

Mobility Committee Meeting Transcript – 04/08/2015

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 4/8/2015 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 4/8/2015

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[3:01:51 PM]

April 8, 2015 mobility committee meeting.

[3:05:53 PM]

>> Kitchen: Good afternoon, everyone. I want to call to order the meeting of the mobility committee. And welcome, everyone. We're going to start with our approval of minutes for the April 1st meeting. Do we have a motion to approve the minutes? If. >> I'll make a motion. >> Kitchen: Okay, councilmember Garza makes a commotion, councilmember Zimmerman seconds. We have got the minutes approved. The first item is citizen communication. This is on -- this is citizen communication on general items. We also have individuals signed up under specific items on our agenda and they'll be called when we get to those items the agenda. So the first citizens communication are our -- our speakers that are signed up on general citizens communication. So we'll start with Heyden walker and then after him John laycock. I mean her, sorry. I'm Heyden walker. I'm an urban planner in Austin. I'm a native austinite. I met someone the other day who called me a unicorn. I'm a graduate of McCallum high school and U.T. Austin. I wanted to talk about travel management and how that shows up in the campo plan. Travel demand manage N the campo plan they talk about it and I think it's really important. The system has two halves, the demand on the system and the system's capacity to absorb that demand. When you get really bad congestion obviously the system is not absorbing the demand very much. So there's been a lot of discussion about travel demand management. And it's nothing that I consider real rocket science. It seems like car pooling, staggering work hours, bicycling more, walking

[3:07:54 PM]

more, taking more transit, telecommuting to work or college. Then it's also about putting housing next to jobs and jobs next to housing so people don't have to commute as far. Often those strategies are policy changes or things that don't cost a whole lot of money, whereas expanding the system can cost a lot. And for example, expanding I-35 from Georgetown to San Marcos with one lane additional in each direction will cost \$4.25 billion. So that's a really expensive project and it probably needs to be done, but my concern is that even though the campo 2040 plan talks a lot about transportation demand management and spends a lot of time, probably a third of the document talking about it, there is no actual funding. If you look at the budget part of it or you do a key word search, there's actually no dollar amount allocated to transportation demand management. And I think that the city is doing a really good job of trying deal with it. The plans that were rolled out last week address those kinds of issues. I think

the city is good for looking for funding for things like additional transit, additional bicycle facilities, additional walking facilities, but a lot of our commuters are coming from the outside of Austin in. And I think that there needs to be a regional strategy. And I tell you why, because it's not just warm fuzzies. When we were working on I-35 in the current proposals, the current Texas transportation institute did a study, they modeled I-35. And they modeled the current scenario which is to add a current lane in each direction, and they put out what was in 2035, 20 years ago, and they discovered that they got a five percent reduction in congestion. So that's over four billion dollars for five percent reduction.

[3:09:54 PM]

So they went back to the table and it the only time I said this has ever been done. They actually took those demand strategies tools, as they call it kind of a toolkit and they said what if they did all these things? What if we car. >> Pool:, what if we commuted -- teleexcited to work. [Buzzer sounds] Telecommuted for work. With all of those strategies and the managed lanes you can get a 40 percent reduction. I'm concerned we know this. When I talked with campo staff they know it and what they said to me was we couldn't make tdm into a project, therefore we couldn't fund it. Therefore I think there's a real miss connect there. I don't think the region can solve our projects until we get regional leadership that takes a real close look at what we can do. >> Kitchen: Thank you very much. Next we have John laycock and Joseph iley after him. Good afternoon, my name is John laycock I run a transit oriented non-profit. I'm also speaking about the campo 2040 plan. I drafted the comments that laura submitted and I'm going to read an excerpt of those comments. But before I do that I want to emphasize that the city of Austin has considerable agency in this plan. The city is contributing more than \$2.8 billion to fund its project -- to fund projects listed in the plan. That's more than the rest of the local governments and the metropolitan area combined. Austin does not need to quietly accept a plan that will surround it with sprawl and flood its street with suburban cars. Austin can and should demand a better plan that funds transportation demand management, pedestrian improvements and cycling

[3:11:55 PM]

improvements instead of just talking about them. This is a plan for the next generation. And we can choose a better course. Here are the comments that aura presented. To the campo transportation policy board, aura is a grassroots organization composed of over 100 community activists in the Austin area. We're dedicated to a vision of a city where everybody is welcome and everybody's interests matter. The greatest city asset our city has is its people and it is at its best when it facilitates connections between those people. As such we are writing with concern that the draft of the campo 2040 mobility plan, the plan lays out the next 25 years of transportation infrastructure and expenditures. It is a blueprint for how greater will spend billions of dollars. This plan seems designed to maintain a status quo of partners and travel use. Specifically we are concerned about the following issues: One, the plan takes as its principal goal to reduce and manage congestion for cars. Both of these goals show a failure to seriously contemplate what a multimodal transit system means. Just looking at cars goals, nothing else. Priorities should be put on moving people and mobility, rather than vehicles. Number two, the vmt projections driving the plan are suspect. Ma less than yells express an interest for urban living and causing less and that is causing many traffic engineers to overestimate traffic conditions. These factors consistently lead to overinvesting in code capacity which does not actually improve the mobility of people. Number three, even more critically, there's no consideration of how new roads affect land use. By enabling green fill development in areas with no transit infrastructure, new roads contribute to sprawl which puts more cars on the road, creating more demand for roads and a cycle that never ends and contributes nothing. This is how we get to a plan that says we are spending \$18 billion on the roads and our funding

somewhat

[3:13:55 PM]

limited. Four, is deeply disappointing that less than one percent of the funds are given to pedestrians and bicycle. Pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure has the highest rate of return on all the transportation infrastructure and tends to be much less expensive than building new road capacity. [Buzzer sounds] Number five, the eight billion dollars dedicated to transit capital projects is heartening, but we are concerned that the plan does not pay sufficient position to how transit is operated. Mass transit is looking like as frequent and reliable. The plan should give consideration to how transit is run and how much it adds to mobility. Thank you for your consideration. >> Kitchen: Thank you very much. >> I have copies of the letter in its entirety that I give to staff. >> Kitchen: Yes. Michael elder. >> My name is Joseph. Last week I spoke on demanding the city do background checks on Uber and tnc. I am here again to demand that once again and the reason I say, do we have that link yet? -- I have a link coming out of the Houston chronicle. Of a driver for Uber who was -- who not only had a federal conviction, he passed a criminal background check. This is the story right here out of the Houston chronicle. This man was convicted of drug charges, served 14 years in prison. And then Uber hired him. And yet they said he passed a background check. I'm sorry. With all the stories that I keep reading every single day in the news, which you guys could easily do just as well, all you have to do is go to Google and hit Uber news and you will get story after story after story of

[3:15:56 PM]

things with Uber drivers committing crimes, running people over, killing them, and then not being liable for it. We have a case in San Francisco where a little girl was killed. We have a case in New York City where a husband and wife -- a husband to be was killed. And yet Uber denies liability in both of those cases. So we have not only an insurance problem, we also have a background check problem. And so before we have this problem become a problem here in Austin, I say we fix it. And don't wait until it becomes a bigger problem than it already is across the country. Thank you for your time. >> Kitchen: Thank you. Okay. Michael elder and then Susan eagle-king. >> I need to cede my name to Hannah rittering. I don't need my general time like I thought I would. Hannah? >> Kitchen: Now, Hannah, you're signed up for item number four. Would you like to wait and speak to that? >> No. This was about something different. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> This one is in fact getting back to the Uber thing, which is not on your agenda today. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> There was one thing that I wanted to point out to you. As an owner of a cab and all of us who are owners of cabs, and all of us who is have businesses where we have expensive business equipment, it would be the same if I owned a bakery. We have to pay ad valorem tax to Travis county for the value of our vehicles, our ovens, whatever it is. And all of us in the taxi industry just paid Travis county just paid our tax. The the county and the cab companies kind of work together and do on an average all the 2008

[3:17:56 PM]

vehicles that would be worth more or less this much tax is owed. They basically trust that the cab companies are going to tell them the truth, but they also know that if they think a cab company is hedging, that they can contact the city because the city knows exactly which vehicles with which vin Numbers they're talking about. I brought this up with Bruce elfant and after discussing it with the city and Uber and how wonderful that was and when the discussion about ad valorem tax came up, every single one of your predecessors, said that of course we expect that everyone is going to follow the law

when they had been accepting that they were operating illegally. I reached out this week to Mr. Elfant again and asked him if even one Uber or Lyft driver had come forward to voluntarily pay their ad valorem taxes to Travis county. I have not heard back from Mr. Elfant and so I'm assuming that they can't find anything. We paid ours. They're supposed to pay theirs and that was an opinion of the county attorney that they are supposed to pay ad valorem tax and that hasn't happened. The other thing I wanted you to keep in mind as you discuss Uber and especially our -- when you're discussing insurance and commercial insurance, whatever, please keep in mind that in no way does what the cab companies have or what Uber should have in any way cover any injuries that the driver themselves sustain in an accident. We are on our own completely. It's all about protecting the public, the riding public. Thank you. >> Kitchen: Thank you for bringing that to our

[3:19:57 PM]

attention. Susan eagle-king will be our last speaker under citizens communication. >> Good afternoon. Austin is choking on traffic and txdot proposes double decking mopac. It is now officially insane. I'm proposing something new, a market approach. What if we throw out everything we think we know about transit, what if instead of thinking big, we think small? Consider two huge leaps in our lifetimes. 30 years old half the world had never used a phone. Then came wireless that leap frogged land lines. Today you will find a get to hearder in Mongolia using a cell phone. 35 years ago computers were huge, expensive and centralized. Then came apple to radicalize computing and give power to the people. What if Austin can leap frog our way into transit? What if it isn't about fixed lines and limited choices? What if we redefine transit with people at the wheels going where and when they want to go. I call it tiny transit. You can smile. It's about scale and size. It's about creating safe, efficient passenger ways around the city for tiny vehicles, whether owned or shared in conjunction with bicycles, taxicabs, pedestrians, all modes. What if you can step out of a building into a tiny car on your schedule. What if small cars aren't sandwiched between four ton should have's and trucks, praying that they see you. The engineering challenge is to design a mini grid with grids, create lanes, parking and refueling stations separate from those for conventional cars. Lanes would be designed with movable barriers so they can evolve. Consider what a car really costs. How can we expect a low income family or ACC student to afford it? Tiny transit attars the cost

