

## City Council Work Session Transcript – 05/13/2014

Title: ATXN2

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 5/13/2014 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 5/13/2014

Transcript Generated by SnapStream Enterprise TV Server

=====

[03:04:30]

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Good morning. Before we begin the meeting today -- are we on? We want to take a moment to mention the citizens forum on saturday, may 31st. That meeting will start at 9:00 a.M. It'll be at council chambers. It's an opportunity to hear from austinnites who don't have the opportunity to come to regular council meetings and speak. The meeting is scheduled for three hours but could go longer than that. All you have to do is show up the day of the meeting, sign up in advance to speak, or you can check the city clerk's page on austin.texas.gov for details. So, again, it's council chambers, saturday, may 31st, at 9:00 a.M. So I'm austin mayor lee leffingwell. Austin quorum is present. I'll call to meeting the austin city council work session, tuesday, may 13th, 2014 at 9:05, we're meeting in austin city hall, 301 west second street, austin, texas. First on the agenda, preselected agenda items, we have three. First is item number 2 -- we'll skip that since council member spelman is not here yet, and go to item 7, pulled by council member morris. >> Morrison: I'd like to ask a question before question start about the order of our agenda. I noticed we moved briefings up over council items of interest. And we actually set this order by council action, and so back when we were first defining the work sessions and how that would work, and so I was -- wanted to ask about how we shifted the order to include briefings without reconsidering the order. >> Mayor Leffingwell: It was just so we could be sure and get in a necessary briefing. We can shift the order by unanimous consent at any time. So we don't have any items of

[03:06:31]

interest listed or any -- we do have one council discussion item listed. >> Did you tell the items of interest were intended to be -- excuse me -- where do we cover just the other non-preselected items? >> Mayor Leffingwell: I suppose we could cover those in items of interest, but just to get the briefing in. >> Right. I just think since it was council action that set the order of the agenda in the first place, that we should maybe revise the order by council action. >> Mayor Leffingwell: I'll be glad to talk with you about it later. So first we'll go to item 7. >> Okay. Thank you, mayor. And item 7 is an economic development item to allocate \$237,000 to the african-american cultural heritage district and, you know, it's a great -- definitely a great cause and effort and all. My question was really about the availability of funds, and then also the council has passed a couple of resolutions in the past months looking for funding for various items of interest and priorities. I think the technology council in chamber and maybe some

others and south shore, that weren't funded, and so I was interested in how much funding is available and how we decide actually how to allocate that funding, given that there are a lot of needs. >> Michael mcdonald, deputy city manager. Yes, council, this item was actually part of the midyear funding that -- midyear funding

[03:08:32]

discussion that of the brought forward by council last year. If you recall, you funded -- you approved funding for 50,000 for the african-american cultural district, and what -- also, your intent in all of that was for us to fund an additional 237,000 to the district. During that discussion, part of what was talked about was maybe even the possibility of some in-kind to assist the district. So during the -- following the discussion on the midyear, we got into discussions with the district about the possibility of space needs that they had, but they ended up pursuing other avenues. That's why during the regular budget process, we didn't bring forth the 237 because we were in discussions with them about other ways we could possibly help them. They pursued other options that they had, so, therefore, you know, it was -- we thought it was -- to be consistent with your wishes, we were to bring forth the 237,000. Again, you know, part of -- you know, they've done a lot with the 50,000 that they've already received. They sponsored bus tours of the district, interactive -- you know, interactive map website, educational op events at the carver. They've been involved in some of the cemetery issues, so they've done quite a bit. Of course that 50,000 didn't cover all of that. They look for other opportunities in the community for matching and fund-raising as well. You know, this is just -- you know, with my history here, this is a great initiative. And the reason I say that is because it really maximizes the community coming -- stepping forward to help something that was passed by council back in 2004, the african-american quality of life initiative. During that initiative, one of the things that the council wanted was for us to formalize, you know, an african-american

[03:10:33]

district because so much genderification and everything was taking place in historic east austin, and so boundaries were set up, you know, i-35 to the east, you know, it circles around the houston tillotson out to the airport, manor road to the north. So that was -- and that district was also established by the council, but members of the community, many of which there are part of this cultural district, went forward to the state and also received historic state designation. It is one of the few times that that's happened here in the state of texas, and so that was, you know, just a little bit of the background of why you -- council supported it back in 2004 and why you took the action that you took last year during the midyear budget. >> Yeah. Great. I know it's a wonderful initiative, and I'm certainly aware of some of the efforts that they've managed, even under just the \$50,000 -- >> sure. >> That's wonderful. >> Sure. >> So the backup mentions that this funding is available because the rental relocation money was not needed. Could you talk about that rental relocation money in the budget? >> Yes. The good morning. I'm financial manager and acting assistant director of economic development. During the 2014 preparation there was \$395,000 added to our budget in anticipation of on us relocating to the cfc building. As you're aware, we did not move so those funds are in our budget, and we did not anticipate using those funds.

So out of the 393, 237 would be for this item, which would leave about 156,000. >> In terms of the relocation, you know, the chest pieces moving around, we've got the ought to be moving around to the csc building, although they had to go to the other building

[03:12:33]

first. Are they over budget? Were they budgeted to move twice? >> I'm not aware of their budget items. >> Is it going to cost more than we thought and we're going to be -- >> no, my understanding, the budget is taking a close look -- we anticipated that second move in the funding, so our understanding in working with budget, we're still, even with this decision, we're still going to be able to cover the move of the auditor. >> I guess, you know, I think this is a great project, no doubt. It just raises a question in my mind, especially since we've had so many discussion lately about, you know, how do we decide when to do midyear, and albeit it was just with regard to the general fund in terms of our policy changes, but this appears to be discretionary funding and I just wonder about the process for identifying when to fund this kind of discretionary funding in the middle of the year. >> Yeah. And allow me to add one more thing as well. This -- you know, part of the reason this is attached to economic development is, they've been very involved with the cultural arts, with assisting us, with opening the cultural center. So long-term, this district and this initiative is certainly going to be around for a while. So what we typically do is try to attach it with a department that will fit. So certainly, the funding is available here, but probably more important, the economic development department was open to this initiative, long-term, being attached to that department. >> Yeah. And understand, I have no qualms about supporting the district. I think it's a great initiative that we need to be behind. I'm just requesting the process. >> Okay. >> Mayor Leffingwell: And I think I have to agree with council member more son on this. We did go through a lengthy process to decide how we're going to spend funds like this

[03:14:35]

midyear. We talked about budget requirement and actually set a new policy for that, so I've got some serious questions about whether or not this relate to that new policy, does it require budget amendment, is -- it seems kind of odd because they're very similar situations where we're talking about allocating funds for something that required a budget amendment, even though the funds were available, it was shifting funds from one project to another. >> Mayor, elaine hart, cfo. The policy that was discussed by council and approved earlier in the year covered general fund only. This is the economic development fund, and they are suggesting that they spend monies within their current-year budget, which would not require a budget amendment. But our policy amendment that we made earlier in the year just covered the general fund, not the other city funds. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Council member riley. >> I just want to make sure I got the numbers right. We wound up with \$393,000 left over from the relocation fund, and 237 is going to this, and so that leaves 156,000. So I wonder about an initiative like, for instance, the south shore project, which seems to have obvious economic development aspects, and also had the support of past council resolutions during the time of budget discussions. Wouldn't that also be a candidate for use of the remaining funds? And I ask that -- I guess I ask that as after manager since it was the manager that made the decision to take this funds and direct it to this

support, I just wonder about the south shore project which also has past council support and has economic aspects. Would the manager also be willing to consider that as a candidate for this funding?

[03:16:37]

>> Let me speak to this particular issue. The reason this matter is before you is because, at the time of the budget process, it was my understanding that the original intent was to support the programs that these dollars are targeted for. So it was being brought as a matter of trying to deal with what I understood was the original intent to support these initiatives. Whether or not these funds could be directed toward the shore project that you are talking about, given the economic development implications, I suppose it could. >> Riley: I'm not sure I understood the answer. These are funds that were allocated for moving city staff to an adjacent building. >> That is correct. >> That's correct. >> Riley: And which, in itself, doesn't appear to have an obvious connection to the african-american cultural heritage district. It would seem like that source of funding would have at least as much connection to south shore redevelopment as the heritage district, just -- I just wonder why that wouldn't also be considered as a potential project for these funds. >> To answer your question, council member, I'm not sure I can speak directly to the source of funds. I understood that it was coming out of economic development, but, mike, you're going to have to speak more specifically to those details. >> Yes. It's -- yeah, the source of the funds would be coming directly out of economic development with the move. And I guess part of what I talked about earlier, with regards to this initiative, is after council made it clear that they wanted the funding, part of the reason it didn't come forward at the time of the budget, because remember, this discussion occurred during midyear last year. Part of the reason it didn't come forward at the time is

[03:18:38]

because we were exploring some other opportunities where we could maybe help them in kind, maybe help them with some space that would have possibly lowered the amount that we would have brought forward. That didn't pan out, and so we still needed to move forward with -- you know, with council's desire to fund the additional 237,000. So whether it -- if it had not been here, we would have maybe had to propose somewhere else to find the funding. It's just so happened, when we took a look at this area, this was an area that we would be able to fund it without taking it from -- or suggesting to council to take it from somewhere else. >> Riley: I'm not disputing any of that. I think it's a strong project, I have strong support of the heritage district, I'm glad to see it funded and glad to see the people here today. I applaud management's effort to keep that on track. I just ask, isn't this also an opportunity to fund other projects which have also had strong support from council where we have not managed to secure the funding in the past, and they have obvious connection to economic development. >> I think my answer earlier was yes. >> Yeah. Yeah. >> And what bothers me, it really does open the door for almost anything. Council member martinez. >> Martinez: Thanks, mayor. I think what I'm hearing, at least what I'm sensing is the lack of transparency, in terms of -- I'm guessing but we probably have multiple resolutions that we adopted over the last year or so that were unfunded that we asked the city manager to please help us try to identify funding and take a strong look at this particular issue. I don't even know

how many are out there. I think what we need to do is revisit that issue and make sure that every one of them are on the table, when opportunities like this arise, because I think ultimately it's a policy

