routes yet. These are things that concerned me in more depressed areas that if I can't guarantee all that stuff is in place there might be some folks left out. So that's the only thing that concerns me about restricting this so much, and I'm assuming that's why in 2008 some of the guidelines that the director had the ability to enforce were relaxed. >> Cole: When you spoke to the federal guidelines often changing -- >> that is the state. >> Cole: I mean, the state -- >> the irs stays the same. Each state makes their own -- their own qualifications. The qualification allocation plan. Each state has the ability to do that within the irs tax code. And that does change every single year. >> Cole: So when we talk about a high-opportunity district, whose requirements are those? Are those federal or state? >> Currently that is the state. >> Cole: That is the state. >> Yes, ma'am. >> Cole: And so you're saying that those often change, so perhaps the better -- the best way to reference wanting to be in compliance with those, or having those as exceptions so that we do not lose that money, is to actually

refer to them as tdhca housing tax credit programs? >> I think it's fine to exclude the tax credits from the requirement in the sense that because they do change, and we don't want to impede that. My concern is that's not the

[09:38:23]

only leverage opportunity that we would want to consider that wouldn't be a part of it, which is the only reason why we're asking for some time in that analysis. Singling out the tax credits is the only thing for an exception -- as the only thing for an exception, it just doesn't account for all the other sources of funds that can help with affordable housing. It's a huge part of it, don't get me wrong. I just don't think it's the only exception. >> Cole: What other exceptions do you envision? >> Depressed areas might be one thing. I apologize, I'm not -- I don't have a list. That's really why we wanted the whole opportunity to talk to the different stakeholders. >> Cole: Well, I -- and I'll reference this question to council member riley. I believe we are -- and especially I know this is in council member spelman's amendment, which I plan -- once we vote on it, to support. -- Is that the other items will be considered during the process of the code amendment and -- as discussed in the resolution. Okay. Thank you, betsy. >> Spelman: Mayor? >> Mayor leffingwell: Council member spelman. >> Ms. Spencer, what you're asked to do in the current version of this resolution is two things. One of them is to hold that conversation among all the stakeholders, and develop not just the code amendment as is currently specified, but alternative language or additional language as necessary in order to address the problems you found after having that conversation and to come back to us by september 1. If instead of developing a code amendment all you were asked to do was have the conversation with the stakeholders, giving particular attention to the transit issues but the current version resolution includes a broader -- broader concerns as well. Could you come back to us before -- would you have time to get back to us significantly before september 1 or would it take that long? >> Then that would be august, correct? >> Spelman: Right. >> Right. >> Spelman: That would have to be august. >> Spelman: Right, because we don't meet in july. I believe we could come back in august with some

[09:40:24]

legitimate feedback and recommendations. >> Spelman: Okay. Thank you. I have a question of the manager or whoever the manager thinks would be the best person to answer this question. If we had information like this, we knew exactly what it is that we wanted to do that was a consensus among the stakeholders, the staff, the council, as to what changes in the code were necessary, what's the minimum amount of time it would take us to amend the code? >> That's a complicated process. Does the attorney have an idea of the sequence of -- >> mayor leffingwell: How long does it take to amend the code? >> Spelman: This is not the land development code, as I understand it, and therefore would not necessarily need to go through the codes and ordinances as subcommittee or planning commission. I believe this is something which we could just do de novo, if we had code language in front of us and had five votes we could do it on all three meetings in one -- readings in one meeting. >> Generally if it doesn't have to go through a particular board or commission, I don't think there's anything in here that -- I'm not sure. I would want to maybe check to see if it does have to go through our board and commission, but I don't

think it does. Rick is there. He can -- greg is there, he can tell us. >> Guernsey: There's a very good chance an amendment like this probably would go through a couple boards and commissions, given the type of amendment, when it -- what it might be affecting, you might see input from some, but we've had s.M.A.R.T housing items, certainly have coming before the planning commission in the past. We just had the uno items, as you recall, which took a little time to go through to talk about. Because of the sensitivity of affordability. So I would suggest perhaps 90 to 120 days would maybe be optimistic, dealing with changes to the s.M.A.R.T

[09:42:25]

housing program and affordable issues. >> Spelman: Would it be appropriate for me to distinguish between changes to the land development code, which have a fairly standardized process, and some clear benchmarks that had to be hit from changes s.M.A.R.T housing program which, although it makes a lot of sense for the planning commission to be involved, and I'm about to suggest an amendment that would require that, that's not a benchmark we have to hit. We don't have to go through a particular drill. >> Guernsey: No, you would not, I think, initially because it's not a land development item. If that's what you're planning to go to planning commission, but there's a lot of overlap. >> Sure. >> Between the possible amendment, if they didn't involve land development codes. >> Spelman: We've also -- the current version of the resolution already references the community development commission. We're already including one, it seems to me would not be too much of a stretch to ask the planning commission to be one of the stakeholders that ms. Spencer would be discussing this issue with, and given that we don't have to go through exactly the same drill as usual, which takes, I think -- I think the shortest period of time mr. Rusthoven suggested to us was six weeks if we wanted to change the land development code and go through that land development process. This is a lot shorter, if we can actually get a good read from our stakeholders and staff as to what needs to be done in the middle of august, we could still at the next meeting change the code by september 1. Wouldn't even need to slow us up. So I'm not certain that we need to initiate the code amendment process if we want to hit that mark of having the code amendment by september 1 in an appropriate way. I'd like to -- mayor, if I -- >> mayor leffingwell: That's not what I heard from mr. Guernsey. I think mr. Guernsey thought there might be a board and commission process and 90 to 120 days would be optimistic. Did I hear you wrong? >> Guernsey: No, mayor, I was talking about as

[09:44:26]

s.M.A.R.T housing applies with amendments to the land development code. We have those -- we have those changed. I think -- well, council member may be speaking not doing changes to the land development code and looking for input other ways. >> Spelman: The amendment in front of us does not involve the land development code at all. It's only changes to the small housing policy by ordinance. If it turns out that that conversation that spencer and her staff will have with stakeholders involves in addition to changes to the land development code that triggers the land development code process and that would take longer. That's not what we're talking about here. I'm trying to see whether or not we can hit that mark of september 1 or very close to it without necessarily initiating a code amendment

process in this resolution. And it seems to me if -- all we're trying to do is amend the s.M.A.R.T housing policy or at least consider amending the s.M.A.R.T housing policy, so long as we include the planning commission, who we think probably ought to be involved in things like this anyway, as stakeholders in the conversation, then we might be hitting that mark. >> That may be correct. You might have other commissions like cdc and others that might want to get into that as well. >> Spelman: Mayor, I have an amendment, if I could offer. I understand there's an amendment on the table. >> Mayor leffingwell: Right. >> Spelman: Well, let me give a suggestion, and I don't know whether this is in the form of a friendly amendment yet because I'm not quite sure what I'm going to say until I say it. Well, actually council member riley has a comment on what I've just said and what staff has said, I'll yield to council member riley if that's okay with you, mayor. >> Mayor leffingwell: That's fine. >> Riley: I didn't mean to interrupt but for consideration I thought I would point out that currently our s.M.A.R.T housing code provisions are contained in article 15 of the land development code. Article 15, chapter 25-1 of the land development code. So s.M.A.R.T housing is part of the land development