[3:21:59 PM]

equation. Two, I spent hundreds of hours of my life studying traffic facility data in Austin. It is carnage. We can save lives. We can think big and start small. Here's the key. I propose we invite two cities to a challenge, Baltimore and Detroit. The only rules are fuel agnostic, gas electric, it's all on okay. Two, no punishing large cars and trucks. Trade-offs, yes, punishment no. Tiny transit will evolve differently in each city and within neighborhoods. Competition spurs innovation. Tiny transit can't do it all, but it is a game changer. It's easy to throw stones. I brought some pebbles for you back there. Let's get all the reasons that this can't work on the table. But in the words of Argo the movie, this is the best bad idea we have. Imagine if I have become this 20 years ago how different things would be here today. Let's not use another year when we could be doing something truly important for our community. I ask the committee to recommend to the full council you issue this challenge to Baltimore and Detroit, let the tiny transit competition again. Thank you, harry Faulk enburg, my friend, for am coulding, and thank you for listening. >> Kitchen: Thank you, Susan. Okay. Members, our next item on the agenda, we have item number three and item number four, and so I'm going suggest a way to approach this and see if this is something that you all would like to do. Item number three relates to the proposed changes to the taxicab ordinance. And item number four relates to the franchise process for taxi dabs. So I'm suggesting

that we take those together. And I think that we have staff here that can brief us

[3:24:04 PM]

again. We had a full briefing at our last meeting but our purpose today would be just to go over the recommendations again from staff that we have all those. Then we have some folks that want to speak on these two items so my thought is -- it's up to you guys, my fellow councilmembers. My thought would be to hear from the staff to remind us again on what the proposed recommendations are. Then to hear the comments from the staff and then have discussion. Is that an order that y'all would feel comfortable with. Yes. >> Zimmerman: I have a question first. I went through these again and the first question I had is these are really policy recommendations, policy statements, policy ideas. And my first objection was I thought that staff was supposed to be administrative and implement policy instead of bringing policy to the council. That's my first confusion. >> Kitchen: I think it up to us to decide what policy we want to bring forward. I think the staff may be giving us their thoughts as well. They were involved with some discussions with some taskforce. So some policy things can come out of that. And also let me just say that I think that -- I think as part of your discussion, if you would remind us again on the timeline. I have been thinking about this as two separate types of activities with potentially two separate time lines, although we could certainly consider them together. But we've got both the franchise tax renewal, and if I'm understanding correctly, that is the item that's driving our timeline because there are requirements in our charter about how we have to do that timeline. But concurrently what's being proposed to us from the staff is that we

[3:26:05 PM]

concurrently consider some changes to the ordinance. From my perspective we can choose to move forward concurrently or not. We could always move forward with the timeline for the taxicab franchise renewal and make changes to the ordinance later or we could do it concurrently. So the other thing I want to say is that today in terms of committee action, you know, the actions that a committee can take are varied. We can choose to make a specific recommendation back to the full council or we can choose to maybe recommend a few things like policy matters, for example, or policy guidance, or we can take no action. So it's really up to the will of this group what you want to do today. So if what you would do is just -- I would like to ask you to first speak to the franchise process, the timeline and then only specifically what's being proposed by staff, and then speak specifically to the ordinance changes in the proposals there. So if we could just hone in on those things. Does that work for everyone? I understand we're going to load the franchise renewal. I have two presentations for you as I understand it's the will of the committee that I go through both presentations and then you all will have discussion. >> Kitchen: I don't know if you need to go through the whole presentation if they're the same ones that we had last time. If you could just focus in on the -- unless my councilmembers want to hear it all. >> Zimmerman: I don't want to hear it all. >> Kitchen: We would like

[3:28:05 PM]

for you to focus in on the franchise agreement on that timeline. There. So go over that with us again and this then I think it's just the last two pages. >> Okay. Carlton Thomas, division manager, Austin transportation department. The slide prior to this indicates that we have three franchises here in Austin and all three of them are set to expire in August of this year. We have set out a track that we would recommend council consider in approaching the franchise renewals because of the requirements associated with the city charter. So our representation would be a first reading on April 23rd, a second

reading on May 21st and a third reading on June 4th. Because we have two franchises that expire on August 8th it would be imperative that the third reading occur no later than June eighth. It's also very important that the first reading occur on April 23rd in order to keep everything else in line. And once the franchise amendments have been approved, our renewal has been approved on third reading there is a 60 day waiting period before they actually go into effect. >> Kitchen: Okay. All right. Any questions on the timeline? Dead. >> Zimmerman: First thing is again could you review what happens if we take no action on it? And if the franchise expires in August 2015 what would happen next? >> Okay. So if it was the will of the council to have readings that would extend beyond June 4th, from June 8th through the 27th we would actually have two of our franchises expire.

[3:30:06 PM]

As Mr. Spillar had mentioned to you during the last mobility committee meeting, there has been an instance where we had a franchise expire. The city does have a remedy period whereas we have -- we give the company a franchise, 30 days to correct whatever deficiency it may be. In that case it was out of compliance with the active franchise. And after August 28th, if again April -- June 28th, if the council chose to extend it beyond June 28th, all three of our franchises would expire. >> Kitchen: Do you have a follow-up? >> Zimmerman: Another quick question. It says there was a recommends for a 10-year term and I absolutely could not support that. We would possibly recommend a one-year extension to give us more time to study the taxi franchise. I think that I've had quite a few conversations, speaking of what the constituents and other people have come in, and our concern is we're dealing with a franchise business model that is -- that I set up 40 years ago, 50, 80 years ago and there's some obsolescence in this model. That's my opinion on it. So I would be more comfortable and gives us more time to figure out what to do and gives the committee more time so we could come up with recommendations, our proposals. Instead of staff proposal maybe the elected council could come up with proposals. >> I could speak to that if I may. First of all, it was also mentioned that the staff has made some pretty tough recommendations in terms of what we expect out of the franchises. Two of those being associated with the city's expectations for a greener

[3:32:08 PM]

fleet as well as wheelchair accessibility. So the 10-year term takes into account the amount of capital that would be required for company to transition toward a completely green fleet and also all of the taxis that are currently in service today will have retired over the term of the franchise, thus giving them time to transition towards those expectations if the city is to have them meet their goals. The one year renewal, it's almost an eight month process, so the companies have to put together information to submit an application for renewal. There's a period of reporting to the boards and commissions and now the committee and then there are also the time restraints associated with the charter requirements. If it's a renewal we will have to work on renewing that renewal two months or so after it's renewed. >> Zimmerman: You said eight months, eight months. Wow. >> It's a very long process. >> Zimmerman: To me that says something is wrong, but eight months. >> Kitchen: Let me ask about that. You can go first. >> I think the question is what is an extension? Is there a difference between a renewal at the existing franchise agreements or an extension of the existing? Could we opt to do -- I think what we've talked a little bit about doing is we have -- we have the taxicab ordinance and we have the tnc ordinance that are floating around over here. And we feel like that that is part of the dialogue and part of the discussion

[3:34:14 PM]

concurrent with it. So what we're attempting to do is most easily for both the taxicab franchises and the city staff find a way to expand the time frame so we have the ability to really talk about the two ordinances in addition to talking about the franchise requirements. So if we did an extension of the existing franchise agreements, would that be agreeable, allowable, less intensive on both the franchise companies and also the city staff? Is that an option? >> Council would absolutely have the right to do that if it was the will of the body. The major concern that we could have with extending the franchises that are we are making recommendations that may not be taken into consideration or do not currently exist in the franchise agreement as they are today. It's our understanding if council were to grant a new franchise or franchise renewal, if it were the will of the council to address or amend in the franchise that say the council approve the 10-year term and there were issues with will franchise that council felt needed to be addressed, as long as the charter established procedure, the council is not locked into that agreement. If the council wishes to make amendments to an existing franchise, the council absolutely has the will to do that. >> Kitchen: Okay. Go ahead. Did you have another follow-up question? >> Gallo: To answer the question about an extension. An extension of the existing franchises an option? Is that different from renewing the franchises? >> It is different from renewing the franchises. Or it -- I'm not certain legally speaking if -- there are like technical

[3:36:14 PM]

differences between an extension or a renewal. However as they exist today I would assume that an extension would only extend what we expect out of them currently. >> Gallo: Right, right. >> Councilmember, if we could consult with our legal team and tell you if there's any legal problems or extending. But I would assume -- I'm sorry, I've neglected to introduce myself, rob spillar, director. I know you know, but perhaps the folks on camera don't. I would assume an extension would take exactly what we have right now and just extend it. And that is the primary difference since we are recommending different changes, I would assume those would not be incorporated in an extension of an existing facility. As Mr. Thomas said even though you're contemplating perhaps an extended franchise, council still has the right with appropriate notification and going through the three readings in 30 days to modify requirements and characteristics of the franchise agreement to council has the ability to renegotiate on a shorter term. >> Gallo: Is it possible for you to get the legal answers quickly as part of of this discussion? >> We will try. >> Gallo: Thank you. >> Angela is here. Look how quick. [Laughter]. >> Hi. I'm Angela Rodriguez from the law department again. To answer your question, I think specifically yours to extend the franchise would take the same three -- the same timeline that he showed you the same as to renew. But you could extend it for a year. Extend it for however long you would like. You would have to go through the same formality to renew. >> And what you're saying is

[3:38:15 PM]

the extension is the same as renewal, right? Or not. >> Kitchen: It sounds like it may be just the only difference is whether you want to change any of the terms. >> Right. If truly the intent were to simply extend it for a year, staff would have to think about it. We might recommend that you simply extend the existing conditions for a year as opposed to apply new conditions that might have financial implications to either the drivers or to the franchises. That goes into our calculation of the recommendation for how long we would recommend the franchise if we're making a request to make a substantial investment a la, how long we have the extension for the vehicles. I think in regards to the timeline to keep in mind, it is verily that over the next five to 10 years dramatic changes are going to happen in the automobile fleet. We already know that there are companies out there offering automated cars. So it could be quite literally within 10 years we're talking about a system that may have a very different user interface than

the typical driver. We've been trying to talk about that with the industry that this is a real issue we need to start considering now. As we go forward. Those are just items to keep in mind. >> Kitchen: Okay. I have another question that relates to this and then you can move on to the recommendations. And this again relates to the timeline. I'm doing what councilmember Houston did the other day, came straight to my mind and I just forgot it. [Laughter]. I know what it was. The three readings. So my understanding is that