[03:20:40]

decision of the council to determine which one of those is a priority. I think this is clearly a priority. It's something we've spoken to and unanimously supported, but I also know there are many other items that we voted on unanimously as a priority. The last thing I'll say is, while I understand that the midyear budget adjustment policy may apply only to the general fund, the logic to the average citizen, it doesn't make any difference, it's their taxpayer dollars. And if we're making a midyear budget adjustment and we've got a policy in place that applies to the general fund, I don't see how we wouldn't apply that same logic to any other fund, whether it is, you know, an enterprise fund or not. >> Yeah. I'd just like to respond to that. I think that makes a lot of sense both in terms of circumstances like this, and we also know that oftentimes this kind of circumstance issue, request that requires funding, comes in the context of ifc's. And this is a larger discussion, but it seems to me that if we had some other kind of structure for the evaluation of these kinds of things and ifc's, perhaps through council's committee structure, you know, where these kinds of requests, you know, we get a full vetting, some of them would survive that process and some of them wouldn't, and I think that that would be -- you know, give greater balance and a sense of equity in terms of how we allocate what are always limited resources in a strained fiscal environment. But that isn't how they're done, you know, these things come, as I've said, on many occasions, on any given thursday, either in the form of an ifc or our ability to -- our efforts to try to respond to what we understand is otherwise, as in this case, a priority of the council. So that's for a future conversation, but I think a more structured approach to evaluating these kinds of requests, including ifc's, certainly where they have

[03:22:41]

significant cost implications through council's committee structure, would provide the kind of vetting so that there is transparency and the proper engagement in regard to these issues. >> Mayor. >> Mayor Leffingwell: I certainly agree with that. Council member tovo. >> Tovo: I've had an opportunity to talk with the city manager about that point and I'm willing to bring those things forward to the full council on our agenda. We need to be responsive to our constituents on a timely basis and not be required through a council practice or policy or whatever to go through a committee process, because some of us may sit on that committee, some of us may not. We need to ability to put things on the agenda as we see fit. But I do have a couple questions about this particular agenda item. And they're different from ones we've talked about before. Really, I'm interested in a little background information about the rental relocation fund. It was my understanding within economic development, within the economic development various funds, that the rental relocation fund was actually for businesses to relocate to try to assist them in relocating within a particular area. Am I mixing up those funds? >> Yes. >> Tovo: Okay. >> This item was strictly for relocation of staff to the csc building. >> Tovo: Okay. That is very interesting, but it was coming out of the economic development -- >> our operating fund. >> Tovo: Ahh. So the economic development has multiple funds and they all have almost the same name. >> Yes. >> Tovo:

But this was out of your general operating budget. I see. So I submitted this question through the q and a process, but since you're here, I'll just ask it. The rental location funding has been reduced as part of the f 1 -- this is from f 115 backup economic financial forecast. And so initially, that didn't -- I couldn't understand that, but now it's been reduced because there's not a need for it.

[03:24:41]

You all have moved. >> Exactly. That's part of the forecast one-time funding, it's backed out. And so in '15, the rental relocation has been backed out of our baseline budget. >> Tovo: I see. It existed in '14 because there were some planned moves, it's not at all in '15. So the point of all that is just to let us know about the one time funding. Thank you for that clarification. >> Mayor. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Mayor pro tem cole. >> Cole: I certainly appreciate the concerns of my colleagues who have steadfastly supported this project and I certainly appreciate that. And I understand the concern is because we adopted a midyear budget policy. And although this is not -- this is the enterprise fund with the economic development and not the general fund, I think that even under the existing policy, this may qualify. So, mayor, if you allowed me to indulge some of the members of the cultural heritage district who are here, lisa byrd, can you come up and speak to the urgency of this funding right now? >> Good morning. Thank you for inviting me and allowing me to speak. Chris and sheryl and everyone, I know how supportive you've been of our efforts and that support has allowed us to provide programming for the city that really is a game changer in east austin. And I think the mayor came out on saturday and threw out the first ball to a reunion game of the old negro league baseball team. And these things may seem small, but they're huge in the perception of african americans have about the city of austin and their place in this city. So we received the 50,000 and we're very appreciative, and

[03:26:42]

we're able to formally form our organization, move from an ad hoc community organization to a non-profit -- a texas non-profit. We just received our 501 status this past week. And we were able to begin programming with keeling students in an interactive web ma, we were able to do programs like we did this weekend, three days of celebration at historic downs field. It is crucial, because that's only \$50,000, it's crucial to our continued programming to receive this 200 and some thousand dollars. I understand a policy conversation, but policy has direct impact on people's lives, and so I just want you to understand that as you think -- as you think about that. Again, I thank you for the opportunity, and I can answer any questions you may have. >> Lisa, can you explain what you mean by it would end your programming? >> Well, we -- the initial \$50,000 was seed money for the programs I've just mentioned and others of the district, but it was \$50,000, and we were just beginning. And so we were able to leverage that 50 for community partners with acbb, people fund, and other community partners, but \$50,000 is not a lot of cash. So we need the cash dollars to continue our efforts. So if we don't have that, then, essentially, we cannot continue. >> Thank you, lisa. And, mayor, I simply wanted to get that testimony on the record. This is not an item that I have brought personally by resolution, but of course I'm fully supportive of it. But because of the emergency nature, which is included in our midyear policy, I do think council should consider it at this time. Thank you.

[03:28:43]

>> Mayor Leffingwell: Any other comments? I'll just say, obviously, I'm supportive of the project, too, but I'm very concerned about the fact that we went through a lot of angst to try to impose physical discipline on ourselves, and I think the same discipline should apply to items from staff too, so we'll just have to see where this goes. Council member Martinez? >> Martinez: I don't want to leave this open ended. I want to ask the manager how we proceed moving forward. I guess when funds are identified that aren't going to be utilized in areas of our city, I guess the short statement is, do we have to do another item from council to create a better process, or is that something you can do with just direction so that when funds are available, the entire list of priorities that this council has adopted is on the table, and we, as a council, make that ultimate policy decision, in full context of everything that's out there? >> Well, when funds are available, you're talking about surplus funds that might not get spent for whatever reason, some things that have been programmed into the budget, or there are all kinds of reasons why there might be surplus funds. It depends on the funds that you're talking about. I mean, within a department at budget for a variety of different reasons, there can be, you know, surplus funds or fund balances, and in some cases, you know, the department enjoys the prerogative to reallocate those dollars within their own -- within their own budget in a much larger context, in terms of a larger budget. We talk to you all the time about fund balances and reserves, and in those instances, generally they require consideration by council, and ultimately a budget amendment for reallocation or reappropriation of those dollars

[03:30:44]

to some other -- some other priority. Likewise, in our capital program, projects come in over and under budget, and we don't enjoy the unilateral prerogative as the administration and management staff to make those kinds of decisions. We can certainly make recommendations and advise council on how we think they ought to be used, but ultimately, those decisions would have to be made by the council. So I think there are policies and procedures and controls that are already in place that give us instruction about, you know, how we manage surplus funds that limit our authority to utilize any surplus funds or fund balances within certain spending limits. Let me ask the cfo if she might want to supplement or add to anything that I've said. >> We certainly do have policies regarding our surplus funds, our ending balances, and I think you're familiar with those, council. In this particular case, we're midyear; we've just finished our departmental forecast, which includes in that exercise a review of your current year spending versus your current year budgets and our first look at our current year estimate for the year. So during that process in march and april, the department would have generally identified any funding as this, like this, that they did not anticipate spending through the remainder of the year. As the city manager said, at that point, the department directors would look at possibly repurposing for another need that they have or another need that the council has expressed interest in. So it's kind of a natural process in our budget. In this case, it happened to be a one-time budget item that was not going to be used, and it was also a program that fit nicely

[03:32:46]

within that revenue stream. There needs to be a synergy between the ask and the revenue source, if you will, to the extent that there's an economic development purpose here or with another project that could facilitate repurposing of that. >> And I agree with all of that. I'm not trying to take any department director's authority or discretion to make recommendations to this body as to a midyear budget adjustment, but I think this is -- in this example, it doesn't sound like the economic development department even considered other projects that are out there that are unfunded that fit seamlessly into a potential funding of one-time influx of cash. So that's what I'm speaking to, is as we move forward, can there be a process in place that shows us what priorities were reviewed, and then what ultimately is that staff's recommendation for funding. And I think that's all we're looking for. You know, I don't anticipate, you know, us not continuing to support this project. But in the context of this conversation, we just want to know, what were the other priorities that were looked at as well, and how did we arrive to this. >> Okay. I think the answer is yes. We'll have to think about how to do that, but -- >> mayor -- >> Mayor Leffingwell: I just have to ask, quickly, aren't all surplus funds the result of unanticipated overages or underages? Isn't that what reserve funds are, I mean excess funds are? So to me, it fits that. I think it would have to meet the standard that was described by mayor pro tem cole, it would have to fit within the framework of that policy and would have to be assumed to be an emergency or fit that policy in some other way. >> Cole: And, mayor, you understand that my argument is that it does. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Incident that argument. >> That's right. To the extent that it would require an amendment, a budget amendment from council.