[09:46:27]

code. >> Okay. I appreciate that information. So would -- in that case would this require our going through the usual drill associated with any changes in the land development code? I would apologize for not knowing that but apparently mr. Guernsey didn't know that either, so I'm in very good company. >> I understood you to say that you wanted to take the policy issue before the board and commissions, seek their input, and if there was -- it was felt that there was a change, that we would go then to do a land development code amendment. It's difficult to divorce those two, as I was saying before, because they're pretty much interlinked, but I don't see an issue if you wanted to take an item -- boards and commissions to get their input and then come back after having their input and then decide whether you want to initiate a code amendment. >> Spelman: Okay. The premise, however, of my comment was that we could shorten the time associated with that code amendment process itself and it doesn't sound like we could given this is the land development code. >> Then I would agree and I wouldn't suggest that you would initiate the code amendment and have that discussion if you're trying to compress that time, if that is your goal. >> Spelman: Thank you. >> Mayor leffingwell: Council member morrison. >> Morrison: Greg, I'm -- greg, just a follow-up. I'm a little confused because we are saying the answer isn't known, let's just go ahead -- what's being suggested, the answer not known, let's go ahead and initiate the code amendment to get the ball rolling through boards and commissions, but we don't know what we're taking through boards and commissions, so why does it -- because the answer is not known yet because all these alternatives are supposed to be looked at. So why does that even hurry things up unless you're going to have a rubber stamp board and commission process? >> You may get to -- in the boards -- one of the boards and commissions that would actually offer you an amendment and the planning

[09:48:27]

commission could make a change to the code as well and then give you a recommendation for your consideration. That could come out of a process, if you're saying to the -- go to the boards and

commissions and you're asking them, this is kind of what we want to do, they could create the amendment and then we'd be bringing back to you, as opposed to seeking their input, getting their comments, coming back and asking for you to consider an amendment and then telling the city manager and staff to move forward with the code amendment. So -- >> morrison: So it speeds things up to initiate the code amendment if you have a concept of what you think the right answer is, but I guess I would just like to add that I think that it's clear that we don't know what the right answer is yet. And there are still things that haven't even been thought out. >> Weefl do the best we can, whatever -- we'll do the best we can whatever direction you give us. >> Morrison: Thank you. >> Mayor leffingwell: I guess I would disagree with that. I think there's enough specificity in the resolution to draft an ordinance and begin the process of taking it through the boards and commissions where there will be an opportunity for public input, to make amendments. There's also the one glaring problem that has been identified, I think council member riley has addressed that by making a change in his resolution, excluding those tax credit properties from this, but that -- the draft ordinance would be something to build on. It seems to me -- I want to emphasize that we're not voting on an ordinance today. We're voting on a resolution to a development ordinance, and I appreciate all the considerations that were outlined by ms. Spencer, and I know they'll be given consideration as we work our way forward in this. But I would -- see, we're all speculating about how long this might take. I would speculate if we go through the process of adopting the amendment that's before us right now and going -- and coming back sometime in august or the fall to try to direct the adoption of another -- of an

[09:50:28]

ordinance that's based on that stakeholder input, we might as well just say this is going to be into next year sometime for another council to consider. Council member tovo. >> Tovo: I appreciate that. It certainly may lengthen the time, but I think we'll have a better policy at the end, and I think our -- we should always err on the side of having better policy even if it's not as fast a process. Mr. Guernsey, I wanted to ask you about the planning commission can initiate a code amendment at any time, so as it moves forward, if there are recommendations that the stakeholders have identified that are alternatives they would like the planning commission -- the planning commission wants us to consider, they have the option of initiating a code amendment at that point after some of this community discussion has taken place. >> Yes. >> So they don't need to wait. It's certainly policy that along the way as these issues get discussed and vetted and really analyzed, there could be a code amendment initiated, or a series of code amendments initiated that would come back to us for our consideration. >> Spelman: Mayor? Anythi anythi ng is possible. Council member spelman? >> Spelman: I agree with that completely and I think it's also true after looking at this very specific code amendment, that this resolution requests the initiation of the process of, there's not any amendments to those amendments, any additions to those amendments, alternatives to those amendments would be a better idea or at least something else for us to consider. They could start those -- that ball rolling as well. So I'm not sure that the two are substitutes. I think the two might very well be complements. >> Tovo: Mayor? >> Mayor leffingwell: Council member tovo. >> Tovo: I wonder if we could find a middle ground here, because I do think when we -- when we present to our boards and commissions a particular code amendment that we want them to consider and provide recommendations about, they may limits themselves to that and not really

think broadly. What I'm asking, in my amendment, is really for the group to think broadly about what alternatives would best meet -- really to analyze the problem and then to look at what alternatives would best address the problem, rather than limit themselves

[09:52:29]

to the discussion of the solution that council member riley has proposed in this resolution. So I think there's a little bit of a difference in focus, but what if we worked out language in my amendment that asks the city manager to return with -- >> mayor leffingwell: Maybe the best way would be to withdraw your amendment -- >> tovo: No, I think I can -- >> mayor leffingwell: -- and propose a new one. >> Tovo: That's fine. I will withdraw my motion, if the second is agreeable, and amend my amendment. >> Mayor leffingwell: Is that agreeable? Go ahead. >> Tovo: -- As follows. The city manager is directed to summarize stakeholder feedback and report back to city council by september 30, 2014 -- let's summarize stakeholder feedback and report back come to city council with code amendments by sent 30 of 2014. Septem septem ber -- september 30. Septem septem ber 30? >> Tovo: Same date has on the paper that I've distributed. And I'm open to other dates if somebody believes it makes better sense. About you that way, if there are some very clear code amendments that received a lot of stakeholder input and a lot of stakeholder support, the city manager in coming back and summarizing the various recommendations could also have those code amendments ready for our consideration. >> Mayor leffingwell: All right. So that would be this amendment that's before us, which is revised to add the words "after stakeholders to report back to the city council by september 30, 2014." Is that essentially it? >> Tovo: In the last -- in the last be it further resolved, I'm integrating that the city manager should come back with the feedback and any proposed code amendments. >> Mayor leffingwell: Okay. Any proposed amendment by -- new proposed amendment by council member tovo.