[3:40:16 PM]

this requirement for the three readings doesn't presuppose a certain content to the first reading. In other words, it's just the subject. So we could move on the first reading and change it dramatically between the second reading and the third reading even. >> And that has happened before, yes. >> Kitchen: I wanted to double-check that. >> The charter requirement requires the time. We would provide an initial policy recommendation for the first reading and then that could certainly be modified or rewritten or whatever. >> Kitchen: Did you have a question? >> I wanted to make sure I was really clear on this. One of my concerns is to always ask the financial impact on the businesses as we make decisions. So if we choose to extend, is there a financial impact on the businesses as far as franchise fees or any -- >> So the impact, the fees wouldn't change with this contemplation, if you extend it. But given the process there would have to be a new submission process and there is a cost for them to gather the data necessary to present. It takes them a couple of months to gather the data out of their data systems and then send it to us for our review. And so there's that extra cost. I think the other cost that would need to be contemplated is if they're getting ready to replace vehicles they may for functioning reasons have to go ahead and replace those vehicles to find that they then need to replace them again over a period of time in the next franchise period. So I would hesitate to say there's no cost. I'm sure there is some cost to preparing the application and turning it in. >> Gallo: But would it be

[3:42:17 PM]

a lesser cost than renewing the franchises? >> I don't believe so. I believe it would be the same process. So give us new data based on the lightest operating characteristics. >> Gallo: Do you ask for that data on an annual basis anyway? Is that something that normally is part of the process? For accounting? >> Yes, we do ask for the data on an annual basis, but when they turn in the data for an application, they have to certify that it's true and accurate to the best of their conditions. I know some of the franchises go to extra effort to package up that data and make it look professional and so forth to provide it to us. >> All right, thank you. >> Kitchen: Did you have a question, councilmember? >> Zimmerman: Just to clarify, I like what councilmember Gallo said, the one year extension. I'm still struggling to understand if we're changing nothing, why would there be additional impositions on the taxi franchises if no conditions are changing and we're simply extending the status quo that we have, why would there be any additional cost? >> Councilmember, we would expect that we would need to go through a new application process because the data they've turned in for this application reflects data from the previous year and so we want to make sure that that data is current so that we can reflect that. Some of these data items, like for instance, the number of calls they provide service for handicapped services, can swing dramatically year on year. Similarly their ridership or service calls with swing dramatically from month to month or year to year. So we want to make sure that we're always providing you and evaluating the latest information. >> Kitchen: If I'm understanding correctly they've already applied for this year. >> Yes, ma'am. >> Kitchen: They've already incurred that cost. It might depend on how long we extended it for. But if you're assuming we

[3:44:17 PM]

extended it for a year that that would make the data that you receive for this application old essentially and necessitate a new application, if we extended it for three months, for example, then that might not be the case, you might not have to do a new application. So it might depend on what we thought of in terms of extension. Would that be a fair statement? >> I guess the challenge is -- if you would talk about it, is that the charter still requires the process of three readings. So to extend it three months you would have to go through the three readings, the 60-day delay and then the new franchise and then do that again. I think we could certainly have a discussion on whether the data by that point is stale or not. I would agree with you I would tend to believe it would not be stale, but that still seems like a lot of effort to simply extend it three months. >> Kitchen: I'm just trying to understand the parameters. The other aspect of the parameters is if I'm hearing you correctly, there's no default extension. It's not like another type of contract that has language in it already that says if you don't renew it automatic ally renews. >> That's correct. >> But it's not that case. You have to go through this process. >> Yes, ma'am. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> And the remedy process we have, for whatever reason a franchise falls out of compliance we have a 30-day remedy process, it just happens that that gives us a little bit of window at the end, even if it's our fault that a franchise falls out of compliance. >> Kitchen: Go ahead. >> Just a quick comment. I feel that a lot of us are feeling that there's a lot of urgency to this, but we could also look at it as we have until June fourth to make a final decision. So that's our deadline really. So we have over a month to make a final decision either way. Correct? >> Kitchen: So let's move on, if it's all right with

[3:46:17 PM]

everyone. If you could focus now just on the recommendations for the franchise renewal, which I think is your last two slides. And go over those with us again. >> Okay. So the reporting requirements have changed as the technology has advanced. Currently one of the franchises has a requirement for electronic dispatch and gps services. We would require that of all three companies in order to full lie utilize the reporting capabilities of that particular technology. Although the three franchises currently accept credit cards, it's not mandatory. And there have been a few situations where had it been mandatory corrections could have probably listen made in a more timely fashion. So we do believe that although it's commonly done now, it should be mandatory. We just finished a discussion about the term. And at the end of the term we are recommending that the taxi fleet in Austin, Texas 100% green and accessible. >> Kitchen: Okay. So those are recommendations for changes to the actual franchise agreement, if I'm understanding correctly. Okay. And the reporting requirements, can you give us a little better idea about what that change is? >> So it's currently we've been -- since probably early 2013 requested different formatting for the things that are required to be reported by the franchise. Prior to that there were probably eight different data points that we received such as the total miles traveled, total fares collected, total passengers delivered. We are now looking at a much more comprehensive set of data that

[3:48:18 PM]

requires that company in four hour blocks to provide to us information on how many taxis are in service, how many calls did you receive for service? Of those calls how many were actually dispatched to a taxi? Of those dispatched to a taxi, how many actually went out and picked someone up? So we're getting a much broader picture of what's actually going on in that industry according to the data that we're getting. >> Kitchen: Okay. If there's no further questions on this I'd like to ask that we move on to the recommended ordinance changes. Is that all right? Do y'all have questions on the franchise renewal?

Okay. If you would move on to the owe again, we're not really -- we don't want to go through the whole -- just the last couple of pages about the recommendations. Right? I'm sorry, councilmember Houston, you have a question? >> Houston: If I may. I'm too loud here. I have a question just because I'm sorry I was late. >> Kitchen: That's okay. >> Houston: Mobility is important to us all. Did you all talk about the bills going through the legislature and what impact that might have? >> Kitchen: We have not yet talked about that. >> Houston: And the reason that this delay or this extension might be critical to make sure that we don't run afoul of any state law that might be enacted? >> Kitchen: No, we haven't talked about that yet. Let's take a minute and -- okay. My understanding of the bills -- the briefing we got on the bills is there's a house bill and a senate bill that relates to the regulation of tnc's. And there may be some other bills too. I think there may be some bills related to -- let me just back up. Can anyone take a second and just brief us quickly to answer councilmember Houston's question?

[3:50:19 PM]

Instead of me trying to make sure I got it right. >> Yes. If you will give my governmental affairs person a second to get here. I believe the bills are on tnc's, transportation network companies. And basically what they would do is take the regulation of tnc's and put them -- tnc's being transportation network companies, put them within the authority of the state as opposed to local cities. Depending on which version you see, cities may or may not be able to pass additional regulation on those. So the regulations that we've been talking about with regards to taxi franchises are not affected by those state discussions. We had been on the path to bring back recommendations related to transportation network companies, but those are the ones that we've recommended that we hold off until after we see what the state legislation does. Is that a reasonable summary of what you understood? Is that correct? I always need to check. >> Kitchen: Does that answer your question, councilmember Houston? Okay. So if you would like to go ahead and turn to the recommendations on the ordinance. The taxicab ordinance change. >> Could we pull up the presentation? >> Kitchen: I think it's just the last few pages of this presentation. >> So here we have two recommendations on the driver hours on duty. One would basically allow a driver to operate for 12 hours within a 24 hour period before having to go out of service. The second one is one that is currently existing in the code, however it's not enforceable due to the language as it exists. But it would basically require a driver who has been determined closest

[3:52:19 PM]

by their dispatch's gps to pick up the call at the location that they've been determined closest. With the wheelchair performance measures currently, there's a requirement that the vehicle be in service 12 hours a day for 274 days a year. That doesn't speak to service delivery. So we're changing the focus to require equivalent service by having the request for wheelchair service pickups occur within seven minutes of that company's request that do not require wheelchair service. Also, in an effort to allow the companies to provide 100% of -- 100% completion rate for those wheelchair trips we're requiring the drivers to serve for that particular franchise to serve at least three percent of their company's requests. We're also recommending that the -- for future franchise special permits be utilized on company owned vehicles as was with the last allocation. Yellow cab received six wheelchair accessible permits and a condition of those permits were that they be affixed to vehicles that the company owned so that the company could have more control over the vehicles. It was discussed that those vehicles are operated by employee drivers. There was a lot of discussion about that during the taskforce. However, with a number of other recommendations, including the company ownership and the requirement to be -- to pick up, if you're the nearest, we don't believe that we need to go as far as requiring them to hire drivers to operate wheelchair accessible vehicles. And final recommendation would be to increase the

[3:54:21 PM]

current fleet requirement from six and a half percent of their vehicles be wheelchair accessible up to 10% of their fleet at a minimum. Again, we spoke to the credit card acceptance. With green vehicles, to incentivize the use of again vehicles in the interim, we're recommending that council consider extending what is currently an eight-year service life for taxis out to a 10-year service life, with the potential of it being longer should that vehicle be able to continually successfully pass vehicle safety inspections. We're recommending council consider a new method to determine the amount of necessary franchise permits. And that's moving away from the formula which basically takes into account the growth in population as well as the airport departure and move to a performance-based means of determining how many taxicab recommends permits the franchise should be allocated. Additionally we're recommending that each franchise be allocated 100 additional permits as well as an additional franchise. Council consider creating an additional franchise opportunity for a company that is willing to come in and operate a fleet of 100% accessible vehicles with up to 105 permits to do that. So what's next? This is not one of those items that would fall under the charter requirements. And if council wishes to, it can approve on all three readings on April 23rd, which we will bring to council for consideration.