[03:34:47]

But department directors would still have a prerogative to a limit, to a certain limit, to reallocate funds within their budget. >> Mayor. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Council member tovo. >> Tovo: If I could just make a suggestion, I want to say I'm supportive of this item. I understand, though, the policy discussion we're having, and I think what we've done over the last couple months is really look at adopting some financial policies that I think make good sense. So these questions, I think, are leading to kind of a new sort of structure that would be very useful. So I really appreciate the discussion. Just to pick up on council member martinez's point about -- about having that background information, you know, for me, it could be as simple as just compiling a list, so that when one of these priorities comes forward, it's paired with a list of other things that the council has adopted, other resolutions that the council has adopted over the last year or so that are unfunded. So we can say, oh, okay, well, we're funding this of this list. I mean, it doesn't need to be cumbersome, but if the staff wanted to address their rationale for suggesting one or the other, they can do that in -- they can do that in the rca. >> Okay. >> Tovo: But just having a very simple list I think would be a good thing for us all to have in our backup. >> Okay. I guess the only thing I would add here is, certainly a lot of items, you know, different items come through for council with certain interest as we've discussed today. The thing that was a little different about this is one that was -- it was the first time we were doing a midyear, you know, and certainly you -- as a council, you've had continual discussions since that time, but it was the first time. And when this item came up, what the initial ask was for 287. We have gotten with the district, and since they were

[03:36:49]

being newly formed, they knew that there was going to be some time to set everything up and do some of the in-kind things that I talked about before that we were going to try to pursue to assist them. So when we got to the budget, we really were not ready for a, you know, full discussion. But it was very clear from council during the midyear that you wanted to fund the 50,000, and that you wanted us to pursue the funding for the 237, because the district moved forward with the idea that they would, in fact, receive that funding. >> Tovo: Yes. Thank you, chief. I appreciate that. Again, I'm fully supportive of this item. I think what you're hearing are some suggestions of how we can continue to instance under our decision making process and the information that we as policy makers get to use as we make those decisions on a weekly basis. So anyway, I think it's been a productive discussion with some good suggestions for how we might continue to -- continue to refine our process. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Council member riley. >> Riley: Just for a little more context about how we got here, we wound up with almost \$400,000 in excess funds because the economic -- it turned out the economic development department didn't need to move and we had expected that they would need to move? >> That is correct. >> Riley: So I think I heard you say we funded the auditor for two most of us and we also funded economic development to move, so we expected both economic development and the auditor's office to move? >> No -- okay. I'm going to speak to it. >> Good morning. I'm deputy cfo. The plan we were putting back together, the budget, we thought we were going to be able to get two floors at the building across the hall. We thought we were going to behooving human resources department over there and at the time either the auditor's office or ero would be moving crews the hall. We didn't know which, but we

[03:38:51]

ended up putting the money into the economic development's budget for the move over there. If it had been the auditor, we would have moved them over there. What happened is, we did not get two floors over there, so human resources is not going to be moving over to that building, and money that we had budgeted in building services for that move is what we used for the auditor's move currently to the lra and eventually across the hall. And so the funds that we had put in for economic development, at this point in time, are not needed. >> So essentially fewer staff had to move than we anticipated. >> It's really the human resources department that we're looking to get out of one texas center that we weren't able to accomplish that. But the end result of all that is that we had funding left over in economic development's budget. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Council member morrison. >> Morrison: I just wanted to look at things and balance things in looking at what priority rises to the top, based on timeliness issues and all of that. Last year at this mid queer budget, that's exactly what we did. Remember, we asked -- staff helped us. They put together sort of all the wishes and all the unknowns that had come out of the election and things like that. We gathered up, ed gathered up all the money that he could find, and we went through a careful process, and that's where the 50,000 rose to the top for the district. So we did go through exactly that process. The reason we didn't do it this year, my understanding is, because we wanted to make sure all the access money went toward next year's

budget so that we would have as much possibility of managing the tax rates and making the decisions at that time, so I feel like it's a

[03:40:51]

little circular what we're doing. We did that last year. We didn't do it this year. We went forward with a new policy, and now we're saying, hey, maybe we really should have done that if we're going to start spending some of the funds. But I do have one question. If these funds weren't spent, weren't allocated right now, what would happen to them in terms of where they end up? What bucket do they end up in when we're considering next year's budget? >> Well, the economic development has been set up as its own department, so every year we'll be looking at the budget of that fund, the economic development fund, and then it's being supported by the water urologist austin energy, and the general fund. And so any monies that aren't spent will just kind of be like the beginning balance of that fund, then we have to charge the other departments to make up the difference. So, for example, if their budget is ten million dollars, and we were to end the year with \$400,000 of savings, then in the 15-year budget, I need to charge out 9.6 million as opposed to ten million dollars. It just gets rolled into the model as we're balancing out the fund. It works the same way with our support services fund and ctm department, the departments that get allocated out to provide funding for them we always start with that beginning balance in mind in order to keep the charges to the paying departments as low as possible. >> Morrison: So from a logical standpoint, intersection it impacts what we have to ask the taxpayers for in state property taxes because the charging department -- >> yes energy rates and water rates too. >> Morrison: Right. I think we need to be aware of that in terms of whether or not our general fund policy ought to also fold over to our other departments that are not enterprise funds but other departments that charge back to other departments.

[03:42:51]

I think it's a fair question, just for consistency purposes because we're talking about how do we make the decisions and how do we maintain the option and the opportunities for aminging ammanaging the tax rate. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Mayor pro tem. >> Cole: Because at the moment our existing policy does not include economic development and the city manager has already made clear that some projects that council has brought forward, like the south shore project, would probably qualify similarly as this one does, I think we should be able to give direction to staff to consider those other items that are within the enterprise fund, as funds become available, until we adopt a policy. Am I understanding the city manager when you said that? >> Not quite. I don't know that I said that. I think I was responding to a specific question from council member riley, relative to this sort of funds and sort of the definition of their purpose. And he was asking a question relative to the short project, given its economic development implications, would this, too, be an appropriate source of funds, potentially. And my answer was yes. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Council member riley. >> Riley: And I appreciate that, as well as the mayor pro tem's comments. So my question is just, what are the next steps that would be necessary in order to make that happen, in order to make funding available to ensure that the south shore planning process continues? >> Mayor Leffingwell: I would presume a request from council to look at

that and provide to lydia this funding source, an

[03:44:53]

item from council. >> I say that, but -- >> I'd be happy to provide items -- >> we already have five items. >> Riley: I'd be happy to bring another one. >> Mayor? >> Mayor Leffingwell: As classic example, we've opened the door here. >> I just want to remind folks we also passed two resolutions, one to support the austin technology council through economic development, another to support the austin gay and lesbian chamber to a greater degree so they can expand, and frankly, after the discussions we've been having, you know, I've sat down with both of them and said, you know, I just don't think that funding you all midstream fits within the context of what the council is doing, but apparently it does. So I don't -- so if we're going to talk about spending additional funds in economic development, I think we have to bring all of those and have a discussion about setting our priorities. >> Again, I think what's been presented here is something that we think is consistent with what we thought council wanted to happen, based on previous conversations, and you've already heard that there are extenuating circumstances here that make, you know, funding a critical issue, i.E., Emergency probably is too strong of a word, so that is the difference I think that can be offered between this and other things that I'm hearing right now that could wait for consideration in the course, perhaps, of the budget process itself. >> But, city manager, every week we have 20 or so items from council that don't commit to spending, they commit to, you know, trying to find resources or work towards a certain goal, but not actually committing to spending. >> They can't.

[03:46:54]

Council member tovo. >> Tovo: Just a last question on this. Has there been a suggestion that this money does not come from the general fund? I thought I heard a couple comments suggesting -- I mean the economic development is well within the general fund, so any -- I would argue that any money we spend that's left over in economic development, or any other general fund department, needs to meet the policy that we just passed, and as you argued, it does -- you know, you've given us some arguments, as has ms. Byrd, for why it -- why the -- why it would meet the timeliness factor. But I don't want to conclude this discussion with anybody thinking that this is not a general fund. >> I just wanted to clarify. Elaine hart, cfo. Economic development is a separate fund and a separate department. It is not part of our general fund. It receives funding in part from the general fund, austin energies and austin water utility. >> Tovo: But it is funded through general fund. >> It gets general fund resources, yes. >> Tovo: Which in my mind would make it different from, say, austin resource recovery, which is a true enterprise fund. I mean, it has, in my mind, a much closer connection to general fund because that's where monies -- I mean, that's where its money comes from. >> Talk about the restructuring that we did. >> Yeah, if terms of -- I think you're correct, council member. Right now, economic development is still predominantly funded by austin energy, up until this year had been fully funded by austin energy, and this queer we went to a shared funding model where austin energy and the water utility and the general fund are going to share the cost and we proposed and council approved a four-year transition plan. Even at the end of that four years, austin energy being the largest of those three funds will still pay the

majority of the cost. Right now I think it's in the neighborhood of nine million dollars or so, funneled by austin energy, and roughly a million each is funded by the