[09:54:30]

Is there a second? >> Yes. >> Mayor leffingwell: Council member morrison seconds. >> Morrison: I would like just one clarification. Did I hear september 30 or august 30? Septem septem ber is what I heard. >> Tovo: How about august 30. >> Morrison: That's what I thought. Second. >> Mayor leffingwell: Council member tovo amends her motion to be august 30 and the second concurs with that. >> Riley: Mayor? >> Mayor leffingwell: All right. Council member riley. >> Riley: Just a question. We would still be removing the first be it resolved clause. Is that right? Correct. >> Riley: So we would not be initiating a code amendment process but we would be directing the city manager to work with stakeholders and come back with recommended code amendments, and I guess I'm a little confused as to if we're -- if we're going to set in process -- set in motion a process with the expectation that we would see code amendments coming back to us, why wouldn't we just actually initiate the code amendment process as proposed in the original motion? >> Mayor leffingwell: Council member tovo? >> Tovo: Because the code amendments may not be along the lines of what you suggested. They may be code amendments that deal with other issues of the s.M.A.R.T housing program that stakeholders have suggested needs addressing. I'm not -- what I would like to do is make sure that we are not -- we are not coming up with a solution -- with a proposal here that makes a hard-and-fast requirement about the transportation

elements that are discussed. So I would like -- I would like the staff to come back with any recommendations and/or any proposed code amendments, but not necessarily the ones you've described here, any that have emerged as stakeholder concerns throughout the process. >> Riley: Well, mayor, I'll just have -- I won't be able to support the amended motion, and frankly I'm a little puzzled by it because I was just hearing a complaint that our -- that

[09:56:30]

the original motion was too vague and open-ended in terms of -- in terms of setting a code amendment process -- in setting in motion the code amendment process, and I gather what we're -- the suggestion now is that we allow for even more possibilities, which seems like it's bringing back -- I guess I don't understand what we would be achieving by declining to initiate a code amendment process. >> Mayor leffingwell: Council member martinez. >> Martinez: One other speaker signed up as we've been discussing this item. >> Mayor leffingwell: Say it again? >> Martinez: There's been another speaker signed up as we've been discussing the item. Angeli angeli ca noyiola? All right. With that brief interlude, we have a new proposed amendment on the table by council member tovo, seconded by council member morrison. Council member spelman. >> Spelman: Council member tovo and council member -- and myself worked separately on our amendments, but I think in that second be it further resolved clause, which council member tovo's amendment would edit, there is I hope inadvertent editing out of the some of the changes I made, which would give staff the -- to be able to look more broadly. Is there a way we could blend those two pieces together so ms. Spendsers spends spencer gets the authority she needs to talks to stakeholders about broader issues? >> Tovo: Absolutely. Have you worked it out or do we provide that to staff? >> Mayor leffingwell: I can say he wants to make a friendly amendment to you on your amendment and you accept it, and the second accepts it.

[09:58:31]

>> Spelman: So it would be I think along the lines of council member tovo's suggestion that we blend these two together rather than pick one or the other. >> Mayor leffingwell: Well, blending is a little vague term. We might want to -- >> spelman: Mr. Okey doesn't seem to be minding here. Sorry, mayor, I couldn't resist. >> Mayor leffingwell: Can I make a suggestion that we put this item on the table and work on your language and go on with the agenda otherwise? Because -- >> spelman: I'll happily accept that. >> Mayor leffingwell: If there's no objection this item is placed on the table with council member tovo's amendment pending. All right. Let's go to item no.32. Item no.32 is pulled by council member morrison, and there are no speakers. >> Morrison: Thank you, mayor, I'm sorry we didn't have time to have a chance to talk about this at the work session. This is a resolution from council member martinez, tovo and I'm not sure who else, riley, maybe, that talks about a particular funding source that funds after-school programs, I believe, that's drying up, and ask the staff to go and look at how we might work together better with aid and somehow support them. I guess I have two points I want to make. First I want to make sure -- as I understand it, our social service contracting rfp is still open, and I have a question as to whether or not these folks are actually going to be applying through that. So if I could ask the sponsor that question. >> Martinez: Mayor? >> Mayor leffingwell: Council member martinez. >>

Martinez: It's a great question. We did meet with the

[10:00:32]

organization that is advocating to extend the funding and we've asked them to connect with staff and determine if they can get an application in by the april 24 deadline, I think. >> Morrison: Okay, great, because that's obviously one of the ways to be able to look at it and -- you know, in the context of all the other programs, because obviously we have limited funding. So I appreciate that. And then the second thing I wanted to mention is that there are some efforts going on that really are along these lines through our joint subcommittees with AISD, the county and the school district, and currently -- in fact, currently there is a joint staff subcommittee working together to look at finding specific inventories of facilities that we really might be able to share. That's something that's been on the table for a long time and I understand they're really getting to it now. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Years. >> Morrison: And then secondly, recently a question came up about another funding problem for the family resource center north of the river, and out of that discussion about how could we fund them, you know, we were talking about how we didn't have much money that was really freed up at this point. We talked about -- well, we had staff -- we had staff with us not from the county but from our health & human services as well as from the school district, and we started talking about we have neighborhood centers, the county has certain centers. We have family resource centers, and we realized that we didn't think we had a really good handle on what's provided where and wondered if we -- and so at our next -- I believe at our next joint subcommittee meeting we're going to be getting a report on really pulling together. So I wanted to add a whereas, suggest adding a whereas to this clause just to acknowledge to this -- to this resolution, to acknowledge the work, and I did type it up but it's pretty simple. It would be to add a last whereas clause that says, "whereas, efforts through the joint subcommittees of

[10:02:32]

the city of Austin, AISD and Travis County are currently examining the potential for shared use of specific facilities and evaluating the possible overlaps of centers for services and programs." And so if someone makes a motion, if the sponsor would like to make a motion to approve this, I'm going to ask that this be adopted as friendly. >> Morrison: Mayor? >> Mayor Leffingwell: Council member Martin. >> Martinez: Thanks, Mayor. I totally would support this as friendly, and I'll just say this. We left out language specific to you all's work, so -- I did so as not to, I guess, offend the work that you're doing by trying to capture it in here because I'm not on that committee, but I'm fully aware of the conversations you all have been having. I'm happy to add that language in. I fully anticipate a more comprehensive approach to our relationship with AISD and the county through that subcommittee, and I knew that work was pending and potential action may come back to council. This was just a specific immediate need that in July of this summer 8,000 local school children will lose after-school programming, and we wanted to simply put that on, you know, the top of the radar screen so that if there is possibly any way that we can assist in alleviating the negative effects of those funding cuts, that we do that as quickly as possible. But I appreciate that and am happy to accept that as friendly. So I'll make a motion to adopt the item and accept council member Morrison's friendly amendment. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Motion by council

member martinez. Is there a second? >> Morrison: Second. >> Mayor leffingwell: Second by council member morrison, for the motion with the added language by council member morrison. Is there any further discussion? In favor of the motion say aye. >> Aye. >> Mayor leffingwell: Opposed say no. Passes on a vote of 7-0. So right now for the city

[10:04:38]

clerk, items no.37, 38 and 51 are withdrawn, and so we can take them off the screen and all the items on the austin housing finance corporation agenda have been postponed, and that was announced in changes and corrections, until april 17. So I think now we can go to our zoning consent agenda. >> Thank you, mayor and council. I'll go -- greg guernsey, planning development review department. I'll go through the 2:00 zoning and neighborhood plan amendment items, public hearings and possible action can occur. Item no.39 is case c14, 2013 0113, that's for the property located at 11,421 and 11432 north lamar boulevard. Staff is requesting a postponement of this item to your june 12 agenda. Item no.40 is case c14-2013--0136. This was a property located at 3215 exposition boulevard. The applicant has requested a postponement. This is their first request. This would be to april 17. Item no.41, are is case c14-2014-0007 for the property located at 2507 mitchell lane. The applicant has requested postponement to april 17. Item no.42 is case c14-2014-0022 for the property located at 7718 and 7800 old manor road and 7815 springdale road. It's to zone the property to public or p district zoning. The zoning and platting recommendation was to grant the p district zoning and this is ready for consent approval on all three readings. Item no.43 is case c14-2014-0035. For the property located at 4300 avenue g. Staff is requesting a postponement of this case to