[3:56:22 PM]

>> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you very much. Did anyone have any questions about those recommendations? Councilmember Gallo? >> Gallo: I was looking through this information and couldn't find anything anywhere that talked about the members of the taskforce. Who are the members of the taxicab taskforce? >> Okay. So we had all three franchise were recommended, Dave Passmore of the taxi drivers association of Austin. David witty, adapt of Texas. We had Greg Tyler with the Austin hotel and lodging association. We had a representative with the Austin convention and visitors bureau. We had an at large driver. We had a citizen. That's all that comes to mind. We had two members of the urban transportation commission. >> Gallo: Thank you. >> Kitchen: Are there other questions for staff before we move -- we have -- okay. Councilmember Houston and then councilmember Garza. >> Houston: I just are a question. Since obviously we're not using the formula anymore to determine franchise permits, how did staff actually come up with 100 permits for each of the current franchises and 105 for this new entity? >> We looked at the existing fleet size so it speak and initially the franchises made a request for additional permits. And in looking at the amount of demand that currently exists, the amount of taxicabs that are in service and the complete overall impact to Austin's taxicab fleet, if you will, those were how those Numbers were determined and the 105 would --

[3:58:23 PM]

there was a calculation of bringing the six and a half to 10 percent, also taking into account -- thus we looked at a potential for 105 additional wheelchair accessible vehicles. >> Houston: How much does a wheelchair accessible van cost? >> I do not have the exist Numbers, but as was -- testimony at the previous mobility committee meeting it's approximately -- it costs approximately 40% more than the vehicles that are currently being used as taxicabs. >> Councilmember, if I may, one other item about the new franchise. The recommendation on an additional franchise that would be 100% accessible and potentially green is to really test the market and see if there is a business model for a 100% accessible fleet today. We continue to believe because of the demand and the community response for the need for accessible vehicles that there might in fact be an opportunity. We've heard calls for -- to allow a co-

op potentially to occur. And this certainly could be one venue for that co-op to occur. And so our recommendation is that we test the market. Now, that doesn't guarantee that a fourth franchise shows up, it simply allows us to go out and advertise to find out if there's interest for a fourth franchise given those characteristics that we're seeking. >> Houston: My concern I think is that without knowing the cost -- because I still don't know how much wheelchair accessible vehicle will cost, for them to be able to do that with 100 permits,. I'm wondering what the cost impact of that will be for whatever company comes in. Because it seems on to me like they're very expensive and I'm wondering why you started with 105 rather

[4:00:23 PM]

than 25, which used to be the. >> Right, the recommendation is for up to 105. Should a company have the ability to come in and operate a 100% wheelchair vehicle. Currently all three of the franchise ordinances require that they maintain at least a fleet of 25 vehicles, so you are correct there. However, the last time a franchise was awarded, it -- it was actually a co-op where the city allocated 55 permits for that company to operate and within five years the company again returned to council requesting additional permits, indicating that anything less than 100 permits is pretty hard to service the whole city 24 hours a day. >> Kitchen: Councilmember Garza and then councilmember Zimmerman. >> Garza: My questions were similar to councilmember Houston, when I read this formula bullet here, it sounds like -- is that saying we use the formula now but we want to change it to this performance base? Is that correct? >> That's correct. And in 2012, the council at that time effectively waived the formula and allocated an amount of permits that was in excess of what the formula would have produced. >> Garza: Oh, okay, so we don't use the formula anymore -- >> It's at the will of the council. >> Garza: All right. Because that 100 -- seems kind of arbitrary, kind of like what -- and I guess you -- the question what was that based on, it was -- could you -- I'm sorry, could you answer that again? >> Initially we looked at a -- Mr. [Indiscernible] Mentioned a 10% increase to the fleet. But again taking into consideration the amount of demand and the amount of people who actually request taxi service and aren't being able to be provided

[4:02:24 PM]

rides, we took an overall look at the fleet and how large could we or should we increase the fleet size of taxis here in Austin and we broke that down into 100 taxicabs across three franchises. >> Garza: You determined we maybe needed 300 more and just decided to divide it. >> Equally divided. >> Zimmerman: Director spiller brought up a work that I was waiting for, market, market. I think of the way a market works is the most efficient provider, going to be the most successful. And the market, if you mandate that somebody has a 40% higher cost, right, for their vehicles providing the service, you build in a market disadvantage because their cost is higher. I'm trying to rationally wrap my head around how we as a council are supposed to decide on 300 new taxis, should somebody be required to go green, all of these decisions that I think ought to be made by a market. I -- I would probably have to just abstain from all of this because I don't know what our rationale is for approving your rationale of 300 vehicle. No the market would decide that. I want to get us out of the position of having to make those decisions we can't make because we don't have the information and neither do you. >> Kitchen: If I can suggest, councilmember Zimmerman, that's a discussion we need to have. We have eight people signed up that would like to comment. If it's all right with everyone, I would like to hear from them and then we should have our discussion about what kind of action, if any, we want to take. Does that make sense? Okay. Now, we have talked that are signed up for both 3 and 4, I would like to ask you, because in our mind these are related as you can hear from our discussion. So what I would like to do is instead of calling

each the folks up to speak on

[4:04:26 PM]

these items separately, when I call you up, if you are signed up for both 3 and 4, I would ask you to speak to both 3 and 4. The other thing that would be helpful to us, at least to me, would be to understand what your thinking is on their discussion so far in terms of specific recommendations. So, first, we have Michael elder and then after him Joseph eiley. Then ed carbo after him. Is Michael here? Okay. >> Given that you want me to combine both I my arguments, can I take them in either order? >> Kitchen: Yes, either order is fine. >> All right. In that case I would like to start with the taxicab franchise - no, excuse me with the taxicab ordinance. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> If you can bring that up, please. Okay. This is ordinance I have proposed before. That is not a mistake on the date, this is the first time that I proposed this. Specific change to the taxicab franchise ordinance that would require the cab companies to call the customer back. If they were unable to get them a cab within 15 minutes. We have no reason to waste our resources by sending cabs after ghosts. I've made this request before. I've tried to word it in such a way that would allow in the event that it is impossible to call the customer back, for example, if they called from a pay phone and grocery store. I'm requesting that they run

[4:06:26 PM]

this by legal and try to get this change passed, regardless of what model we choose to pursue in the future, this is going to be a service to the customer and I have not talked to anyone outside of the cab companies who would not welcome this change. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> In addition, the cab companies should be held responsible for mistakes in their dispatch, they need to clean up dispatch. Now, if I may go ahead and read what I have. >> Kitchen: Uh-huh. >> As far as the taxicab franchise, I have heard some stuff here that I like, like the idea of stepping the current franchises instead of giving it a new one. But I'm going to read what I have. It's a limited amount of time, I would like to spend it talking about possible solutions. Instead I have to spend it convincing you that the cab companies are not interested in possible solutions, they just wants more permits. Today I'm going to talk about integrity and insanity. Right and wrong is something that can always be argued, but when it comes to integrity, there is an easy test. Does it work? If something lacks integrity, there's nothing wrong with that, it just doesn't work. Integrity is a word to word match. You say what you do and you do what you say. A well-known definition of insanity is to continue to do the same thing over and over again expecting different results. In Austin the cab companies have been controlling the cab business for at least 30 years that I know of and the Austin city council has let them pretty much do what they wanted. But how has that been working out. Couple resolution 20140515-025, if you could bring up that bulleted list now. Created the current taxi tab task force with specific stated objectives to be addressed before the renewal of the franchise agreements. But unfortunately, the cab

[4:08:29 PM]

companies have been -- you noted there were three cab companies, one citizen at large, one cab driver. As a result, up in of the objectives have been addressed because that's not what the cab companies want. What do the cab companies want? More permits so they can lease more cabs and make more money. That's what works for them, but how's that working for us? As a council resolution, objections have not been addressed. Would it have integrity for the city council to renew the franchises should the cab companies be allowed to continue as -- [buzzer sounding] >> Do I have a combined time or is that it? >> Kitchen: No, we don't have time for six minutes. If you could take another minute or so -- >> Okay.

Should we continue -- so the cab companies -- should the cab companies be allowed to continue as they have, or is it time to hold the cab companies accountable for their failures. How is it working? I think it's time to do something different. The tmcs have taken away enough business from the cab drivers that more permits are not needed. They were able to come into Austin because the cab companies were doing a lousy job. In light of that, does it make sense to reward the cab companies with even more permits or would it be better to make the cab companies earn those permits and their franchise agreements by doing the work they were supposed to do? Are we going to act with insanity or with integrity or are we begin to continue with insanity, I will end right there, thank you. >> Kitchen: Thank you very much. Okay. Mr. Eiley and then ed carbo after him. As a future cab operator and an observer who went to the taxicab task force, Mike elder was also one of those who went there.

[4:10:30 PM]

Resolution 25 was not met, it was sidelined by the tnt thing to begin with because what happened was they were working with the task force and then when the tnt issue came up they kind of pushed that aside and left it alone. I don't believe they met all of the recommendations of resolution 25. Will also in this section of franchise renewal, I like what Mr. Zimmerman said about extending it for at least a year and then get back to the tables and discuss the issues the a hand. Also, this thing about disability recommendations, 3%, that is absurd. Because first off you have franchises that only have five wheelchair cabs. If they only have to complete 3%, that means they only have to compete or complete 15% of all of their wheelchair requests. That would mean that there would be a lot of wheelchair patrons that are wanting cabs, sitting on the side of the street. That number, I believe, came up, by taking the number of wheelchair cabs that the city currently has and dividing it into 100. The only problem is that not all of those wheelchair cabs belong to the same franchise. Okay. That number they come up with for 3% is absurd. Also, the credit card issue. I know cab drivers who have complained to me about the credit card being mandated that the franchise says if they have to use their system. I use square on my Peddy cab, I used scare when I drove a -- square when I drove a cab. There's no reason as an operator that I can't use my own credit card authorization system. But yet I know lone star cab requires their drivers to use their system and their system alone. That is not acceptable.

[4:12:31 PM]

As for the franchise renewal, I disagree with it. Especially for 10 years, because drivers and 405, by the way, it was said in the task force it was only supposed to be 10%. 10% of the current number of cabs that we have now comes out to about 75 cabs or so. Where do we get 405? You put 405 more cabs on the street, you're going to have drivers according to ed carbo making \$14 an hour down to about maybe 10? Then you've got to take out all of the expenses. By the way with those expenses out cab drivers are making less than minimum wage. [Applause] >> Kitchen: Thank you. Ed carbo and then Hannah ritering. >> Good afternoon, council, thank you all for having me today. Just like to start off by addressing some of the statements that were made, so the \$14 an hour is after expenses. Based on the calculations that we ran and in our fleet, an investment of \$15,340 a year for the lease fleet actually grosses revenue per permit of about \$82,000. So drivers are making an investment in their -- in their vehicles and the opportunity. In the shadow of house bill 2440 going to the state transportation committee tomorrow, a phased in measured approach seems prudent and achievable. Improving efficiency in the short term is critical. An amendment to the ordinance that's already on the books is a great start. Being able to carry out the intent of an existing ordinance relating to dispatch acceptance presents a great way to ensure drivers are getting picked up quickly and drivers making more money. The problem has almost been problematic, in a way that improves service to the community while being contract of driver well-being

in a more dynamic

[4:14:32 PM]

capacity. Having all vehicle for hire companies submit data and using that information to inform decisions is an opportunity. I hope that you will continue to request or demand data from all transportation service providers to better inform your decisions. David witty with adapt spoke last week and says it's more important to make sure service and efficiency are improved as it pertains to wheelchair accessible service instead of just increasing the number of accessible vehicles on the road. Each of those cars does cost about \$40,000. If we were to go to 10%, that's about a \$1.9 million cost for us in the light of considering potentially just a one-year extension, extension or renewal, that is a lot of commitment being asked of the companies up front. Implementing changes to the dispatch acceptance ordinance quickly gets us started down the road to a solution and a phase, measured approach. Some elements of these recommendations need to be acted on quickly. Others over time and some may prove to be unnecessary. I would like to conclude by asking for the opportunity to visit with each of your offices to answer questions about any areas of concerns that may exist as you form your recommendations. I know this process is going to play out for you guys over the course of some time. And, you know, from the standpoint of the franchises, we have data. We're willing to sit down and answer questions about that data to inform your positions, opinions and recommendations and I think that's critical that you all take advantage of that, so that you are not making decisions in a vacuum. >> Kitchen: Thank you very much. Okay, we have Hannah rittering and then brad, I'm not reading your last name correctly, is it ricker? Okay. Go ahead. >> I have introduced myself before, I'm Hannah rittering, just so you know, when it comes to green vehicles, when my friend Leo and I ordered our Ford escape has hybrids back in really in the fall of 2006,