[03:48:55]

water utility and the general fund. So going back to the discussion of council member morrison, it's predominantly going to result to savings to austin energy, it's just the way the allocation model is currently set up. A lot of discussion has been about our new policy, which I think is still a very strong policy and I'm trying to think through on the fly if any amendments to it would really need to happen, based upon the conversations we're having. And my answer is, I don't think so, because what we're talking about here today is not a budget amendment. It is absolutely a matter of priorities, but it's a matter of, we have identified a need, and the policy says when we've identified a need, the first thing we should be doing, the budget office should be working with departments to try to find existing funds, existing funds that council has already appropriated that aren't needed for some other purpose, we're supposed to be trying to find ways that we could reallocate existing but whatever reason, not needed funds that could be reallocated to meet new priorities. Then we go on to budget amendments, and if a budget amendment is needed, it requires, you know, on these different criteria in order to move forward with the budget amendments. I did just want to clarify that this action here is not a budget amendment. I feel our actions are consistent with the policies, which is, we should first be looking within existing department resources to meet new priorities, whether they be the technology issues that council member morrison talked about or this african-american heritage district. I think that's the work that the policy called for us to do, and I think we've done it. If a budget amendment was needed, if there were no funds and we needed to actually amend the economic development department's budget and, thereby, in maiming the economic development department's budget, he had to do a transfer from the general fund to the economic development department, we would absolutely have to look at that policy and make sure the need adhered to those different priorities before we did the general fund budget amendment. So I actually think the policy

[03:50:57]

serves us well in this discussion. >> Mayor Leffingwell: I have to make one final comment. I support partially funding the economic development department with austin energy funds and with austin water utility funds, but there has to be that link there, the justification for it is that austin energy and the water utility get a return on that investment. It's not a donation, it is an investment in the economic development department. And you have to be able to have that link to show where that return on investment comes in. And I want to make sure that we don't hamper our ability to do that in the future. I guess that's all the discussion we have on this item. I'm sure we'll address it again on thursday. And, council member spelman is not here. The only two remaining items were pulled for discussion by him. So council member tovo. >> Tovo: I do have some questions on number two 2. I'm happy to wait if we want to see if council member spelman comes but since we have staff, I would just ask we have an opportunity at some point to address number 2. But, again, I'm happy to wait and see if council member spelman comes later. >> Mayor Leffingwell: I think what I'd like to do is go on understand a get our

briefing in, then we can come back to council member spelman's items on the boards and commissions.  
>> Good morning again. I'm victor martinez, chair of the boards and transitions taskforce, and this is my co-chair. We wanted to avail ourselves to you guys to give one final presentation on the report that you guys received from the recommendations of our work.

[03:52:59]

The resolution that you guys created directed us to provide recommendations on a transition plan for appointments. The number of members, the appointment process, looking at distributing responsibilities in chapter 2-1, like I mentioned, we submitted our final report on may 5th and I'm happy to see it's in place for the transition plan, which I think is the most urgent thing that you guys need to consider. Our goals were to -- first of all, for the transition plan, to minimize a disruption in the work because it's going to be a very interesting time for our city as we migrate from our current system of government to 10-1, there's going to be a lot of changes, pretty much on the city council will be new, so we want to give the boards and commissions the ability to do their work while everybody figures out what's going on. We also wanted to improve communication by improving silos. It was very interesting for all of us to learn how boards information have a lot of things in common, never talk to each other. There's no communications, there's no channels, there's just -- they don't talk to each other. And to us, that was very critical, that we try to remove those barriers to communication. We also looked at identifying producing greater benefit if combined rather than individually. One of our members mentioned that in some cases the end result is greater than the sum of its part, and I agree with that. I think that by combining some of these boards and commissions, you are able to get more than you started with. We wanted to make it easier for the community to participate in the government. Sometimes right now, if a group or individual is concerned with an issue, they have to go to multiple boards and commission meetings to address that one issue because, again, it's all very separated. There's no communication. So having some of these in one place, it'll make it easier for

[03:55:00]

the community to participate and be heard. We want to optimize limited resources that support the boards and commissions like you guys were just discussing. We all end up paying for everything so we want to make efficient use of our money. It's not about saving money, it's being efficient with the taxpayer money. We want to align the boards and commissions with imagine austin wherever possible.  
>> We were also looking to analyze the positive and negative impacts that may be realized by integrating, separating, or redefining the roles and responsibilities for each board and commission. And we really tried to identify opportunities to bring consistency to the naming and structure of boards and commissions. And then also to somewhat -- commissions to deal with similar issues, to standardize the way they function. >> The things that we considered in doing this was the value added to the city. To make realignments based on common interests and synergies, redistribution of responsibilities, membership size, whether appointment would be by district or at large, diversity, recruitment and quorum issues that arise, and training and staff support. Any questions? >> I have a question, just about the last point you made. Are we going to get a report sort of indicating how you weighed in on some of

these issues? For example, one of the questions that I'm asked pretty frequently is what the new boards and commissions will look like. Will each council member be tasked with nominating somebody from that particular district. So I see that on your list, appointment by district or at large, and I just wonder what you all concluded, what was the substance of your -- your consideration. >> In general, we decided it was not a good idea to require the future council to appoint people from their district. We believe that focus should be

[03:57:00]

on appointing the most qualified person to serve on that board and commission. We also decided that, you know, if voters see that their representative is not appointing people from their district, well, then they won't reelect them. So ... (Laughter.) >> thank you for your work. I know that it was a lot of work and it was pretty intense, and so everybody that participated, we owe a great debt of gratitude. I wanted to mention a couple things. First, thank you for the brevity of your presentation. Two things we mentioned, one, in he remembers the of naming and making things more consistent, sometimes I find when I'm going through the list to get to one, I don't know if austin is in front of it, like the austin music commission, versus just the music commission and the community technology also has austin in front of it. Did you address those kinds of naming inconsistencies? >> Not really. Because we have boards, we have commissions, we have taskforces, and we said, okay, let's find out if we can choose one name so that people know what you're talking about. We shied away from board because the person that comes to mind is non-profits and full profit boards. Commissions sounds more governmenty, so that's the word we -- >> governmenty? That's a nice word. >> So we recommended many of them be changed to be commissions. Some we left alone because they're just like, you know, zone and platting, that's -- >> environmental board? >> Yes. That one stays. >> The airport boulevard -- >> many we chose to just switch or are recommending to switch to commission. >> And those are listed in the report somewhere? >> Yes.

[03:59:02]

>> Morrison: Just something I wanted to share with folks, in terms of silos and commissioners, boards not necessarily talking to each other, one of the things I've done every year that I've been on council has been to host a reception for all the folks that I nominated that I consider my appointees. I know they're not really. And it's just really exciting to get these people that are engaged in their various areas talking to each other, hanging out, and finding the collaboration, plus the areas they share and issues they share, plus it forms, you know, sort of a personal bond, they get to know each other, they know how to call each other and all that, so it's a nice thing to do. I know we used to have -- the city used to host a whole, big reception for all the boards and commissi and I guess we probably stopped doing that because of funding? >> Because of the budget. >> We did, however, have a question to see if there was a possibility of starting to do those things again because as volunteers that we are, it's a nice thing. >> To get a little bit of -- feed you a small sandwich, once a year. >> Piece of cake. >> Piece of cake once a year. But I wholeheartedly endorse anything that we can do to bring just in a social setting those folks together because they're all one, in a way, and a social setting, they do talk about policy issues. It's

something that's to the benefit of the community. >> Council member martinez. >> Martinez: I wanted to thank the working groups that came up with these recommendations. I'm really excited about a lot of the recommendations that you've made, in particular, the thought that you put into creating an economic prosperity commission. I think that is a very good suggestion. I think it's long overdue. I think the only tweak that I see on that is maybe adding someone from the construction

[04:01:02]

advisory commission because construction is also a big, big component of our decision as it relates to economic development. But then the joint sustainability committee, the joint inclusion committee, I think these are well thought-through suggestions. But as you know, we also hear from citizens who are concerned about some of the recommendations, and so, as you know, there's a deep concern among some hispanic community members about the recommendation to combine the hispanic quality of life commission and the mexican american cultural center advisory board. I wanted to just ask for your general impressions and thoughts, but I also wanted to see if you were hearing the same concerns from the asian american community and the african-american community because you also have similar recommendations combining a couple of their -- those similar boards and commissions. >> Right. First, to answer your second question, we heard -- actually read on the paper that the chair of, I think, the african-american quality of life commission was generally not sure about this recommendation. That was done before the final report, so I'm hoping to see what he thinks of the final report. The asian american representatives we spoke with were very supportive and very excited about this recommendation. As you well know, the hispanic community was not happy with this, was very shocked at the level of animosity that was present in the meetings, where they came to speak against it. It was interesting also that we kept -- some of our members kept asking them for reasons why they would oppose them, feeling personally offenders or insulted by this. We said give us a reason why you think it's a bad idea. And we didn't really get a whole lot of actual substantive answers about why we think it's a bad idea.