[10:06:39]

your may 1 agenda. Item no.44 is case c814-2012-0055.02. This is known as the cover bridge planned unit development project located at 6714 covered bridge drive. This is to zone the property to planned unit development neighborhood plan or pud-np, combining district zoning to change to conditional zoning. The planning commission's recommendation was to grant the planned unit development neighborhood plan pud and combined district zoning to change a conditional zoning. Staff would like to clarify three things just for the record. First the planning commission did recommend 235 residential units. It's with the understanding that 230 of those would be for multi-family and five would be for condominium use on tract 1. Tracts 2 and tract 4, the planning commission recommendation was to lower that amount from 55 feet in height to 45 feet in height. So that would be a reduction of 10 feet in height on tracts 2 and 4. And finally on tracts 2 and 4, given the number of units, the density would equate to -- on tracts to on tracts 2 and 4 to 0.173 to 1. -- .173 to 1. And with those changes staff would offer this for consent approval on first reading only. Item no.45, case c14-2014-0017, this is the westgate neighborhood plan area rezonings. Staff is requesting a postponement to your agenda of may 1 at 4:00 p.M. I note that at 4:00 p.M. So we can combine that with the other items that will be at 4:00. Case 46 is c14-2014-0018

[10:08:42]

south manchaca. Staff is recommending a postponement to your may 1 agenda at 4:00 p.M. Item no.47 is case c14 c14-2014-0019, garrison park neighborhood plan. Staff is requesting postponement of this item on may 1 to 4:00 p.M. Item 48 is c14-2013-0147 for the property located at 707 west avenue. Staff is requesting a postponement to your agenda -- to your april 17 agenda. Item no.49, case c14h-2014-0001. This is for the property located at 1607 west 10th street. The neighborhood is requesting a postponement of this item to your april 17 agenda. Item no.50. This is an item that would consider the imagine austin comprehensive plan by adopting the south austin combined neighborhood plan, staff is requesting postponement of this item to your may 1 agenda at 4:00 p.M. And that concludes all the items I can offer for consent or postponement at this time under your zoning agenda at 2:00. >> Mayor leffingwell: Okay. So the consent agenda is to postpone item 39 until june 12, to postpone items 40 and 41 until april 17, to close the public hearing and approve item 42 on all three readings, to postpone item 43 until may 1, to approve -- close the public hearing and approve item 44 on first reading only with the three conditions -- or additional conditions approved by the planning commission that were read into the record, to postpone

[10:10:44]

item -- items 45, 46 and 47 until may 1 with a time certain of 4:00 p.M., To postpone items 48 and 49 until april 17 and to postpone item 50 until may 1 with a time certain of 4:00 p.M. That's the consent agenda, move approval by council member spelman, second by council member morrison. All in favor say aye. >> Aye. >> Mayor leffingwell: Aye. Opposed say no. Passes on a vote of 7-0. And I believe we have a postponement request for a public hearing item? >> Yes, mayor, our 4:00 public hearing items with possible actions, item no. 52, staff was requesting postponement to your april 17 agenda. This is to conduct a public hearing and consider an ordinance amending chapter 25-1 and 25-5 regarding the vested rights and continuing rights under the texas government code amending chapters 25-4 and 30-2 of subdivisions, and staff is requesting a postponement of this item to your april 17 agenda. And I can read the next one in the record, mayor, if you'd like to consider both of these, because staff is requesting postponement -- >> mayor leffingwell: Yes. >> Item no.53, this is to conduct a public hearing and consider an ordinance amending the city code title 25 to allow breweries to sell beer and ale for on-site consumption and staff is requesting a postponement of that item to your next week's agenda on april 17. >> Mayor leffingwell: The consent agenda for our 4:00 p.M. Public hearing items is to postpone items 52 and 53 until april 17. Is there a motion? >> So moved. >> Mayor leffingwell: Council member martinez moves approval, seconded by council member morrison. In favor say aye. >> Aye. >> Mayor leffingwell: Opposed say no. Passes on a vote of 7-0. >> Thank you, mayor and council.

[10:12:48]

>> Mayor leffingwell: So I trust somebody will let me know when we're ready to bring item 26 off the table. That would be council member spelman. Are you ready for that, council member? >> Spelman: I'm not sure, council members. Am I ready? Appare appare ntly not. Council member martinez. >> Martinez: We've had folks patiently waiting on item 34 and that's the next item. If we can take that up

and then we'll get back to debating 26. >> Mayor leffingwell: We are not ready on item 26 at this point, so we'll stay -- it will stay on the table, and item no.34 happens to be the next item on our agenda, so we'll go to that. That was pulled for speakers. First speaker is gus pena. >> Good afternoon, mayor, council members, mr. City manager, my name is gus pena. Thank you, council member mike martinez, for bringing that up. We've waited patiently long enough. I think I was growing roots just sitting back there. Item no.34 is a resolution regarding approving a resolution renaming process under city code 13-134 to rename the dlora recreation center dolores duffy recreation center. I've known dolores duffy for many years. I am a native of east austin. I was austin bailiff at district criminal courts. We had a lot of interaction with judge kennedy and that's where ms. Duffy work -- I will say worked with, not for, because I know I'm politically correct, and I just want to say there is no other person that deserves the name to be changed from rosa recreation center to the dlora duffy

[10:14:48]

recreation center. This -- dolores duffy recreation center. This young lady has been an integral part of the community, not just african-american, but the hispanic and large low anglo community. She's been there for us just like dorothy turner and very well ma roberts, may they rest in peace. I'm glad we have the opportunity to name something when the person is alive and not when the person has gone to the lord. And so I -- we -- not i, we, and I represent maybe about 650 people that asked me to speak on behalf of them. I will not name them, but we wholeheartedly -- wholeheartedly support the resolution renaming the rosa recreation center, which has been there for enema years to the dolores duffy recreation center. I call her ms. D. I love her and respect her, and you have been there for us in the community. And it's well deserved, well honored. And, you know, carry it just like we carry it. Our title of the united states marines, and this means a whole lot to us and to you and your family, and thank you very much, mayor and council members the city manager, anybody else who was involved in this, but especially I would like to ask ms. Dolores duffy to stand up and be recognized. Stand up. This is the lovely lady. Whoever is here I'd like to ask you to give her a round of applause. [Applause] thank you, ms. Duffy. She's been involved in civil rights issues also and she has made our community a proud community and thank you very much, and I am proud to be here, ms. D, and I love you and thank you for all the hard work you've done for everybody, not just the african-american community. Thank you very much. >> Cole: Thank you, gus, I appreciate those words for ms. Duffy. Joe risa, are you here? -- Rias. Joe martinez, are you here? Will mcLeod, are you here? Well, that is the conclusion

[10:16:49]

of our speakers. I would like to just say that I've known ms. Duffy for many, many years. She has been very active in the community, not only the african-american community but the entire community, and that her legacy will live on not only through the rec center but the other things that she has been involved in. But she has been especially committed to rosewood, and I think it is an honor that we recognize her with this renaming. So I will move approval. A motion was made and seconded by council member morrison. All those in favor say aye. >> Aye. >> Mayor leffingwell: Those opposed say no. That motion passes on a vote of 6-0 with mayor leffingwell off the dais. Council member morrison? >>