[4:16:33 PM]

as far as we know, those were the first two hybrid taxicabs in the state of Texas, not only in Austin and they were in Austin, one of them was mine. I've been on this a long time. I just retired that escape and replaced it with a max hybrid. The formula, as it exists, has been very useful and I don't think there's any reason to throw it out at all completely. Maybe it needs to be tweaked in the computer age, we can gather more data and so. But the formula actually is a form of an analysis of the market. And -- by trying to alter that formula and do away with it, you are making -- you are taking away some power that the drivers have had because that formula was devised over many years of all stakeholders coming up. The number of cabs per pop -- per 100,000, for instance. Those Numbers, the drivers had input into that. And my observations in recent years have been that -- that people really aren't interested in what the drivers have to say. We used to be a lot more respected in this. And I don't think that this should be just thrown out and say, well, staff can figure it out. Because what we see is already the result. They think we should have 400 more taxis in the city of Austin. And I was thinking about this the other day. 100 here, 100 there, you get 100, you get 100, what kind of math is that? It's the kind of math my four-year-old granddaughter does when I say Morgan, how many Easter eggs did the Easter bunny bring on Sunday? She's not going to say, well, I don't know, Oma because I was too busy to count. She's going to say 100, 100! Everything is 100. That's what we're seeing here. I'm somewhat concerned about this dispatch acceptance. I'm afraid that I'm going to

[4:18:34 PM]

start getting penalized for missing a trip because I ran into 7/11 to go to the bathroom. Um ... I think it

would be great if there were some green vehicle incentives. I must say the saving on gas is quite an incentive as it is, but it would be nice to have some sort of recommendation because in general a green car does cost more than a standard vehicle. If -- if we need specialized or additional taxicab permits, I believe it should be -- we should need to come up with some way for the industry, in Austin, to be able to come up with temporary permits for large large -- for large events that do not destroy my ability to pay my mortgage all year round. >> Kitchen: Thank you very much. Okay, brad. You said it was ricker, is that right? >> Yes. >> Thank you. After that -- >> Thank you very much. I love this city. I've lived here 45 years. I've been in the taxi business for 27 years. And I've owned taxicabs for 23. I own 42 taxicabs, I lease them out to qualified drivers that are trained and approved by yellow cab. Right now, I need drivers. The reason I need drivers is because I'm using them to the tncs. I don't think it's fair that the tncs don't have to go through the same requirements that my drivers do. My drivers have to be finger printed, they have to have a -- a spotless motor vehicle record, they have to produce a motor vehicle record every six months to yellow cab to make sure that nothing has happened in the

[4:20:35 PM]

interim. Our cabs are looked at 14 times a year. Once by the state, once by the city, and 12 times by yellow cab. Yellow cab does a safety inspection and also looked at the cabs roadability. Its comfort, the seats torn, cracked windows, they are looking out for the customer. Yellow cab has also made sure that we're all covered, well the customers are covered. The drivers are not covered, but the customers are covered. I don't know that -- is there anyone checking tnc's insurance you know, tncs may say they have insurance, but do their insurance companies know they are picking up people for money. They say it's ride sharing, it's commerce, it's business, it's not ride sharing. These guys are making money. Uber is making money. I don't see how it's a ride sharing program. Our cabs have security cameras in them, I don't think the tncs do. We have fire extinguishers in there. We have also have to take our cars off the road after seven years. As I understand it, Uber allows their cars to be on the road 15 years. I keep my cars on the road three years because they are getting 100,000 miles a year on them and that's awfully hard on an American made car. There's all kinds of issues that come up with the vehicle and that's not good for the driver or for the public for them to be on the road that long. What I'm asking for today is parity. Make tnc's do the same thing we do, same vehicle, background check, oversight for the insurance, whole nine yards, thank you for your time. >> Kitchen: Thank you. >> [Applause] >> Kitchen: Up next we have -- I apologize, I'm not able to read this, with adapt, I'm sorry. Tell me -- tell us your

[4:22:37 PM]

name. >> [Indiscernible]. >> How are you doing? It's not the first time, my name is -- [indiscernible] >> Thank you. >> Adapt of Texas. And we -- we at adapt agree with the staff recommendations. We also think that the taxicab industry here in -- in the great city of Austin and the state need to step up their game. We also agree that by 2025 the whole fleet should be accessible. Thank you. >> Kitchen: Okay, thank you very much. Next we have -- I'm having a hard time reading today, I apologize to everyone. Sayad, after that our last speaker is Joan cabella. >> My name is [indiscernible]. Do I -- do I have your permission to [off microphone] >> Kitchen: Move closer to the mic. >> Do I have your permission to donate my time to our president, Dave -- >> Kitchen: Yes, that would be fine. >> Thank you. >> Hi, good evening, councilmembers, my name is Dave Passmore, current president of the taxi drivers association here in Austin. Last week I was here, I'm going to try to be a lot briefer than I was. I would please ask you in a request, please take your time in making a decision around renewal of franchise. Please take your time.

[4:24:39 PM]

Don't be rushed to a decision. The 10 year timeline, seems way too much. A lot of you won't be on the dais in 10 years time. It will be two councilmember term and a half before the franchise are up for renewal again. We will need to look more closely at the industry to see what the performance measures is actually sending back to you. Number 2, I'm not here to bash that, but staff recommendation does not equal the task force recommendation. That's one other issue. So it seems as if this thing that is coming up, I'm not sure if it's modeled off of the tnc timeline when it was a 9:00 to 8:00 thing where everybody was rushing to do things. Please take your time, there's plenty of documents to be able to make a decision and the tdaa and all of us drivers do recommend that you do that and I thank you very much for your time. >> Kitchen: Our last speaker is Joan cabella. >> I'm a bit confused. I'm surprised that we are trying to evaluate taxicabs atmosphere this point. The transportation was given an assignment by the former council to -- to look into making tnc's and taxicab franchises more equitable. My assumption was that the recommendations by the city staff regarding franchise

[4:26:39 PM]

renewal was not something that would be questioned. I think we need to make a strong case for the necessity of taxicabs in Austin, Texas and in every city in America. We cannot have -- have tncs serving everybody, because everybody doesn't have a smart phone, everybody doesn't have a credit card. People can try to use there -- do I have extra time here? >> Kitchen: No, keep going, the buzzer hasn't gone off yet. >> People cannot even ask their grandchildren who have technology to get a taxi for them. There's a huge proportion of this population in Austin that needs taxicabs. As for back to this -- some of the questions about renewal, that is something that we have been looking forward to for years and we've been working for -- towards for months. This was quite a shock that this could be shortened or delayed. And so this is shocking. And then as far as 100 permits are concerned, this was the taxi franchises contribution to equity. We have thousands and potentially thousands more of tncs who are taking the bread from our drivers and preventing the drivers from paying their mortgages. It's not us. It took us years, 30 years, to get 187 permits. And in fact it's not 30 years, but it's more than that, since 1943. So here we've got countless Numbers and the only thing

[4:28:40 PM]

that we could think of was -- was give us enough permits to be competitive. I think you need to understand the taxi industry. When somebody calls and all your cabs are busy, or your drivers are sleeping in the daytime because they were all -- up all night the night before -- [buzzer sounding] -- On sixth street or taking people from the airport, you need more cabs. So that is our contribution to this thing of equity. We don't want to have no insurance. We don't want to change all of the other regulations from the city. We would like to suggest that the city of Austin support its franchises. >> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you very much. >> Okay. >> Kitchen: Okay, councilmembers. We're at the point on the agenda where we can discuss amongst ourselves if we would like to take any action at this point. Again, we don't -- you know, we don't have to, but we can if we would like, does anybody want to open up the discussion. Okay, councilmember Zimmerman. >> Zimmerman: Thank you, councilmember kitchen. Just a take-off on the last thing that I heard, I hope what our committee wants to do first is to support our constituents. I don't want to be in a position of opposing taxi franchises or -- or aiding and abetting taxi franchises, I want to be in a position of best serving our constituents. So one of the things that I haven't heard yet in the testimony is the point of view. It's true that not everyone has a smart phone, absolutely true. But in the same way, not everyone has internet, not everyone has cable TV, so

that they can download movies on demand, but block

[4:30:41 PM]

buster video disappeared as a business. That business used to serve vhs tapes and what have you and people would come in and rent these things and go watch them. That business no longer exists. And I think the reason for that is the technology outpaced the business model of block buster video. And I'm still afraid that's what's happening to the taxi franchises. So from the constituents's point of view, if they prefer to use one of these, the people that have them, if they prefer to use this to get a ride, call it a ride share, call it a -- a ride for hire, whatever you want to call it. But if our constituents prefer, to use this and use Uber or Lyft to get a ride, should they be prohibited or punished or fined? And if we're not prepared to fine and prohibit our constituents, why would we do that to our taxicab drivers or Uber drivers or anything else? What I'm getting to is an argument of how much sense it makes to have liberty, you know, in the marketplace and give people choices and let people decide and I want to have that included in our discussion. I think what we should be focused on is what's in the best interests of the vast majority of our constituents. >> Kitchen: Okay. I would be prepared to make -- let me just make a statement or two about my perspective and then we will move to councilmember Houston and anyone else. Today I am not prepared to vet on any particular set of recommendations -- to vote on any particular set of recommendations but I am prepared to talk about our policy approach. I want to share that. What's top of mind for me is that we have a fair playing field. If we are going to regulate, which, you know, that's our current scheme, but if we're going to regulate ground transportation, I think that we should have -- as a city

[4:32:43 PM]

we should not be in the business of favoring one type -- as a city we should not be in the business of favoring one type of ground transportation over another. To me that means we need to take a very serious look at how we regulate tnc's and how we regulate taxicabs. I'm not comfortable with our scheme right now because I believe there's too much of a difference of what we are doing with taxicabs and tncs. With that said we have a timing issue, we may be in a position where we have a much more limited role in terms of tncs. Regardless of that, I don't think it's the role of the city to favor one type of business over another. Second thing is I do think it's the role of the city to make sure that to the extent that we are regulating, that we do make sure that we do that in a way that's fair to our drivers. As well as our cab companies, so there's some details that I personally would like to look at with regard to the chauffeur's license for example. I have some concerns about the fact that that doesn't reside with the driver. Last thing that I would say is that or two last things. I would say that from a policy perspective, I do personally believe that it's important and that there's a role from the city to regulate from a health and safety standpoint. I do think that the city has a responsibility to look at health and safety. We may disagree on what kinds of items really fall under health and safety, but I do think we need to do that. Finally, but certainly not finally in the sense of last, but accessibility is absolutely necessary. We have to make sure that our ground transportation, whether that be tnc or whether that be taxicabs are fully enter I believe to our entire population. So I don't know if that's helpful, but I wanted to just explain where I'm coming from, from a policy perspective, and that's