[04:03:04]

We said you guys don't talk to each other. Actually, one of the people that spoke was a professor at ut, he was very eloquent, he gave reasons about workload and all that. I said what if we -- say we're increasing the number of members because you have a lot of work, but we require you guys the meet once a quarter, and they were opposed to that and that really shocked me. I could not understand why people would be opposed to meeting once a quarter to discuss things that they have in common. I couldn't understand that other than, you know, changes, scary. >> Exactly. >> Turf control -- you know, once you've worked so hard -- because I understand they work really hard and we're lucky enough to have laurie in our group, she was there in the trenches from day one. I know once you've fought so hard for something, feeling like you're getting it taken away must be a very scary thought. But, again, I don't think that we are taking anything away. I think that we are combining two separate voices into one that could be more powerful because it would be the voice for everything that has to do with the hispanic community in austin. And as we grow in population, and I think that voice will carry more weight as a

unified voice than as two separate ones. >> I really appreciate that. I think you're right. You know, I think there is -- there is an initial reaction to a change, if you will, and we certainly are hearing that. I like the suggestion of it. At least if we can't agree on consolidating them, how about we agree on you guys communicating every now and then? Because I think over time, they're going to see that the issues are similar and actually they could probably assist one another, as opposed to working in silos. So I think that's a fair compromise as a suggestion and certainly one that I would consider supporting. In the other recommendations for consolidations that don't really deal with a minority community or cultural committee, did you hear from citizens regarding the environmental board and urban

[04:05:06]

forestry board and downtown community court advisory committee and the public safety commission? >> So we did hear from the downtown community court advisory committee because lori serves on that group. And that's where with the suggestion was actually borne from, because they cover many of the same issues. In terms of the environmental board and the urban forestry board, again, we had members on our commission of both -- both of the chairs of those groups. >> Great. >> So they -- they found that to be a feasible recommendation. >> And anything from the mayor's committee for people with disability and the commission on seniors? >> Yes. The mayor's committee on people with disabilities was supportive in general. The commission on seniors, not so much. And that was all we struggled with, because, yes, there are a lot of different things, but again, there's a lot of common things. There's accessibility, there's housing, there's fixed incomes, there's, you know, workforce, and I think there's a lot of commonalities that they can really leverage and work together and have a stronger voice. That was one that -- I think that was the one that our council was the most divided on, and that one really looks like, the -- the wiser thing to do would be to keep them separate, but make sure they form a joint committee because there's a lot of things they can leverage and come up with things for our community. >> So we can do a hybrid of your recommendation and keep them separate but have them meet on a quarterly basis and please exchange information after every one of their individual meetings, make sure the other committee knows what they discussed and what's on their agenda. Thank you you all so much. I look forward to moving this forward and accepting a lot of these recommendations.

[04:07:07]

>> Mayor Leffingwell: I'd like to just follow up on that. I would characterize the opposition from the commission on seniors as more than "not so much." I would say totally against. And so I think that's a good idea to keep those two commissions separate and have them collaborate on some basis. Council member riley. >> Riley: I want to thank the taskforce for all their work. A lot of interesting issues you all have talked through. I want to ask about ones, a couple of them that council member martinez raised, especially with cultural centers, mexican american cultural center, asian, african-american. I was visiting with members of the mack advisory board at a recent event about that, and one thing that came up is that there are -- there are a number of roles that the mack -- that a board can play when it oversees a cultural institution like that. Also, with private sector institutions, a board will have an important fund raising role. This is different because our boards cannot do fund raising so you wind up

with things like -- you have a library commission, and then you have a separate friends of the library group that will do fund-raising. I just wonder if there had are there -- for cultural centers like the ones we're talking about here, are there best practices from other cities that you all might have looked at? Did you all look at the role of boards overseeing cultural institutions, in particular, to see whether it was typical for a -- for a city to have a city board overseeing it, and then a separate non-profit board that would raise money for it, or are there other models out there that we should consider? >> We did not look at that, but that's a really interesting

[04:09:07]

point because I do think that the more public funding these centers have, the less reliant they are on taxpayer money, I think the more profound their impact is on the community. Because it means that really the community is supporting them, and they're not only saying, yes, I support it, but they're opening their wallets and doing so. I think that's a really good idea. >> Riley: It's just something to consider with respect to those cultural institutions because we're talking about people who are very dedicated to the success of those institutions, and with respect to other institutions, often that dedication turns into fund-raising. And our city boards are not in a position where they can do that. >> I think that one of the misapprehensions that arose from this process in terms of the cultural groups is like -- the misapprehension was that you were going to have a bunch of people working on a broader range of topic areas, and that some of the work that each of these groups does was going to be diluted. However, one of the things that we told -- we proposed was, well, you know, you could always have a subcommittee that focuses just on the cultural aspects. So even in the merged embodiment of what we proposed, there is the potential to maintain the standard -- the standard of service, based on subcommittees and working groups. I just think that going back to the change issue, that's always very difficult. And it's very difficult to think of yourself as being a member of a board, thinking of yourself just as a member of a subcommittee to a certain level. >> I just want to -- >> Mayor Leffingwell: Excuse me, raw member of the committee? >> I am, sir. And I took a I heat over that. I'm a mexican by marriage.

[04:11:10]

I am a member of the downtown austin community court advisory committee, and long-time supporter of the mack, and I just wanted to come forward to say that the friends of the mack, is a private non-profit that's been around -- we formed 30-something years ago as a political action committee, and we've received our secretary of state, you know, and we're in the process of getting our 501c 3. The other big issue that we discussed with all three of the cultural centers facilities and their quality of life boards is that they're all reporting to different departments. And you have different staff people. So not only are the members of the boards and commissions not talking to each other, the quality of life and the advisory boards, but you have staff from different. So if we consider that a lot of our tourism and cultural facilities not only serve our local population but are also attractions for economic develop the., It only seems fair that had he all be under economic development or all be under parks or all be under human resources because when you look at the three communities, you have three different departments that are staffing those groups. And a good example of the need for collaboration is the

hispanic quality of life board was really new, so a lot of their complaints about not being involved or being invited to apply for a seat on the taskforce -- the clerk only looked at the boards and commissions that were meeting as of december, so the asian and

[04:13:11]

hispanic quality of life committees had not been formed yet. The -- after one of our meetings with the latino community, frank rodriguez had been elected as chair of the quality of life board, and he sent an e-mail to everybody thanking them for support, and people like me, we encourage you to get involved with our committees, but we don't have a place to meet. So, you know, I mean that raises an issue. If you've got a quality of life committee and they can't meet at their own cultural center, I mean, there's some lack of communication there. So, you know, and that's one thing the asian community talked to us about. They said our resource center is a paired facility, and we're reporting to the manager, and there's real issues in trying to get use -- you know, help with our quality of life initiative around cultural education awareness when a different department is controlling the building and the keys and the hiring of the staff. So you've got to figure out a way to put them all in one police and let them work together, and then encourage them all to form their non-profits, friends of the library, friends of -- you know, we all need those. Thank you. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Mayor pro tem cole. >> Cole: I certainly couldn't agree with those last comments more and I'm glad you formed a joint cultural committee because I think that will help with a lot of that understanding of what goes on between the different ethnic heritage groups that we -- the ethnic committees that we have. I wanted to ask, because we had a brief discussion last time, about how the committees

[04:15:12]

actually do their reporting to council. Was there any discussion about what goes to management versus what comes to council? I know if we put a little effort into it, we can get those reports, but I was wondering if the commissions have any concerns about that process. >> Yeah, it's very interesting, because we have, as you all know, some commissions that are sovereign and they make final decisions, like the one I chair. Then there's other ones that make recommendations to council. And while they all have an annual report requirement, I don't think there's a consistent way in which, you know, those things that the community discusses in those meetings that require funding or require council action, how those, you know, bubble up to council. I think that's something that we really should look into, how to -- have a standard process so that not only the citizens know how to get, you know, something done in their neighborhood, but also they know where to go and what that process looks like. >> Cole: Okay. I couldn't agree more that we need a consistent bubble up process. I just want to thank you for your work. It has been truly astounding in the time that you put into it, and I think it'll help us greatly. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Council member tovo? >> Tovo: Couple of week questions. Can you address the commission for women? I see that the recommendation is to dissolve it and integrate it into the joint inclusion commission, which will be made up primarily of individuals who actually serve on another commission. And so I guess I'd like to hear a little bit about why that model wasn't considered for the commission for women. I know that our commission -- I know this from listening to my colleague

council member morrison speak, it was kind of the first in the country and kind of a model for others and it does serve some pretty focused purposes of nominating and honoring women who have served in our city and maintaining the women hall of fame and whatnot. So if you could just speak to

[04:17:12]

that. >> Well, I would actually -- what we found is that they focus on a single -- they focus on activities that impact women, and -- but there's -- what it was, I'm going to bring norman keike up here because he's the one -- he was hoping that I wouldn't do this to him, actually. Norm, can you come up -- thanks for being here. >> I'm on the austin mayor's committee for people with disabilities. I talked with both the chair and the staff liaison for this committee. Last year in their annual report, they reported having the luncheon where they recognized women in austin. Their goals for next year were the luncheon and to support early childhood initiatives. There's a commission that already addresses those. And health care issues. And there's a commission that addresses those as well. So I didn't see a lot of growth in what they were proposing for next year. We anticipated that the combined commission that they were part of, the integration commission, would have a subcommittee to do the luncheon. So -- >> Tovo: Yeah, the reception. Yeah, I appreciate that. I wonder, though, if we could -- I guess it bears some more thinking about and consideration. I've wondered if they might not expand their focus a little bit, you know, now and then we hear comments from -- that suggest there might be an opportunity for them to look at and talk with some of our staff, for example, you know. Occasionally I get comments that there's a need to look at how women -- how representative women are in management positions at the city, and

[04:19:12]

that's certainly something that our commission for women could take on. So it may also be -- there may also be an opportunity just to rethink some of the areas we want them to consider. >> One of the factors that we looked at with commissions was the frequency of meetings and the frequency of cancellations. >> Tovo: Right. >> They had a lot of cancellations, a lot of lack of quorum. >> Tovo: Thank you. That's helpful information. Do they typically meet quarterly? >> They're scheduled for monthly but their first two meetings were cancelled and frequent meeting cancellations last year. >> Tovo: Thank you for that. >> Frequently right before the awards program. >> Tovo: That makes sense. >> So we saw that if I got really well into a combined commission where they have a taskforce or subcommittee to do that particular event. >> Especially there's also hispanic women issues and african-american women issues. One of the biggest challenges, I think, for women of color in austin, healthwise, is hiv. And it's something that people don't talk about. The largest demographic per capita getting infections of hiv is women of color between the ages of 24 and 35. It's a really terrifying statistic. >> Tovo: It is. Well, thank you again for that background information. I appreciate it. There's another potential merger I'd like to touch on, and that is the -- well, can you tell me what happened to the electric utility commission? I'm not immediately seeing it. I see the joint sustainability committee, and I know there was a discussion about maybe merging that with the resource management commission. I'm not immediately -- >> I think so. >> Tovo: -- Seeing whether they are changes contemplated or recommended for the electric utility

commission. >> I think the electric utility commission stays with 11 members. Let me check real quick.  
>> Tovo: I see someone in the back nodding. >> It goes to eleven members,