Morrison: Could I just make one point of personal -- >> cole: Sure -- I mean, yes. >> Morrison: Ms. Duffy, I want you to know that two of us on the dais here go to the -- your rec center every friday at noon for our pe tab dance class with a whole lot of -- tap dance class with a whole lot of other city employees. So I just want you to know it's well-loved and well-used, and you'll have to stop by the class sometime. >> Cole: Thank you. Ms. Duffy, did you have any words you wanted to say? >> I'd just like to say thank you, it's an honor. Thank you, those of you that supported this resolution and this passing. I'd just like to say thank you, and I continue to work in my community. I appreciate all of you. Thank you for your support. >> Cole: Thank you. Mayor, that was no.34. >> Mayor leffingwell: And I saw the -- that's the all the speakers, correct? >> Cole: That's all the speakers. >> Mayor leffingwell: You've

[10:18:49]

already taken action. Okay. So we'll go to item 35. >> Cole: Move approval. >> Mayor leffingwell: We do have speakers. Gus pena. >> Cole: What item number was this? >> Mayor leffingwell:35, it's only to set a public hearing. Joe rios? Joe rios? Not here. Leo martinez? Leo martinez. Mayor pro tem moves approval of item 35. Is there a second? >> Second. >> Mayor leffingwell: Second by council member spelman. In favor say aye. >> Aye. >> Mayor leffingwell: Opposed say no. Passes on a vote of 7-0. That brings us back to item no.26. And so we'll take item no. 26 off the table. And we have before us amendment proposed by council member tovo. >> Spelman: Mayor, I have a -- >> mayor leffingwell: Council member spelman. >> I have a proposed amendment to the amendment on the table. >> Mayor leffingwell: It's a friendly proposal to tweak the language, council member tovo. Go ahead council member. >> Spelman: All right. The -- this would leave alone the first section of the amendment, which is to remove the first be it resolved clause, to remove the second edit -- second be it further resolved clause and replace it more or less with the one which I had proposed earlier, and I'm not quite perfect because I've made a couple of other additional edits to t but I think I can -- to it, but I can walk through this.

[10:20:51]

Replace that second section -- actually first section, remove first be it resolved clause would stand. Third section as amended on the dais by council member tovo would stand, as I understand it, with one addition, and that would be the city manager is directed to summarize stakeholder feedback, and I would add "and any alternative recommendations on strengthening the s.M.A.R.T housing program and the transit requirement, comma, and report back to city council with any recommended code amendments by august 30 of 2014." >> Mayor leffingwell: So I think we have the sheet, which is more or less correct? >> Spelman: I would add an additional clause to that last section. So between summarize stakeholder feedback and report back to city council, add a clause from the original -- my original amendment, and any alternative recommendations on strengthening the s.M.A.R.T housing program and the transit requirement. >> Mayor leffingwell: That's in the sheet you have here, correct? >> Spelman: No, it's not. That last section is not. Let me take it from the top down, it's easier this way. The first two additions to whereases haven't changed. Remove the first be it resolved clause would stand. Amend the second current be it resolved clause to read as written here, with one exception. We were moving in a big hurry, mayor, to get us under the wire before 4:30 and I think we're going to hit it but

we made a couple of small errors on the way. The code amendment process would be struck. The code amendment process would be struck. We don't want to presume a code amendment process, although we certainly want to allow one. They should also include consideration -- no, I think it's all right.

[10:22:53]

Okay. Okay. And that last section of the second be it resolved -- further resolved, at the same time of the draft code amendment, again presupposes a code amendment, and we could strike that last clause after the comma. >> Mayor leffingwell: Last clause. >> So the last line of the be it further resolved would read, "recommendations on strengthening the s.M.A.R.T housing program and the transit requirement, period." Actually having said that, we don't need to make any changes to the last one. That wasn't the way I was originally going to write it but this will work just fine. >> Mayor leffingwell: All right. Let me -- let me see if I can -- if I can recap. So adding two whereases -- you're adding two whereases, correct? >> Spelman: Yeah -- well, it's already been done. >> Mayor leffingwell: That's a part of your -- well, that's not a part of your amendment. We're talking about council member tovo's amendment. >> Spelman: Mayor, we're working real fast here to try and end the meeting as quickly as possible. Those -- the first whereases have already been accepted as friendly by council member riley as part of the main motion. >> Mayor leffingwell: Okay. Then I don't know why they're here. >> Spelman: Because we didn't remove them, but they're not doing any harm. >> Mayor leffingwell: They were accepted, they're part of the -- they're part of the main motion now. >> Spelman: That's correct. >> Mayor leffingwell: Now we have council member tovo's -- I thought the effort was to offer a friendly amendment to council member tovo's amendment. >> Mayor, the first two whereases are unnecessary. They can be removed, please feel free to take them off of your piece of paper. >> Mayor leffingwell: They are off my piece of paper. >> Spelman: Excellent. So then we -- council member tovo has proposed to remove the first be it resolved clause, and your friendly amendment keeps that part in. >> Spelman: That does. >> Mayor leffingwell: All right. So really what you're

[10:24:54]

amending is the language underlined here and striking the listening that has the line drawn through it, plus the -- after "and the transit requirement" there should be a period there and the rest of that language in that sentence is stricken. >> Spelman: That is correct, yes. >> Mayor leffingwell: So then I would ask, council member tovo, do you accept that? >> Tovo: So I have a question for the maker of the amendment to my amendment, and that is, this all looks good, except I believe that last sentence, the city manager is directed to summarize stakeholder feedback and report back to council, should replace the last be it further resolved in the original. Otherwise we'll -- there will be initiating a code amendment. >> Spelman: Agreed. >> Tovo: So maybe I'll suggest to you that you make it, say be it further resolved and then the last be it further resolved should be removed and replaced with what's here. >> Spelman: Yes. >> Tovo: So if you make that suggestion, and you did -- I'm going to accept your friendly amendment to my amendment. >> Mayor leffingwell: Second accepts that also. So this essentially removes the direction to create a draft ordinance and take it through the process. >> Spelman: Mayor? >> Mayor leffingwell: Council member spelman. >> Spelman: All that it removes the

direction, it is consistent in the original version it was a requirement that staff take a code amendment and move forward. [One moment, please, for change in captioners.]