[4:34:44 PM]

what's going to guide me in terms of thinking about the specifics of how we go forward with recommendations. Does -- do you all -- councilmember Houston, yes? >> Houston: Thank you so much,

councilmember kitchen. I've got a couple of questions. If I might. One is for staff. Seems like the aviation department is able to enter into their own agreements with the transportation network companies. And can you help me understand, does that go through the airport advisory committee, does it come to council? >> How is that handled, Carlton Thomas, again Austin transportation department. I can't speak to how it all developed, but the previous council in the ordinance that enabled tnc's to enter into agreements with the city of Austin, also indicated that they would have to enter into an agreement with the aviation department, which I understand they are still working on. It's my understanding they are about to, 45 day, temporary pilot basis for \$2,500. Does that not get reviewed by either the advisory committee or the council or is that -- >> I apologize, I can't -- I can't answer to that for the aviation department. >> Houston: Okay. >> Kitchen: Good question, we should follow up on. >> Houston: We might need to get that answered from them, thank you so much, that was all. I have the same concerns. I would like to see complaints added to the data that we collect from both the -- all ground transportation. I view the taxicab industry and the transportation network companies as ground transportation. Different forms of ground transportation, but ground transportation nonetheless. My be is public safety. Public welfare as elected members of this city council, we have an

[4:36:44 PM]

obligation to ensure that the right kind of insurance is in place so that the people who ride in any of these ground transportation entities is covered. In case of an accident. That's our responsibility to ensure that. I do want level playing fields for that. You know, some of the comments have been really interesting. I hadn't thought about temporary permits. I'm confused about how we decide 100, 100, 100, and 105, where are we going to get those, a whole fleet of accessible vehicles. It's a very complex conversation that we're having. It started a long time ago, we're trying to catch up as best as we can. I, too, am not ready to support anything coming to council without having more information and more time to have those kind of conversations. >> Kitchen: Okay. Go ahead. >> Yeah, I would have to see to -- I'm not ready to make a specific recommendation, but because of the timeline in front of us, I do believe we should refer it back to the council possibly with no recommendation and let -- let each councilmember start to delve into the details of this because we do have this deadline in front of us, my understanding is that we're not going to meet again until April 29th. >> Kitchen: That's right. >> Garza: This next council meeting that gives us this timeline is before the mobility committee's next meeting. So I guess that's my two cents on this. I'm willing to make a motion to that effect. When discussion is over, I guess. >> Kitchen: Okay, do you want to -- okay. >> It's interesting when

[4:38:47 PM]

councilmember kitchen sits down to go over the agenda, we start thinking about some of these items and thinking that we probably would have different opinions on them and ended up in the conversation agreeing on everything. So this is an interesting process and not to repeat what you said because I have agreed with all of it, but I do think that it's important to have a level playing field. I do think that the protection and safety of the customers is important for the city to have a -- to have a except and be a part of the -- I have a concern of overregulating business owners and field that that's really probably not appropriate for the city to be a part of. The accessibility issue, at some point maybe during a briefing, we talked about the possibility of looking for a company that would just provide accessible vehicles and so I wonder what we can do to promote and encourage that process to take place because if there is a company out there that would do that and specialize that, and take the place of requiring the franchises to also do that, if they choose not to, it just seems like that's a win-win situation. So I would encourage that we help with whatever we need to do to make that process move forward. I would, you know, I

think we've talked about the issue of we've got the state legislature out there, perhaps impacting our ability to -- to work and regulate the tncs and bring them to a more level playing field, waiting to see what happens, impacts our discussion on the tnc ordinance and I think that needs to happen at the same time that we're talking about the taxicab ordinance, so what I see is that we do need to buy some time not to say that we're not interested in staff recommendations or the

[4:40:48 PM]

recommendations of the taxi task force, but I think that we have a process here that needs to play itself out appropriately. So I think my suggestion would be that we, because we have a time frame that we have to deal with, is whether we do it out of this committee or whether we do it as part of the council, but I would support extending the current franchise for a short enough period of time that it doesn't become overly cumbersome for staff and overly expensive for the franchise companies and I think that would be the direction that I would support. >> Kitchen: Okay. Someone ready to make a motion -- >> Zimmerman: Can I go next? I wanted to make that motion that we recommend to council a one-year extension without changes, a one-year extension of the current franchises that we recommend that to the council, that's my motion. >> Is there a second? >> Houston: I will second. >> Kitchen: Discussion. >> Gallo: I have one question. It seems like with staff's recommendation of updating records, there might be a difference between a shorter period of time and a year. I would support giving us enough time to work our way through this process, but at the same time being sensitive to people's time and energy. >> I guess the primary concern is the amount of time it would take council to address the renewing and extended franchise. So anything less than a year would -- would place quite -- quite a burden on the process. Essentially, having an eight-month process, after you've approved it for one year, it will take 60 days to go into effect. So -- so 60 days have already gone. Then they need to begin the process of producing a new submittal, so that they can renew before the year runs out. >> I think we're talking about extending, not renewing. >> Yes.

[4:42:49 PM]

>> So I understood your question to be the difference between stepping stepping for a -- extending for a year or less than a year, is that what I heard? >> Zimmerman: Simply extend, not renew, simply extend. No changes in the existing terms, just extend it. >> Councilmember Gallo, I think the data requirement that's required is in the code and so we're limited as to how long we could make the assumption that the data is still good for, so I think that's what you would have to balance. I don't know how long that data would be good for. >> Zimmerman: Can we look that code section up? I'm curious, 13 dot something? >> I don't know the number. >> Zimmerman: I would love to know that. >> Kitchen: I have a suggestion. I have a suggestion to -- maybe it's a friendly amendment. That we recommend back to the council that -- that we -- okay. Let me just think out loud for a second I'm sorry. Maybe it's a comments and then we'll do an amendment. But I support the need for us to take enough time to be able to look at the tnc ordinance at the same time we're looking at the taxicab ordinance. I think that's important. At this point in time, I'm not sure how long that would take. I do think that the only thing we have to do on April 23rd is to keep our options open is to -- to pass the first -- on first reading the renewals of the franchises. So I would support a recommendation back to council that says, you know, that lays out the importance of that timeline, but also says that we could pass on first reading an extension or we could pass on first reading a renewal,

[4:44:50 PM]

understanding that the timeline for first reading is way too early for us to really know what we want to do by second or third reading. So I don't know if that makes any sense. In -- >> Madam chair, I got excited and I second the motion and I have no standing. So I -- [laughter]. I'm here only as the council. >> Kitchen: We certainly appreciate you here. I let you do it so -- anyway, I'm sorry. >> Madam chair, if I could, you are correct that the listening and the intent of femur ordinance passed by council can change between the first and the third reading, I believe you would be correct. Change the -- extension versus renewal between the first and the third reading. >> Kitchen: What we have on the table is councilmember Zimmerman's motion to make a recommendation back to council that we extend the franchise for one year. About I state that correctly? And we have -- we have someone else who wants to second that? Okay, we have a second. Further discussion? Did you want to -- go ahead. >> I'm just reluctant to support just a year. It just doesn't seem -- regardless if it's just a year, we still have the same timeline in front of us. Just for clarification when I said no recommendation, I meant no recommendation from this body, just bring it to council and let them decide what to do with staff's recommendation. And as anything that staff usually brings us to speak to councilmember Zimmerman's point is it is just a kind of -- >> It's advisory, yeah. >> We've -- we've already not supported -- staff recommendation -- [indiscernible] Not to say

[4:46:50 PM]

that -- anyway, so I would be reluctant to just support a year again. I think it's -- we have time, really do have time. I mean, we really have until June 4th. I think it's important to look at this with the tnc's, I think it's important to know what the legislature is going to do before we can take that look. >> Kitchen: We'll know by may. So -- >> Madam chair, if I may. To get back to an earlier question about the timelines. It is outlined in 13-2-403, finance -- franchise application is required. Depending on the franchise information, for instance a criminal background check of the management, has to be provided, we will do the 90 days, financial statements. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Change monthly, so we need an up to date financial statement to be able to analyze and those are just two of the items, but every data item has, I believe, a statement as to -- time requirement. >> Zimmerman: Point of inquiry, you said 13-2-403? >> Yes, sir. >> Zimmerman: The title of that is use of special permits, I'm looking at that right here. Dealing with modified ground transportation service and the vehicle within 60 days, after the department issues a special franchise permit to the holder. Is that the one that you meant to reference? Because I looked through here for data trying to see the information requirements and I couldn't find it. >> Okay. >> Are you accessing the city code -- >> Zimmerman: Yes, city code 13-2 -- >> By which platform? Unicode. >> Zimmerman: Begins with 1992 and it's been modified several times. >> What's your source.