[04:21:14]

yes. >> Tovo: So that remains unchanged and research management will become a little broad, at least in terms of a name change. Thank you. You did a tremendous job. >> Morrison: Two points I wanted to touch in terms of the inner governmental that you're recommending can you talk about that, and what they're made up of? >> There's a lot of government organizations and groups in central Texas that deal with issues that affect all of us, but there's really no citizen group that's involved in the decision making process or perhaps some level of oversight on how those funds are spent. And it's all taxpayer money, so we wanted to have a forum in which these groups could come and report on what they're doing. Again, that's another communication thing happening there. And also citizen input, having -- having a voice in how those taxpayer monies are spent, which I think is very important. >> Morrison: I think that's an interesting idea. You know, we have one joint subcommittee with the school district and the county, and it offers a good vehicle for discussions, and the topics that we address are certainly what is up to individual interest, although we're doing financial stuff. So I'm curious -- I imagine maybe transportation issues would be touched on, and committee quality, and things like that? >> Yes. >> Morrison: Did anyone -- one of the things that's always been of interest to me is that we don't have -- oftentimes we have a correspondence between a council committee and a commission. Health and human services has some tie to the community development commission, but we don't really have a public health -- anywhere to go to

[04:23:14]

discuss public health things in general. Obviously, HIV is a public health issue. Did that issue come up at all in your discussions? >> Not specifically. That's a -- that's a really interesting idea, but because there are a lot of public health issues, and again, there's no commission that addresses those. So perhaps that's a new one you guys want to think about? (Laughter.) >> Morrison: Well, our public health agendas are always really interesting, really meaty, there's lots of -- lots of topics that need community discussion. We do a lot of recommendations ourselves. I could just -- I could see that as something that could be of interest, and, obviously, public health is part of many of the quality of life issues. So I'm not sure -- >> joint committee from the quality of life groups and perhaps somebody on the planning council would be a good idea. >> Morrison: Maybe we could think about that, and if you have -- especially within the context of all the discussions you all have had to think about throwing that on the table. So -- and then just one thing I wanted to talk about, I might have misunderstood mayor pro tem's comment about making sure we have some consistent process, I think you were talking about for communication between the council and the commissions. >> Cole: Mayor? >> Mayor Leffingwell: Mayor pro tem. >> Cole: Yes, I would like us to think about that, and maybe that's more something that should come by council resolution, but I feel like our commissions do a lot of work that our council's subcommittees could discuss, and then potentially bring up to a full council, that we don't get to delve into enough, and that a lot doesn't bubble up. >> And I just wanted to add there is one system we have in place right now

that the clerk put together because that was something that was clear to us a while ago, that the commissions are making all these wonderful -- doing all this wonderful work and making recommendations, and she did put

[04:25:16]

into play something to ensure that we see every recommendation, at least, that comes out, and I wonder if we could speak to that. >> Sure. Jeanette goodall. We have a process in place where a board and commission adopts a formal recommendation that they want to pass to council, is that they submit it to us through the same process that they submit their agendas for their meetings, and then we post that to the web, and send an e-mail out to the council offices saying here are the following recommendations from the board and commission. We do not do that with the annual plans, but we could look at doing some type of automatic notification when we get those going forward, but we do do it with at least the formal recommendations that we get -- that get submitted to us. >> I think that would be a great idea on the annual reports because that way we'll be notified, and I appreciate you sending the recommendations. And generally it comes with a quick little description. >> Right. It will say what board, and then give a little -- quick little description, and I think it gives you a link to that document so you can go and view any of those documents that you're interested in. >> Yeah. I really appreciate that. It's been very informative, and in the past, before we had this in place, it was almost like, you know, the recommendations sort of went out into the -- so this is a really good tie that we have going now. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Any more discussions or questions? Okay. Thank you. Take care. >> Thank you. So council member spelman still isn't here. I would suggest we go on to item e 1 since that is a possible action item.

[04:27:16]

E 1. So this is possible action of appointments to the joint working group on public safety with travis county created by resolution number ... So on. Council member riley. >> Riley: This is prompted by an item the council passed at our last meeting on may 1st, and it relates to public safety issues that are of interest to both the city and the county. And the idea is simply to have a working group so that we can have informal meetings with staff here at both the city and the county, as well as county commissioners and council members. Council member martinez and I have been working on certain had you been safety issues that involve the county for some time now, and my understanding based on discussions with people that have been involved in those issues is that there was -- at one point some time ago, there was a standing working group that involved both the city and the county, two commissioners, two council members, and then staff from both the county and the city. We'd get periodically to discuss public safety issues and perhaps issues outside the public safety realm. The idea was simply that there are an awful lot of matters of common concern, and it's very helpful to have some regular form for discussing those issues with staff, and staff really needs some direction from council in order to be able to work in that sort of setting. And so that was the reason for the resolution, and so now we have this item on here just so we can -- the resolution, the council picks two council members to serve on that. I'd -- and then the idea is that

[04:29:18]

the county -- county commissioners court has a similar item on its agenda, I understand, so it will pick two commissioners. The meetings that we had -- there have been a few meetings that had both council member martinez and myself and two commissioners, and I can't speak for council member martinez, but I'd be happy to continue in that role if it's the council's pleasure that those conversations continue. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Council member martinez. >> Martinez: Likewise, I'd be happy to continue serving in a role that is created via that resolution. The one example that I'll point out is the one that we've been discussing now for some weeks on this -- the fire monitoring system that is potentially coming back to council. We absolutely had to have conversations with our county partners and other governments, the city of westlake who already owns a monitor, so it's difficult to ask staff to help us facilitate those conversations to work on those issues when council hasn't given that policy direction. And so we simply wanted to formalize that so staff didn't feel like, you know, they were not operating under a policy position that this body has taken. Likewise, though, there are many other issues that are seamless in terms of public safety with travis county. When we look at the city's growth, it's rapid growth, and how the county is responding to that as well, where they're sighting ems stations. We heard through last week's budget conversations that I think we need two new ems stations, in terms of unmet needs. Those are the types of conversations we're going to have to have moving forward so that we can make those decisions jointly, as opposed to individually operating without, you know, some fruitful communications between the two entities. So, again, I'd be happy to continue serving with council member riley in that capacity, but ultimately council's decision. [One moment please for change in

[04:31:20]

captioners] items that were pulled by councilmember spelman, 2 or 27. Councilmember tovo. >> I have some questions about number 2. And I see we have staff here. So I guess maybe we could start with a little explanation of what this does. It's my understanding this is consolidating various authorizations related to hedging. If you could flesh that out for me. >> Yes, it is. It consolidating some spending that we do on fuel and on energy and those are two separate authorizations that apply during fy and so we're talking about consolidating those into one fund. No increase in the funding, but consolidating \$245 million of authority that we have for natural gas and 71 million that we have for power. So that would be one authorization on an annual basis. And then the edging program, we already have \$800 million in spending authority and that is over a five-year period.

[04:33:21]

And we're making some administrative changes on how we would do our accounting and our netting of the gains and cost of that program. That's really the only change on that. So no increases in spending authority, but just making clear of the changes that we would like to do in bringing those together as one pool available for energy and gas. >> Tovo: Okay. I appreciate that explanation, but I'm not

following it as closely as I really need to. So the 800 million is being -- so you have the ability right now to make power purchases in a total of 71 million. And then an additional 245 million of natural gas. >> Correct. >> Those are going to be merged into their own authorization or are they being merged with the \$800 million of hedging authority? >> Yes. They'll remain as independent from the hedging authority, but merged into a collective pool available for energy and power. Because of the convergence that we see in the markets today we do a lot of purchasing through the market. We're not always sure whether we're going to be buying natural gas or buying power, so it would be one collective authority. >> Can you help me understand how this -- how this authorization affects hedging in particular? I know that commissioner fath raised some concerns about this because in part it's my understanding that some of the evidence suggests that we've lost something like \$400 million in hedging. I haven't been able to verify the access of that, but there were concerns that we have lost -- there were concerns about hedging and I want to understand how this may or may not affect us? >> Well, generally -- larry weiss, general manager austin energy. Generally speaking, these risk management

[04:35:22]

programs for policymakers or for folks that are not in the professional side like us, becomes sometimes a little interesting because there's a cost associated with it. This is an insurance policy really. What we're doing is we're discussing credit risk, which is required, frankly, by wall street on all of our debt and everything going forward. These are very serious programs to the financial community that we do not go out of bounds of a risk requirement. We have the city cfo and also the treasurer sit in on this, not just austin energy. And that being said, all public utilities and probably private ones, have a way of managing these securities going forward. Looking back you can always say gee, we could have done a lot better. But that's driving forward in the rearview mirror because the reality of it is that we have to be very cautious and not expose our utility to the market. If we expose our self to the market too much it can get very volatile. This flexibility we're asking for is what we have to find sometimes is the flexibility between acquiring more gas and running our own generation or doing it in the market. And that flexibility has caused us some administrative concern a time or two. And that's one of the cleanups we want to do. So our committee which meets monthly, the rock roc. Risk oversight committee, the roc. We met and we discussed it thoroughly ourselves and we voted on it. So that's really the way that this starts now. Back to the euc, again we've had many discussions on it because they don't understand the professional nature of why we need to hedge our fuel. These are financial hedges that are complicated. In fact, erica has to explain it here for us because they are, they're difficult instruments to understand. And I think euc we've had many discussions