[10:29:01]

>> Mayor Leffingwell: 20% of those residents have far, and the more family oriented projects, developments like the cardinal lien, they expect 98 to 99% of those families to have cars. In the credits, the real transit reach developments, like m station, 90% have cars. So this is just reasons I would suggest to you that we need a more flexible policy, such as the one we have where transit proximity to transit, proximity to accessible side box is a consideration, but it's not the only consideration. And it's balanced against the other important considerations, like whether you're reducing car trips by locating families close to where they work, like walmart, like h-e-b, as mr. Morrow said. It's one way of cutting down on transportation, traffic, car trips, lowering their household costs, but you're balancing -- you're balancing that value against another one, and that is a family's ability to live close to where they work and to live close to -- within attendance zones of high quality schools. So we've talked a lot about values and policies and what are -- what are -- our comprehensive plan says, but at the end of the day, I believe that the policy that we're setting in place here today and initiate ago code amendment is going to foreclose opportunities for many, many families who would like to live in other parts of the community where they could live closer to work and within proximity to high quality schools, to child care, to other kinds of opportunity that don't necessarily exist in every neighborhood in this community. They should, and again it's a high priority of mine to make sure that we are locating affordable housing in transit-rich places, but we need -- these considerations all need to be balanced against one another and we need policies that allow us to look at each case individually and to balance these different values, and to really come up with the right recommendation for different

[10:31:01]

developments, and to take into account the variety of needs family has. >> We've heard on the main motion as was amended by council member spelman's suggestions and accepted as friendly. All in favor, say i. Opposed no, passed on a vote of 5-2 would council member tovo and morrison voting no. Well, that completes your agenda. Without objection, we stand adjourned at 4:30.

[11:32:38]

[🎵 Music playing 🎵] [singing] >> okay. Welcome, every one, to live music at austin city council. This is something we do at every council meeting to give our local musicians an opportunity to showcase what they have to

[11:34:41]

offer. Tonight we have the sun machine. I'm reading the biography of this group right now, and it is a little bit strange. Jesse hernandez, nathaniel rendon, tito ruiz, rnest joined together in 2012

simultaneously -- I'm just telling you what they tell me -- they experienced an unprecedented event when a signal distorted television screens, muted all radiofrequencies and froze every working clock. When trying to unravel this overt figure, orbiting, it was set out to decode this phenomenon and bring a thorough analysis of their discoveries back to earth. So they enlisted the help of bassist steven thyberg to help navigate them through these channels and together they have been experiencing with sound waves and using them to emulate the scenes projected in their twisted minds. Please help me welcome the sound machine. [Cheers and applause] >> thank you. [🎵 Music playing 🎵]

[11:37:02]

[singing]

[11:40:21]

[applause] >> thank you. >> Welcome back to the '60s. Very good. Now, you have an opportunity to tell folks about where you're playing, where they can go watch you, how they can get your music, what's your website, anything self-promotional you want to do in the next few minutes. >> Yeah, well, we've got a couple shows coming up. We're from austin. We've been playing here for a number of years now. We usually play here -- we've got a show coming up on the 17th for the mohawk [indiscernible], and that will be available on the 17th. Then we're place in san marcos, which is not too far from here, a little festival we like to do out there. Basically, that's what we've got planned so far, then we'll releasing another ep before the summer. So we'll definitely be playing throughout the summer as well, usually every month we play in austin. >> Great. And we wish you the best of luck, and hope folks get out and see a full hour or two of this stuff. Huh? Great. >> Thanks a lot. Thanks for having us. >> Mayor Leffingwell: So I've got a proclamation to read in your honor. Be it known that whereas the city of austin, texas, is blessed with many creative musicians whose talent extends to virtually every music genre, and whereas our music scene thrives because austin audiences support good music, produced by legends, local favorites, and newcomers alike, and whereas we are pleased to showcase and support our local artists, now, therefore, i, lee leffingwell, mayor of the live music capital of the world, do hereby proclaim an tenth, 2014, as the sun machine day in austin. Congratulation.

[11:42:58]

[Applause] >> now the koblenz folks come on down. Students, you want to line up over here? And who's going to speak for the group? Some of you may know that koblenz, germany, is our sister city in germany, has been for a long time. We've had a great relationship with lots of interaction back and forth. What did I say a while back? [Speaking german]. So we're very glad to have you visit our city once again, as you do every year. And I'm going to let margie talk a little bit about your program. >> Thank you, mayor leffingwell. We've had a sister city? Koblenz since '92, and we actually started the secondary school exchange a year before in '91. And one year the koblenz group comes here, and the next year we go over there. This time it's the koblenz group here. And julia leschler is the german teacher at anderson high school, and she's going to help the mayor with the names. >> Mayor Leffingwell: I only get -- I get

one try? Is that it? >> Do you want to try? You want to try? >> She can just read it from the list. >> Yeah, you can -- go ahead. >> Are you going to take individual pictures or wait till the end? >> Congratulations.

[11:44:59]

[Calling names] >> Mayor Leffingwell: You're doing much better than I would have. >> Thank you. [Calling names]

[11:48:08]

>> and these are their accompanying teachers from germany. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Good. Welcome. Come on over. >> And a couple of the students have a little speech prepared for you. >> Mayor Leffingwell: By all means. >> Dear mayor of austin -- oh. >> There you go. >> Dear mayor of austin. Thank you so much for having us. It is such a great honor for our group of students from copeland, and we are happy to visit the beautiful city of austin. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Thank you. [Applause] >> well, I can only say it is a pleasure for us to be here, and although we are still overwhelmed by all these new expressions, I can say that -- everything is so big. (Laughter.) and the food here is really good. >> Mayor Leffingwell: You like barbecue? >> Yeah. And people here help us to feel at home and -- yeah. So I think I can say thank you from all of us to be here, and it will be a great time. Thank you. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Well, you're all very welcome. [Applause]

[11:51:26]

[applause] >> Mayor Leffingwell: Very good. Thank you. You did a great job. >> Thank you, mayor. >> Mayor Leffingwell: So this is a great day in austin for our four-legged friends. And I'm not just talking about my fellow council members. (Laughter.) austin has received a generous grant of three million dollars from maddie's fund, which is a national organization for austin's no-kill animal status. [Applause] >> Mayor Leffingwell: Since february 2011, austin has been able to achieve its no-kill status, saving more than 90% of the homeless pets in our animal shelter, and we're very proud of that. Three austin animal welfare agencies, commonly referred to as the austin coalition, have received the prestigious maddie's life saving grant. The animal shelter, austin pets

[11:53:27]

alive, and austin humane society have been recognized by maddie's -- by maddie's fund, sustaining the no-kill status, saving all healthy and treatable shelter pets. So, I would first like to introduce -- well, first I'm going to read this certificate of congratulations, and there are three of them here because they're three organizations, but the good news is I'm only going to read one of them. And I'll just read the names of it three times, so the city of austin is pleased to recognize and you -- austin pets alive, the austin humane society and animal services office for having been awarded the 2013 maddie's fund saving award. It provides a grant for shelters, agencies and organizations that have implemented an adoption guarantee for all treatable and healthy shelter pets. The austin coalition, consisting of the

animal services office, the austin humane society and austin pets alive, has already achieved no-kill status for at least two years, and is committed to sustaining austin as a no-kill community. We congratulate the austin coalition on their fine work in protecting and caring for our animal population that enabled them to qualify for the maddie's fund award. It's presented this tenth day of april, year 2014, by the city council of austin, texas. So, I'm going to present the certificates now. This is for austin pets alive. [Cheers and applause] the austin humane society.