[4:48:52 PM]

>> Zimmerman: Al legal.com on the internet. >> The city no longer uses that site it's out of date. >> Zimmerman: Where's the right place -- >> Unico. >> Councilmember Garza, would you like to make an amendment to the motion that's on the table? >> Garza: Sure, I would make a motion we send this back to council and speaking with councilmember Gallo another option would be to send it back to council now, to get this timeline but then could also come, I'm assuming come back to the committee. >> Kitchen: That's right. >> Garza: Then we can discuss it more before the second reading. >> Kitchen: Okay. If I'm hearing your motion, your motion is to recommend to council that we pass on first reading only and then we send it back to the committee for further discussion of -- of the specifics, is that right? >> No, actually, I was saying send it to council with -- with no recommendation. >> Kitchen: Okay. We send it to council with no recommendation. Is there a second for that motion? I mean for that

amendment? Not a second. I'm sorry. Councilmember Zimmerman, do you accept that as a friendly amendment? >> Zimmerman: I'm not quite sure I understood it. Would it be to send the -- >> Kitchen: I'm sorry, I said it wrong. Do you want me to repeat it? >> Garza: Really do what you are doing. You are asking -- really doing what you are doing, you are asking for an extension of what's existing right now. We're not making a recommendation, we're sending what's existing right now to council for council -- >> Zimmerman: Existing franchise agreements you mean. >> Kitchen: Yes, just not putting the one year on it. >> Zimmerman: That's fine. I'll take that as an amendment. >> Kitchen: All right. So is everyone clear? Let me restate this. So what we are doing is we're recommending to move forward

[4:50:52 PM]

the franchise -- for purposes of first reading, we're making a recommendation to the full council that we move forward with the franchise renewal process for purposes of first reading only. >> Zimmerman: As is. >> Kitchen: Right, as is. Okay. Did I get that? The proposed new franchise. >> Without any changes at this point. I'm sorry, are we doing this not correctly. >> Aim Angela Rodriguez, I'm the one that's going to have the write the ordinance. When staff is talking about renewal they mean with all of those proposed changes that they outlined. You don't want that. So basically I think that's what councilmember Zimmerman was confused with as well. Really, what you would like to do is move forward to extent the existing franchises. >> Kitchen: For purposes of first reading. >> Zimmerman: Extend existing franchise. >> Kitchen: Purposes of first reading. >> That may change -- okay. All right. >> Kitchen: All right. Any further discussion? >> Garza: Just I don't know, I feel like it would be premature to write that ordinance - - >> Yeah. [Multiple voices] >> I'm not going to write the ordinance about the renewal. We're just going to put in backup on the agenda the existing ordinance. I'm not going to write anything new. >> Okay. >> Because if you were going to move forward with the recommendations, then I would have to write something new. So that's why we're just making sure what I needed to post for discussion and action. And what I had to put in backup. >> Garza: I have a quick question. If we're recommending to council the existing franchise, does that -- what is the -- the existing franchise, what was that time? Was it a 10 year agreement?

[4:52:55 PM]

>> Three and five. Council had directed us to make them all expire at the same time. So I believe two had three years and the other had five to make them expire at the same time. >> Garza: Okay. We would have to think about -- >> Other way around sorry. Two, five, one, three, sorry. >> Kitchen: Okay. Well, okay. So I think what we're doing, what our motion is, is to recommend to -- to recommend to the council to move forward with the process, with the existing franchise agreements. For purposes of first reading only. Is that what we're saying? All right. We'll figure that out. >> Okay, great. >> We'll post is accordingly. >> Kitchen: That's right. All in favor? >> Aye. >> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you. All right. Does anyone want to say anything else? >> Houston: I just want to say one more thing, thank you all for allowing me to sit here. >> Kitchen: Thank you for participating. >> Houston: But I want to be also very clear about the use of smart phones. I would like some data as to the location where the transportation network companies pick up and deliver because they don't seem to do it in district 1 a lot. So although the taxi companies have a requirement that they service all of the city, that's not something that the transportation network companies have. And it would be interesting to see where they pick up and where they don't pick up and where the calls come from, if that's possible. >> Garza: That's something that we asked last time. Staff, correct me if I'm wrong, I believe they told us that was proprietary and they won't tell us that information, so we don't know that information. But somebody can speak to that. >> Gordon [indiscernible], Austin transportation department. The city attorney's office has asked for an

opinion from the attorney general about the data. We have received the data.

[4:54:57 PM]

We expect within the next week to get the first quarter data for this year and we have that. >> I'm sorry, I missed the question. What was the question? I know -- >> Councilmember Houston was asking about specifics on pick up locations and I thought last time we were told that -- for tnc's and we were told they were challenging our request for that through the attorney general's office because they said it was proprietary. Now they are going to release it? >> They have released some information. I think that was a misunderstanding from the last term. What happened is the city asked for specific information, reporting information. The tnc's have provided some. Not all that we would like, but they have provided some. What the attorney general challenge is about is the city releasing that information publicly. We've had a lot of open public information requests for that data, obviously, from competitors and other ground transportation services. So what's going on with the attorney general right now is the tnc's, Uber, Lyft, et cetera, challenging our ability to release that information by claiming it was proprietary and it would damage their business model. However the city right now does have that information and can give it to council as long as obviously we don't disseminate that because then we could incur liability. >> Kitchen: Okay, thank you. Does anyone want to say anything else on the -- this first -- the first two agenda items on taxicabs before we move on to our next item? Okay, councilmember Garza. >> Garza: I just want to thank staff. It's such a learning process for us, you all have been so patient. None of our comments or questions are directed to thinking that you are not doing a marvelous job, which you are, but just trying to increase our learning curve and adequately represent the citizens of Austin, so thank

[4:57:01 PM]

you [Gallo]. >> Kitchen: I would echo that, I would also echo as you can hear there's a number of policy concerns that we have expressed that have some timing issues related to them and so we're working through all of that. Okay. All right, we can now move to agenda item no. 5, which is a briefing on the campo 2040 plan. >> Good afternoon, good, I'm Gordon durr, assistant director of the Austin transportation plan. Just to give you some perspective on the 2040 plan, this is a process that the capital area metropolitan planning organization has been working on for five years, since the 2035 plan was adopted. There's been -- there's been changes to the processes, as things have moved forward. Sold to give you some perspective, for the 2040 plan, the -- the state-wide population employment Numbers are brought down to the local level. So the -- so the estimate for 2040 is there will be 4.1 million people living in the six counties, which are composed, which are campo. In 1980, there was 600,000. So that's the Numbers we're talking about. In relation to about. To the people. According to the 2040 plan, 84% of that growth is from migration, not particularly from people who live near in town. The growth of families here in town. It also shows 2.3 million jobs of which about half of them are in Travis county, the rest throughout the other five counties of the campo region. The 2040 plan is meant to be fiscally constrained and represents the estimates of potential revenue from federal, state, local sources. Right now the plan itself is about

[4:59:04 PM]

3-point -- \$35 billion between now and 2040. That is composed of operations and maintenance in addition to added capacity. And as one of estimating to operate and maintain the system is a significant portion of those funds. Basically to get to 4.1 million people living in the six counties we're talking about

doubling the amount of travel that will be occurring by that time frame. And only adding about 15% to the capacity of the system to carry people. That's the dilemma working as we move forward to 2040 plan. Now, I want to take kind of a digress for a second and talk about modeling. So you're going to hear a lot of discussion about modeling and this is what the model says and all of that. The model has been upgraded since -- over the last five years. We now have a model that looks at morning peak, midday, afternoon peak and overnight. It uses 13 different types of trips within that so home based work is just one of the types of trips, home based school, the university of Texas is a special category. So it takes a lot of data and manipulates a lot of data and takes a considerable amount of time to actually run. But that's really what we're talking about in terms of the model. I would like to emphasize and this is my own emphasis, the model itself is an air quality model. It was originally intended to show that as we do improvements over the next 25 years we're not going to make air quality that we're actually moving further into attainment. So when people talk about we need to do this to the model, over the years there's probably have been people that played games with models. You can assume that half as many people will travel. That will make your air

[5:01:04 PM]

quality Numbers look really good, but there's constraints on how the model is run and how it operate. So as we talk about the model you need to keep that in the back of your mind that the primary function of the model is not transportation system design. We have other models that do that from local intersections. We use sin crow systems, traffic, we use a number of models, including the university of Texas is working on a model that really does a great job on arterial street looking at how traffic and transit work together along those corridors to help us refine plans. But at the level of the campo 2040 model, I don't want to say gross model, but it's a macro level model and it looks at the system as a whole and what do we need and what can we add to the system? You will probably also hear as part of the 2040 plan the term illustrative list. Travis county has an illustrative list of projects. City of Austin has a very illustrative list of projects. To be in the 2040 plan you have to be able to pay for it. There are a lot of roadways particularly in undeveloped areas why we want to have a roadway go through the area. It needs to be in a plan so that we can accept donation of the right-of-way for those roadways. So that's why Williamson county, Travis county, all the county. The folks from campo are here. They will talk about adding projects to the illustrative list and that's in terms of preserving potential right-of-way to be received. The city is -- we're pretty much developed. We're mature city so we don't have those potential corridors that we could utilize or develop over time. We work with Travis, Williamson, hays counties to look at those. So what we wanted to do is kind of go through

[5:03:08 PM]

some of the product of what staff has done to look at the 2040 plan. And we looked at it through the lens of the city's policies and procedures, including most importantly imagine Austin. Our objections in some cases have been related to some particular aspects of the plan. We wanted to make sure that the plan and the pieces of it meet with the intent of city policy. Don't exacerbate traffic capacity constraints or pose problems with environmentally sensitive areas. So to kind of highlight some of those, the one that's been in discussion in the last couple of weeks, has been loop 1 Cesar Chavez to slaughter. On the agenda for next meeting is some modifications to the 2035 plan. This particular project has been removed from consideration for the 2035 plan, but it's still in the 2040 plan assumptions. So we really think this needs more discussion. In particular as they're moving forward with their environmental process, which they've extended into the fall, to really look at the projects and the implications of the projects in the city of Austin. To really make a recommendation after that work is completed. >>

Kitchen: Let me ask a question there. So campo adopts the 2040 plan and then there's a process after that and I forget what it's called that additional projects can be added. So from the staff's perspective there's additional analysis that needs to occur on this proposed project before there's a determination of whether or not to put it in the campo plan. Am I understanding it correctly the recommendation? >> It's currently in the 2040 plan as proposed.

[5:05:08 PM]

The question is do we want to try to remove it or leave it in there and follow it through the process, the environmental process and the other processes that will be involved. But there's always an opportunity to modify the plan. >> Kitchen: So the recommendation -- I don't know if it's a recommendation, but one of the things staff is thinking is we could remove it from the 2040 plan and it could continue with its environmental processes and be added later as a result? >> That would be a path. I don't know if we have a particular path at this moment, but we think in keeping with the policy and plans of the city this is an area of concern. >> Kitchen: All right. Councilmember Gallo. >> Gallo: I have a question. So if we were -- if it was chosen to stay with the 2035 plan with the one lane, the one lane each way, and the environmental study was done based on that, and then at some point during the process it was determined that it really made more sense to do the two lanes each direction, does that then trigger another environmental study or does the environmental study that was done, can it be applied to both? >> Ashby, do you have any thoughts on that? Ashby Johnson is the -- stirks on? Thank you. Good afternoon, madam chair, members of the council. My name is ash by Johnson, the executive director of campo. Councilmember Gallo, could you restate your question again? >> So we were talking about the possibility of leaving the proposal as it is in the 2035 plan with just the one lane each direction. And my question was as that begins the process of the environmental