[04:37:22]

over it where they still think we would be better not having any risk oversight, we better plan on the market. We just fundamentally cannot do that. So that's where that gap in discussion happens. >> Tovo: I appreciate that distinction. And I guess one question I would have for you is hedge -- the utility has adopted hedge ising in the last six or seven years. >> After the energy crisis of 2000 where several utility companies nationally were caught with not having a financial policy where they're at risk. It almost

collapsed those utilities. So after that -- it started in California and affected companies in Texas, Enron and others. So after that the financial markets, the rating agencies and the people we borrow money from, wanted us to be -- operate programs where we really secure our future and not put ourselves at risk. So that's really where it started. I think 2003 is when it was adopted here, but it all started across the country by the same issue other utilities -- I'll give you an example of one utility. I believe in Southern California, they lost \$100 million because they have not secured any hedging position and it really caused a huge problem. Big problem. So without this policy in place, how does this change your hedging strategy? >> It doesn't change the strategy, but gives us a little more head room because we've bumped up into a limit between those two different funds a couple of times and maybe I should defer to Erica or Sheryl. >> I thought we weren't raising the amount. >> Aren't changing the amount, just the

[04:39:22]

flexibility. >> Tovo: But in regards to hedging how is the flexibility? >> I think we're not really changing the hedging approach, but because of the way our accounting has been done, those losses that you've spoken of, the losses have been historically captured in a bucket. So that limit -- we no longer have 800 million in spending authority forward. So as we look to the summer and look at the drought and the possibility of high temperatures, we're concerned that if we don't go ahead and clean that up and make it 800 million of authority going forward again, that they would be at risk of taking on some exposure that we might not want to take on. >> So what's currently going on is as hedges settle or occur we go in the market and we make the acquisitions currently, for the current year. The gains are ignored and the losses permanently deplete that spending authority. That's happened over the last 10 years. >> Tovo: So the gains don't come back to that authority. But the losses do. So what happens is that over the last 10 years in equality what occurs is that transaction moves to the current fiscal year, which is that 316 that we're talking about, whether it's 245 in the gas or the power historically or currently I should say before this is looked forward approval, that is -- those transactions are then taken into it. They're actually done, performed, and they flow through the PSA, through the fuel charge. Whatever that cost might be. The gains or losses are not included in -- the gains or losses are not included in that. So what happens is they get stuck or they stay in that forward spending authority. So what we're looking to do is clarify that

[04:41:23]

accounting so that that complete transaction can move to the current fiscal year and then move on through the PSA. And the forward spending authority is looking at the forward obligations that we're managing in the 60 months out into the future. >> So does this reset it or does it change it going forward? Will the losses -- hopefully there won't be any. Would those losses come off the 800 million again or does it permanently change the accounting method? >> Well, currently what it would do is it would replenish the 800 million because now that transaction has rolled off or settled. It has moved into actuality. It's been realized. And now it's sitting in the current fiscal year being accounted for in the current year. So that the accounting of that transaction stays intact. It just moves from one pool to the other. Since one was forward and now it is no longer. And it sits in that current fiscal year and rolls off through the PSA. >> I think that to answer your other question, I think that we're asking to make a

permanent change to the way we do that accounting so that everything gets cleared as it's settled, but the horizon leaves the 800 million funding available. >> Tovo: Okay. >> We don't always have that much obligation out there. It depends on the price of energy, it depends on the price of natural gas, but having the ability to plan for the customers, for that steadiness of expectations and the cost is what we want to make sure we have. >> I want to reiterate too that it does happen the other way. Where if we saw a sudden rise in wholesale prices or gas prices and we're holding our positions it actually goes the other way. >> Tovo: In terms of -- >> I've seen that happen a couple of times, especially around that 2003 time period, but in recent times it's been interesting for folks like on the euc and other public power

[04:43:23]

policymakers to look and watch that. We keep ensuring ourselves, but the market keeps getting cheaper. So it's not really -- I guess it's like having an insurance policy and not having a claim for. So the reality is in the future there will be some times and it will be very important. >> So I guess another way to look at it would not be necessarily losses, it just didn't -- we ended up paying more than the market than the price turned out to be. >> We were comfortable in layering that premium in because it created the predictability that we were looking for. >> Tovo: So it's my understanding that there's another element to this that I wonder if you could address. And that's the congestion revenue rights. >> That is something that we've used the spending authority to be able to acquire. So I'm not sure what you mean by another element, but that is part of -- >> Tovo: That is a part -- >> yes, it is. >> Tovo: Could you explain what that is? And why we want it? >> It's what we call basis risk. We use that to manage two different price points in the ERCOT nodal market. So we buy power for our customers at Austin Energy load zone, so that's one price exposure that we have. We purchase at that point. And then we generate at our facilities at other price points within ERCOT. And those will settle -- that can settle at different price points. So what we do is we purchase -- in essence it's a swap, so fix the price between those two points. So I would rather pay 50 cents that I make sure that the price I'm paying here and the price I'm receiving here is the same as opposed to being off. And we having to pay more at load zone than I receive at my generation.

[04:45:23]

>> Tovo: How does this policy change? How does this item on here change that? >> It doesn't at all. It allows me to be able to continue to do that in a proper fashion looking forward and rolling off the gift cents allocating it to the proper bucket going forward. >> Tovo: So again it's a shift in accounting methods so it's -- is that currently coming off your total authorization? >> Yes. >> Tovo: I see. >> And that's included in the program prior to this that's been part of the hedging program. It's the same accounting treatment. >> Tovo: Thanks very much. I appreciate that clarification. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Any other questions? The burning meadow of Austin, Texas. [Laughter] Councilmember Morrison. Are we ready for another item? I didn't have a question on this. >> Mayor Leffingwell: You do? Go ahead. >> Morrison: This is a different item. And this is for one of my colleagues, number 24, is the resolution on looking at finding a way to come up with a recommendation for TMCs transportation network companies like side car and all that. And I wanted to -- you do reference the resolution that we passed last year that

asked staff to go out and look at things. And they came back with a report that sort of delineated different things. I know there's been action nationally since then so that provides some additional guidance to have this discussion. I found that the report that staff came back with was really helpful to me in many ways. One of the things I think we get questions about and one of the things that I have sort

[04:47:24]

of grappled with and learned about as a councilmember is what is the city's interest in regulating taxis and ride services. And I wanted -- they did a good job of talking about some of those -- all of them probably was a pretty comprehensive list. I wanted to make sure that we were foreseeing -- I don't know if it's needed explicitly -- that the stakeholder discussions will really address all of those issues that the staff had raised for us. I can list a few of them. It's about obviously public safety, equal access, all across the city and all of those kinds of things. So I just wondered what your intention was and whether you think it might make sense to add a whereas that actually captured that. >> Go ahead. >> Riley: Absolutely. All of those issues are things that I would expect this stakeholder group to be working on. There are a lot of concerns that we would have with any ground transportation service, including services provided by transportation network companies and that would cloud a lot of things related to passenger safety, insurance, as well as issues related to having a fair and level playing field between tnc's and taxi companies and other ground transportation service providers. There has been a lot of discussion about this nationally. Work has been going on even since the time did that report last year. So I think that the staff's report is a great starting point for continued discussions. I also think that we have a lot of folks in austin who can help us cyst through some of those issues and work toward solutions that meet all of the concerns that are out there, including the ones that you mentioned. So I'd be happy to include any language in the whereas that identifies those issues as things that we need

[04:49:24]

to be sure and look al. I've certainly been having those conversations with people interested in this and pointing out that we need to be sure that we figure out a way to address all those concerns. That's really why it's been such a difficult issue for cities all over the country and states all over the country is because there is a lot to work through. You can't just say sure, go ahead, do this service. There are a lot of protections that you need to get into place. >> Morrison: I appreciate that and I think it would be useful to have a whereas that delineates all of them. It's bringing a lot of people to the table that might not have a lot of experience in some parts of ground transportation services so it would help set the level of discussion. Do you want to suggest one. If you would like to do that, put it in backup so we don't have to pull it. >> You mean just adding language about the specific issues to address in the course of the discussions? >> Right. And you might even mention the specific report. I know you've mentioned that they did a report because -- so that folks can find it if they want. IT'S MAY 21st, 2013. I think they laid those issues out quite well here. >> Riley: Yes. I would be glad to work on some language for you. >> Mayor Leffingwell: So I have a lot of concerns about safety issues and liability issues. I was shown a news clip recently about one of these type companies. I don't know which one of these two it was, who there was a serious incident involving passenger and the company refused to assume liability because, quote,

the driver's app was turned off and they were unable to communicate to him, that kind of thing. So I think there are a lot of issues. I do recognize that we need more public transportation, but I think there's also fairness issue and that fairness has to do with our existing cab franchises. I think if we're going to open this up, and I'm not necessarily opposed