[11:55:30]

[Cheers and applause] and I know this one very well, the city of austin animal services office. [Cheers and applause] so I would now like to introduce the president of maddie's fund and the grandfather, not the father, but the grandfather of the no-kill movement, mr. Richard avanzino. [Cheers and applause] >> it's quite an honor. Actually, I like to refer to myself as the dogfather of this wonderful movement, and you are so marvelous, the people of austin, the council, the mayor, the elected officials and the wonderful organizations that have made all of this possible. This is the largest grant that maddie's fund has ever given out as a life saving award. You are number one. We compliment you, we congratulate you, we applaud you. You are the best. Thank you. [Cheers and applause] >> Mayor Leffingwell: Before I go to the next speaker, I also would be remiss if I didn't introduce council member mike martinez, who I know has been very active in this movement. [Cheers and applause] and has at least one dog that we know of at this point. (Laughter.) so now I'll introduce my former appointee to the animal advisory commission, dr. Ellen jefferson from austin pets alive. >> Actually, mayor, I think on behalf of the coalition, since, you know, we're -- we're going to be your friend tonight. On behalf of the austin coalition, we'd like to agree

[11:57:35]

and thank our city leadership for building the foundation on which this no-kill success was built. We'd like to thank all of our staff and amazing volunteers, day in and day out, freezing rain or sunshine, they show up to take care of the animals. We'd like to thank all of the animal welfare organizations in this great community. There are hundreds. Our prevention partners that help the people and pets in need and keep them out of our shelters, and all of the other rescue groups that help us achieve live outcomes every single day. So thank you to all of you for making our no-kill success a reality, and thank you to every single member of the community that has chosen to adopt a pet from one of the shelters or a rescue partner. It's you that makes this real. Thank you. [Cheers and applause] [applause] >> thank you.

[12:00:06]

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Can we have the long center folks come on down, please? Just one? Accepting the award for both? You're cliff? >> Cliff ernst, yeah. >> Mayor Leffingwell: So we are now about to recognize the long center, and at the same time, we have two proclamations for the price of one here today. And so I'm going to read both proclamations, but first I'm going to say a couple words about the long center, and the -- what this has meant, the partnership between the city of austin and the long

center, with the city basically owning the real estate and all the funding for operations of the -- construction and operations of the center coming from the private sector, and we very much want to once again thank all of the folks who participate in that in bringing top quality music and other entertainment events to our city. It adds immeasurably to our cultural fabric, and I'm sure all of us think almost every day, what would we do without the long center. It's such an asset to our great city, right across the river from city hall. So I'm going to read both proclamations and they're going to be accepted by cliff ernst of the long center. He's going to accept both proclamations on behalf of the other group, also. Be it known that whereas the city of austin is pleased to recognize our creative home, the long center, on its sixth birthday, and whereas, since 2008, the long center has hosted more than 1.2 million visitors and is on track to cross the 300,000 mark this year for performances by the austin opera, the austin symphony orchestra, and ballet austin, as

[12:02:08]

well as austin shakespeare, polly anna theater company, tapestry dance, and others, and whereas the long center hosts its own annual season of eclectic programming, along with serving as an iconic venue, along with you think you can dance, america's got talent, and my personal favorite, the jimmy kimmel live show, and whereas the long center is also a non-profit, it collaborates with community partners to sponsor educational programs, host free events subsidize rentals, i, mayor leffingwell, do hereby proclaim april 12th, 2014, as the long center's purple party 6 day in austin. I've got to say before I go on to the next proclamation, in case someone were to get the wrong idea, I just had a personal interest in the jimmy kimmel show because -- well, I won't go into why I do, but -- (laughter.) I also have a personal interest in the austin lyric opera. I've appeared in two different operas. Did you know that? Yeah. Okay. That shows there's room for everyone in opera. Second proclamation reads: Be it known that whereas more than 400 students from 19 local high schools will perform live, on stage, at the long center during the first annual greater austin high school musical theater awards, and whereas the production, the first large-scale project produced in-house by the long center consists of 13 large had of scale musical numbers and the awarding of \$10,000 in

[12:04:09]

scholarships, and whereas the production is also a first-ever collaborative effort between the long center, Zach theater -- excuse me -- zach theater, and ut college of fine arts; and whereas the event celebrates the high school musical as an american institution which has a power to change a young person's life; and whereas we join the sponsors in acknowledging the best of high school theater programs, and the value of arts education in our schools, now, therefore, i, lee leffingwell, mayor of the city of austin, texas, do hereby proclaim april 17th, 2014, as greater austin high school musical theater awards in austin day. So congratulations to you. [Applause] and, cliff, are you going to accept both these? >> Sure. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Why don't you say a few words. >> Thank you, mayor. We like to call ourselves austin's creative home right across the river here. You're over here stealing our thunder with your shows over here, so we appreciate it. My name is cliff ernst, and I'm serving as a volunteer of the chair, board of the trustees of the long center, and I want to really thank the city and the mayor for

this support and recognition today. For those of us that volunteer and work at the long center, it's really a labor of love. We are passionate about the long center's mission to provide the performing artists and organizations in the greater austin region with facilities and services that foster excellence, encourage originality, and promote collaboration. We are thrilled to celebrate the long center's sixth anniversary of austin's creative home with the annual purple party this commemorates the merely one and a half million people who have come through our doors since we opened in 2008. Our city, debra and carry studio

[12:06:09]

theater, the, others, have hosted thousands of community and cultural events and the long center hopes to welcome at least 300,000 visitors again this year. During this season, we could not be more proud to present the first annual greater austin high school musical theater awards on april the 17th. These awards represent the first ever partnership among the long center, zach theater, and the university of texas at austin college of fine arts. 19 high schools and hundreds of students will come together for this spectacular tony style awards production. In addition, \$20,000 in scholarships will be presented to students and schools. And we are certain that the greater austin high school musical theater awards program will become austin's newest and cherished tradition. Please join me in welcoming and wishing the long center a happy and prosperous anniversary and welcoming to our community the greater austin high school theater music awards. Thank you, austin, thank you, city. [Cheers and applause] >> come on up.

[12:08:10]

Come on up. It is with great -- >> if you want a free t-shirt, you've got to take a picture with us. Anybody? Come on up. >> We'll do it after I read the proclamation. I want to welcome the safe digging crew. We have a proclamation for them for all the hard work they do in our city. Be it known that thousands of times each year the underground infrastructure in texas is damaged by those who do not have underground lines -- do not have underground lines located prior to digging, resulting in service interruptions, environmental damage, and threat to had you been safety; and whereas in 2005, the lcc designated 811 to provide excavators and homeowners a single number for contacting utility operators to request the location of underground lines at the intended dig site; and whereas the central texas damage prevention council, dedicated to the prevention of damage to underground utilities in 12 central texas counties promotes the national 811 notification system; and whereas we encourage excavators and homeowners throughout austin to call 811 before digging to save time and money, and to help keep our infrastructure safe and connected, now, therefore, i, lee leffingwell, mayor of the city of austin, do hereby proclaim april 20, '14, as safe digging month. [Applause]

[12:10:38]

>> hi. On behalf of the central texas damage prevention council, we would like to thank the mayor pro tem sheryl cole for giving us this opportunity. The central texas damage prevention council is excavation

and utility owners that meets once a month and are committed to damage prevention of underground utilities as well as safety. Part of the damage prevention council's job -- I'm sorry -- okay. Part of damage prevention is calling 811 before anyone digs. This way, the utilities can protect the facilities, and the excavator or homeowner can excavate safely. So it's wonderful that austin is declaring april safe digging month. [Applause] >> don't forget your proclamation. You're rocking them boots and shovel. That looks good! You want a t-shirt? >> Of course I w a t-shirt. >> T-shirt, anybody? >> Are you there? Okay.