[04:51:24]

to that, but I think we ought to open it up for the cab companies as well. So just say anybody that meets these safety and liability and what other regulations we need to have, whether they be a conventional cab company or some other type company, they should be able to have an authorization, a franchise to operate. So I think that's only fair. I think it's not fair to give unlimited opportunities to these new companies to come in while you don't do the same thing for cab companies, the existing cab franchises. >> Martinez: Mayor? I 100% agree with you and that's one of the reasons I'm a co-sponsor of this. I would dare say that I've worked on taxi cab issues more than anyone over the last eight years. I completely agree that there is a long-standing process for how we have established our cab companies, via franchise agreements, and we have to honor and respect that process. The the reason I support this is because of the other reasons you mention, and that is we do have a -- an inordinate demand for service at certain peak hours that we're not able to address and this item simply asks for recommendations for a pilot program. So we, the council, retain ultimate authority of anything, including a pilot program. So I will be a part of this resolution for those very specific reasons and I share concerns about liability, insurance, and quite honestly what it means to us as a city. Whether or not we can come forward with a new and improved franchise agreement process, if you will, that potentially generates additional revenue for the city, but also provides a much needed service at the same time. I don't know if we can come to that conclusion. Based on last year's report I think we see some major obstacles in our way, but I do

[04:53:27]

believe that looking at all options is really important especially in light of some of the incidents that have happened here in austin. >> Mayor Leffingwell: I haven't read the resolution, councilmember, but does it include directing the city manager as he's looking at all these options to include the option of lifting the restrictions on all cab franchise limitations? >> Riley: Mayor, this simply sets in motion a stakeholder process that includes representatives of taxi companies and taxi drivers as well as those interested in transportation network companies that work through all of these issues and come up with a set of recommendations. >> Mayor Leffingwell: It doesn't exclude that. Is that part of your vision? I mean as a sponsor of this, that you would have unlimited cab franchises for anybody that meets the basic qualifications? >> Riley: No. I don't expect that we would have unlimited cab franchises, no. >> Mayor Leffingwell: But you would have unlimited [indiscernible], for example. >> Riley: It's a good question and I don't know what the ultimate solution is. I have heard that in places like san francisco that we have seen many cab drivers end up being involved in tnc's. And it may be that there is some solution that would involve some overlap in the roles of the tnc's and taxi cabs of the I think it's important to have them at the table. This is uncharted territory for the whole country. We need to figure out a vision for

how tnc's can co-exist with taxis. I don't think we're there yet, but I think austin is the sort of place that ought to be among those cutting edge cities who are out there exploring those issues and coming up with what could become a best practice model for the country to follow. >> Mayor Leffingwell: I just don't think I can support it without the clear direction, making it clear to the existing cab companies that that

[04:55:29]

this proposition is on the table too. And maybe that can be made clear in the resolution that one of the options would be -- if any of these options selected it would apply equally across the board to existing cab companies and new entrants, new modalities that would come into the market. >> I did have discussions with the chair of the urban transportation commission subcommittee that has been working on these issues. And he certainly has been very mindful about the need for a level playing field. So he has been looking at ways that we could ease up on the restrictions on taxi cabs while allowing tnc's to enter the ground transportation market. It is not an easy thing. As you recall, dr. May monody had a record in 2011 where he raises a number of concerns about deregulating taxi services. He point to a number of other cities across the country that have tried -- gone in the direction of deregulating taxis and his report indicated that the results have been -- have not been very good from the consumer standpoint. We've seen higher prices and worse service. That was back in 2011 before the whole tnc conversation was really underway. In the meantime the landscape has changed. Dr. Ray mundy is now serving on the national board of rights [indiscernible], one of our homegrown transportation innovators. And they really believe that tnc's can help fill a role and maybe it would work to ease up on taxi cab regulations and avoid some of the negative effects that we've seen in the past. That is what this conversation is all about, figuring out how all those services can operate at the same time while still maintaining

[04:57:30]

certain standards of service and customer safety. And that's exactly what the idea of this resolution is to have all those conversations. >> Mayor Leffingwell: The last thing I want to do is ease up on the regulations, that's not it. But if one type of cab company or public transportation has virtually unlimited -- an unlimited number of cabs, because that's what they are, then why shouldn't all the others? I think this that should be made clear in the direction of this resolution in those words so that there's no misunderstanding about what our intent is. >> Mayor? >> Mayor Leffingwell: Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: I appreciate the comments I would also say we've heard from taxi drivers over the last years that they would like to get their permits directly through the city rather than a franchise. And to me this -- consideration of these issues really does open up a completely different paradigm for how we're operating ground transportation in our city and I think all of those considerations need to be a part of this. But I think I have a fundamental basic question. We've got an urban transportation committee that at audit and finance we blessed to go forward to study this issue and it's my understanding that it's been set up as a subcommittee or work group or something like that. So why is there a need for a stakeholder group when we already have one that's been meeting on this issue? >> Riley: If I may. We have a

subcommittee of the utc that's been working on this. Unfortunately it's not been going so well. They had quorum issues and the meetings just have not been going as well as we had hoped. It has not worked out.

[04:59:31]

It was based largely on those discussions with the chair of the utc subcommittee that we arrived at this resolution. The idea simply to shift the conversation to a different venue, bring in more stakeholders, have a council authorized stakeholder process and the hope is that might provide a venue that would put us on a path towards success because the current path we have been on does not seem to be pointed in a very positive direction. >> Tovo: I heard they had quorum issues, but is that it that the commissioners have not been interested enough to participate in it enough other than the chair? >> Mayor Leffingwell: I don't know. >> Tovo: I'm looking to you because I think chris is waiting for an authorization to speak? >> Riley: Yeah. They did have quorum issues. I think the larger issue is getting involvement of a broader array of stakeholders. And putting in motion a council-authorized process for those stakeholders to work together to arrive at a good solution. And the utc subcommittee just wasn't able to get -- achieve that critical mass that would give us confidence about the outcome of their work. >> Tovo: I don't mean to keep belaboring this point, but it was a council-authorized action that created this subcommittee, so I'm -- I would say they have a council sanctioning to forward and work on this issue. And it was my understanding they could involve stakeholders. Were the stakeholders coming? >> Riley: I know they had taxi representatives. I don't know what other stakeholders they had arriving there. I did hear that the meetings were not going

[05:01:34]

well. >> Tovo: But I guess -- what's going to be fundamentally different about this? Did they need a certain number of transportation commissioners to function and would they have been better offsetting themselves off as a work group instead of a subcommittee? Was that the fundamental issue that they were facing? >> Riley: One thing, if I'm not mistaken, the subcommittee was not actually council directed. That was an initiative of the urban transportation commission. And while I did direct people who were interested to that process, it really did not have the momentum or the recognition of a process that would actually be initiated and authorized by council. So the hope is that simply with council setting up a formal stakeholder process that there would be a heightened level of awareness and interest in participating that we have not gotten from a purely utc initiated process. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Any other comments? I would just go back and reading the posting language, directing the city manager to work on shareholders to develop recommendations for a pilot program authorizing the use of transportation network companies. And councilmember martinez. >> Martinez: So in that language all I'd ask is that you take into consideration that it's asking the city manager to come back to us with those recommendations. We would be implementing that pilot program. It's not giving him direction to implement the program. The direction is for the city manager to create that process to come up with recommendations and then it ultimately come to us. So if it doesn't have the clear and explicit language at that point that you're referring to, that would -- that I think would be the more

appropriate time to either insert it or to oppose it.

[05:03:35]

This is just asking him to come back to us. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Okay. Councilmember tovo. >> Tovo: I have just one more question. Are we awaiting additional staff information? I thought there might be a june report back date with some additional information about these companies? All right, thank you. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Apparently not. Okay. Councilmember spelman. We're waiting on you for item 27 that you pulled. >> Spelman: My apologize, mayor, I was called away for academic issues this morning and it took a lot longer than I expected. Item 27 is one of the cleanup items responding to the boards and commissions transition taskforce report in two ways. Section 1 would ask the manager to prepare the ordinance necessary to implement the first of the four recommendations, four sections of recommendations. And the sections two through four I think required more input from our board and commission members and from the general public because they're calling for relatively important changes in the structure of the responsibilities among the boards and commissions and actually reducing the number of boards and commissions. That's the sort of thing that I think we needed more public input from and we're asking the manager to post a public hearing on that item on the august 7th meeting. I wanted to hold this open. My apologies for having missed the presentation by the transition taskforce, but I wanted to hold this open in case we needed to have a discussion about that. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Okay. Any other items that are of council interest on the agenda? Councilmember morrison. >> Morrison: I didn't pull this, so we

[05:05:36]

probably don't have staff here to speak to this, but on the new film, etcetera incentives program that's being put forward, I notice that there are several resolutions and ordinances that it waives. And I've just had a chance to look through which ones those are, and it seems like some of them make sense, but others, for instance, calling for transparency in the process, so we're talking about number 8. Number 8 itself waives several ordinances and resolutions. And so I guess I just want to call that to my colleague's attention and maybe ask staff if they would be able to send us -- send us some backup that explains why each one of them would need to be waived. I'm particularly concerned about the ones calling for independent assessment, transparency, public postings and things like that. >> Mayor Leffingwell: What is the item number? >> Morrison: Number 8, the new economic incentives program for film, gaming, etcetera. We heard a briefing on and it sounds great, but I'm concerned about getting the right framework. >> Martinez: I appreciate councilmember morrison bringing that point up. We did express some concerns about the presentation about waiving things like the mbe, wbe ordinance, which is arguably one of our highest priority ordinances when it comes to minority contracting. And it was explained in the briefing that it was difficult for the specific ordinance to be part of the program because we're talking about building a set in 24 hours or rebuilding a set. You don't have that procurement process, but staff assured us they would do everything they could to implement as much as they could of the goals and outreach that we currently have in place. So I appreciate councilmember morrison bringing that up. I just want -- I would also like from staff a

[05:07:40]

little bit information in the backup as to how we're going to go about trying to comply with the spirit and intent of those ordinances, but not strictly applying them in this program. >> Morrison: That would be helpful. Thank you. >> Mayor Leffingwell: Any other items? Councilmember tovo, okay. All right. Without objection, we're adjourned at 11:10.