[12:12:39]

Today, we celebrated the civil rights 50-year anniversary, and we did so at the university of texas. [Cheers and applause] hook 'em horns. I actually had the distinct pleasure of hearing president obama speak, and he reflected on all the good work that president lbj had done. And one of those good works was the fair housing act. And we are here today to recognize that act and give a proclamation. And I'm going to put these on. Be it known that whereas this year, we commemorate the 46th anniversary of the signing of the fair housing act of 1968, and its amendment in 1988, which provides safe, affordable housing as part of the american dream, and opened that possibility to everyone, regardless of race, color, sex, national origin, religion, disability, or familial status; and whereas the city of austin is likewise dedicated to ensuring that all citizens receive equal treatment when buying or renting a home, and whereas we encourage everyone to recognize the importance of fair housing practices, and to continue to work to change attitudes and remove barriers that limit access in choice. Now, therefore, i, lee leffingwell, mayor of the city of austin, texas, do hereby -- april 2014 as fair housing month. >> Well, thank you so much, mayor pro tem cole. It's an honor to be here with you today. I would like to say that we are all very fortunate to live in a city where our citizens have the wisdom to elect officials who will accept the leadership challenge to not only match, but

[12:14:40]

exceed the protections and civil rights laws found in federal law and create those protections here locally to guarantee freedom from discrimination in employment, public accommodations, and housing. I am very fortunate that I work in the city of austin equal employment and fair housing office. We investigate complaints of discrimination in housing, public accommodations, and employment. We can be reached at any time by dialing 311, just ask for the equal employment fair housing office. We do not charge a fee for our investigations. We are happy to talk to people who only need information. And I am also proud to say that in about 50% of our cases, we are able to achieve volunteer settlements. In addition, tomorrow we will be hosting our annual fair housing conference at the brand new asian american resource center up on cameron road. We have almost a hundred people planning to attend, professionals in all aspects of housing who come together once a year to learn how to remain in compliance with fair housing laws. And, again, thank you to you, mayor, and council, for the proclamation. [Applause] >> come on down. Rocking.

[12:16:53]

It is with great pleasure that I present a proclamation on behalf of the fusebox festival. Be it known that whereas fusebox festival is a free, on its tenth anniversary, and features 50 unique performances, installations and events from more than 300 local, national, and international artists in venues throughout austin, and whereas artistic director ron berry says fusebox -- ron berry? [Cheers and applause] >> everybody wake up around here -- is designed to spark conversation about how communities value art and culture; and whereas in ten years, fusebox has grown from a \$5,000 budget and audiences of a few hundred to a 400,000 budget reaching tens of thousands, and whereas support for fusebox's business, cultural and community partners allows everyone to experience the festival for free this year, and whereas -- [cheers and applause] >> you like that. And whereas, we urge austinites to explore the vast array of entertainment options available during the 12-day festival, and take chances on artists and projects they may not know anything about, now, therefore, i, lee leffingwell, mayor of the city of austin, texas, do hereby claim april 16th through 27th, 2014, as fusebox festival days. [Cheers and applause] >> thank you so much, mayor pro tem cole. Thank you so much, greg anderson, the mayor and city council. This is a great honor. We're really thrilled and delighted to be here, to receive this award, to call austin our home. It's a very special place to us. The festival would look really different if it didn't happen here in austin.

[12:18:54]

It really is a celebration and a love song to the city, and it's a -- it's a love song and a celebration of being alive in the world today. We try and feature some of the most interesting artists making work in austin every year, but we're also really interested in injecting new ideas and new thinking by bringing in artists from around the country and around the world. And we're really interested in using the platform of the festival to explore place, so the festival takes place in 25 different locations all around the city, and like she said, it's all free this year. So we really encourage you to come out and join us. We'd love for you to be our guest at the festival this year and take a chance so some projects that maybe you're less familiar with. The festival dates are april 16th through the 27th, and you can find out all the information on our website, fuseboxfestival.com. Before I go, I want to thank our wonderful staff and volunteers and artists, some of which are up here today, they're amazing, this really couldn't happen without them. I'm very blessed and I love each and every one of you. Thank you. [Cheers and applause]

[12:21:19]

>> please join me, mr. Navarro. Come on up. >> All right, folks. To round out the evening, I have a special proclamation that I'm honored to present to mr. Navarro. If the family would like to move over to this section, you can. Do you want to -- okay. So it's my pleasure to recognize the 50th anniversary of manuel navarro's winning the bantam weight golden gloves at the age of 16. This is him, and he looks like he could still go 15 rounds. I'm not going to take the 10-minute challenge with him at all. But seriously, folks, as a father of a soon to be 16-year-old, I cannot fathom my son putting in the time and effort and energy to a craft that leads him to a national championship. Mr. Navarro did that at the age of 16, traveling the louisville, kentucky, to compete in the national championship. He adjusted to new surroundings, stayed focused, and ultimately represented austin at its highest and finest level. It speaks

to your talent, mr. Navarro, your training, your dedication, your work ethic, and I'm sure that's what led you to be such a successful austinite as well. I understand you have the opportunity to meet mayor lester palmer, as well as governor john connelly, so this is like old-times. I'm just younger and better looking than those guys. We've had a long history of amateur and professional boxing in austin, especially at our city facilities, but most notably where mr. Navarro trained at the ab cantu pan am

[12:23:20]

rec center. It's a pleasure to recognize you and I have a proclamation and I had like to read and present you and ask you to say a few words. The proclamation reads: Be it known, whereas, we are pleased to recognize manuel navarro as he celebrates the fiftieth anniversary of winning the national golden gloves crown in 1964. Man, just think of that. The civil rights movement was right upon us. I got to listen to president obama today so it's most fitting. >> Is he going to join us? >> Yeah. He's on his way. He's stuck on i-35 with the rest of them. (Laughter.) whereas mr. Navarro started boxing in 1958 and fought 91 fights, losing only five prior to his trip to the golden gloves final, he won his title when he was a 16 -- 16 years old, and whereas mr. Navarro went on to serve our citizens through his career with the texas department of human services and gave his time to the gloves of gold boxing club, helping our firefighters and whereas mr. Navarro now is enjoying retirement, spending time with his six grandchildren and his great granddaughter, and his hobby of working on old cars, therefore, i, lee leffingwell, mayor of the city of austin, texas, proclaim the year 2014 as the fiftieth anniversary of manuel navarro's golden gloves title. Congratulations. [Cheers and applause] >> thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you. This is a great honor. This is a real great honor for me. I really appreciate it. I have people to thank for this. First of all, I'd like to thank the -- my family for being here, and also I'd like to thank a good friend of mine that -- he spear-headed this event here,

[12:25:25]

mr. Alturo guerrero. Thank you very much. Also, I'd like to thank mr. Councilman mike martinez and his assistant andy moore for their help in having this. And I really appreciate it, and it's a real big honor for me. Thank you. [Applause] >> thank you.