[5:07:10 PM]

study if at some point the plan is altered to add the two lanes, would that change the environmental study and trigger a new environmental study process or does the environmental study that would be done under the one lane each direction also be able to be used for the two lanes in each direction? >> Where we are right now is the description that's in the 2035 -- existing 2035 plan that's only good for another few weeks, is one lane in each direction. Because we already had a description in the 2040 draft plan that included the four lanes, the two in each direction, the project sponsor will have to make sure that their project description in the environmental document matches what's in the 2040 plan, otherwise that analysis cannot move forward. So they're already making steps to make that happen. The question -- and this goes back, madam chair, to something you asked me last week at the campo meeting. I think a potential way forward for us is to leave the environmental analysis in with the description of four lanes -- two lanes in each direction in there, but we also include two more alternatives to analyze. One would be dropping back to one lane in each direction, which was what was in the 2035 plan, and there would also be a no-billed option and all three alternatives would have to be explored and looked at. In addition to those things, madam chair, once the environmental document is complete, they are supposed -- they, the project sponsor, are supposed to come to the transportation policy board and ask for concurrence on a locally preferred alternative. In addition to that affirmative step that would have to be taken by the policy board, if this project ever received funding for

[5:09:10 PM]

construction -- right now it has no funding for construction at all. If it were to receive funding for

construction before it could go to construction it would have to be part of the transportation improvement program, which is the subset of our long range plan. That would be another affirmative action that the transportation policy board would have to take. So it just can't fly through and suddenly become a project on the ground. And what I'm proposing to you is we use -- we move forward and we use the time for ctrma and the city to talk through Cesar Chavez and other issues that might come up as part of the process. >> Kitchen: If I'm understanding correctly all three options could be part of it so the environmental analysis could also look at no-billed as well as one billed and two billed? Yes, ma'am. And that's a Normal thing to do. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> So the next project is one which has been through the environmental process. That would be 45 southwest between loop 1 south and F.M. 1626. There's been Dwight a bit of discussion about this. There was discussion about the environmental board. Most recently related to this issue. We have chuck Lesniak from the watershed department, if you have questions related to this. Again, I hope this is a concern and again it's not consistent with imagine Austin specifically spoke to this issue. Another project that's in there is the extension of 45 southwest from 1626 to interstate 35 south. We have very similar concerns. >> Gallo: I'm sorry, I want to go back and ask you a question on the 45 southwest loop 1 south to 1626. Before you go off of that. It says one of the concerns was an

[5:11:12 PM]

insufficient environmental review. Could you speak a little bit more to that? >> I think chuck would be the best person to speak to that. >> Good afternoon, councilmembers. Chuck Lesniak, city environmental officer. The city has reviewed -- city staff has reviewed the environmental impact statement and record of decision that was issued about a month ago. And our concerns on the final Eis were very similar to the draft environmental impact statement. We think that broad through there was just not good scientific support for the conclusions of no impact to Flint ridge cave, the golden cheeked warbler and other Karst features in the area in the city's -- city and county's balcones canyon lands preserve lands and water quality protection lands that are in the area. Failed so have those concerns -- so have those concerns been addressed and are they a response to environmental study that was done? Are we talking about the environmental study that you have concerns with? >> Yes. >> Gallo: So have our department's concerns been addressed towards that study? I'm trying to understand the process, environmental study has done and we have concerns about what happens next. >> How the process works is last summer txdot issued the draft environmental impact statement. There was a formal comment period. The city issued some 500 some comments. Other agencies, county, large number of the public sent comments in. The process is then txdot reviews those comment and issues a final Eis in response to

[5:13:12 PM]

comments, and presumably you would hope that the concerns are addressed in the final Eis. For the most part our review of the final Eis found that we don't believe that most of our concerns, environment Al concerns were addressed in the final Eis, however txdot did make some changes to the roadway, to the alignment of the roadway to reduce the impact. They did make some minor changes in final Eis, but we think that overall our concerns from the original draft Eis remain. >> Gallo: So then our response to the final Eis, have we done that in writing so it speaks specifically to the areas that we still have concerns about? I'm just trying to figure out kind of -- >> In terms of process -- in terms of process there is no formal comment period to the final Eis. Once the record of decision is issued, which it has been, it essentially ends the environmental review process and the road has received its environmental approval to move forward. We're looking at right now its best way to approach txdot and ctrma as they move

through design and communicate those concerns, and we're looking at that issue right now. >> Gallo: Okay. So the concerns that you had, are they anywhere in writing? I'm trying to figure it out. If I wanted to see where the issues still were would I be able to access? >> Yes. We've summarized our concerns and put that together. We wrote up comments on the draft Eis. >> Gallo: I'm talking about the final one. >> The same team that reviewed the draft Eis reviewed the final Eis and we've collated comments and sort of our overall opinion on the final Eis. So we do have that put together. >> Gallo: So we could -- we would have access to that? >> Yes. >> Gallo: Okay. Thank you. I just once again am trying to figure out the process here.

[5:15:16 PM]

>> Kitchen: Councilmember Zimmerman? >> Zimmerman: Thank you. Has council asked to you look at the draft Eis and ask you for concerns? Did that come from council? >> There was a council resolution from may of 2014. >> Zimmerman: About a year ago. Okay. Because the reason I ask is because I know some of these projects have been lack languishing possibly for decades. We've had congestion issues that have been building over decades of time. It seems like this is kind of a broken record. We have environmental concerns, we have a study. The study says it's okay. The time study, we still have concerns. We do another study, there are concerns for that study. Do another study, concerns. It's a cycle. It's kind of a vicious circle. And then roads don't get built and then we end up with the parking lot we see today. Is there a way -- do we need to have another vote on it? >> Kitchen: That's at the will of council. The staff is working off the previous council's direction. So if the current council wants to make any changes to it that's where the change would have to occur. >> So next is the extension of 45 southwest to interstate 35. Again, north Austin specifically spoke to not connecting interstate 35 to mopac. The garlic creek drive is on an illustrative list, there is no funding but this is basically a western outer loop. This would be an elevated toll road that passes through the balcones canyon lands conservation and through the water quality protection lands. So again there's concerns related to preservation of those protected lands. The centers policy,

[5:17:17 PM]

there's been somewhat change and one of the things the campo board has done over time is change some of the policies from the 2035 plan -- >> Kitchen: I'm sorry, councilmember Gallo? >> Gallo: I'm sorry, you probably want to go home today. Because of the issue of the 620 and 2222 intersection is such a huge concern in our districts, tell me a little bit about if -- there was a question about poses threat to quality future city of Austin water supplies. Could you describe what Christmas. >> That's probably another question for -- >> Gallo: Thank you. >> Chuck Lesniak, city environmental officer. I think the -- looking at what the the expansion in the northwest area of roadways out there is somewhat constrained by existing balcones canyon lands preserve lands and there may be water quality protection lands. Most of those -- actually, water quality protection lands are primarily in the southwest, but those are no preserve water quality in the Edward's aquifer and to drinking water supplies in that area and also to the central texan. So any kind of major road expansions in those areas has to take in consideration those federally protected lands in the bcp, the balcones canyon lands. >> So does that policy, as we talk about policy areas, which is what we're obviously concerned about, so that policy in the bccp areas, does that in your

[5:19:18 PM]

mind prohibit us from building any roadways. We have huge road issues and how do we address that?

>> I don't think so. I think it would have to utilize existing right-of-way to a dr.extent. There's a possibility of acquiring private lands to expand some of those roadways. But there are areas where the proposed routes for roadways, the only way to do what's being proposed is to take it through federally protected land. And that's something that the city would have limited ability to do so without federal approval. And one of the things to keep in mind is that those federal preserve lands, the balcones canyon land preserve lands have been able to keep development from the last 20 years now in western Travis county is those are mitigation for the very large amount of development that has occurred out there. So if we were to take away any preserve lands, we would have to replace it with preserve lands of similar value because that is land that is mitigated, development that has already occurred. And without those lands, those preserve lands that are out there today, much of the development you see in western Travis county would not exist. >> Gallo: So it sounds like transportation plans need to be developed outside of those areas. >> Yes, but that can be done. There are ways to do that. Some of the proposals that are in the 2040 plan, the more regional new roads for that area would be difficult and the only route to do it would be will you preserve lands. >> Gallo: Are there any routes available to

[5:21:19 PM]

help address those traffic concerns that wouldn't be through those areas? >> I don't know. I'd have to take a closer look at that and with the transportation department. We can still meet our environmental goals and our environmental requirements for that matter. >> Gallo: I would just really love to see us be more proactive about being on the ground floor of proposing that work environmentally rather than always be reactive to something that's been proposed that we feel like we shouldn't do. However we start that process there's such a huge, huge issue with transportation issues and congestions over this knows areas. So however we start that process to begin to say, hey, here -- we need to address the problem, here it is and here is the proposal that has limited impact environmentally that we can all get behind and promote. >> Kitchen: Maul, one of the things we talked about -- councilmember Gallo one of the things we talked about is a strategic mobility plan. We haven't talked about it, but it's been mentioned by staff and something that's been done in the past so that might be something that we would want to really talk about because I see that as an avenue to talk about planning for the whole area. >> How do we start that? >> Kitchen: We could put that on our agenda, rob. In fact, I think -- >> Zimmerman: You have it on future item, right? No, that's not congestion action. >> Kitchen: No, I didn't put the strategic mobility -- yeah, it's item number nine as a future action item. So you can see it right here on the future agenda. >> Gallo: I just want us to be very proactive about fixing the traffic problems because

[5:23:19 PM]

everyone expects us to do it tomorrow. >> Kitchen: Okay. Keep going. >> To go quickly through the last three, the 2035 plan had specific goals for centers related to population and employment, and the 2040 proposes language, but no particular goals. >> If you could go back to the last slide to clarify something. Madam chair, if you could, the second bullet item on the Rm 620 to 45 south that was proposed by lakeway in the illustrative list has been removed from the plan at the request of the city of lakeway. >> Kitchen: All right, thank you. >> So again there have been specific goals previously. The new plan does not have specific goals. Likewise there have been specific allocations of state transportation mobility monies or something like that. Stpmf funds related to bicycle and pedestrian. Those are now targets as opposed to specific allocations. And that's the last slide on that. On that particular section. >> Kitchen: We have two speakers signed up. Do you all have any questions? Questions first? No? Okay. Mr. Tom Ferrell? And after him amber Lentz. >> Thank you, madam chair and members of the council. My name

is Tom Ferrell and I have the honor of being mayor of the city of rolling wood, y'all's neighbor. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to y'all. The city of rolling wood has been very concerned about the proposed plans on mopac south on that and how it would adversely affect our community as well as parts of Austin and Travis county that we

[5:25:21 PM]

have on that. We passed -- we proposed -- we sent a letter that basically said that we object to the plans as presented on that and we had some pros and cons that we wanted to do and we wanted to make sure that our input was included in that. To summarize that a little bit, the biggest problem I think we've faced on that was the upper deck that was coming across lady bird lake on that. It did present some noise and light pollution problems for that whole area that would come on that, and we did have some issues about visibility that came on that and how it would adversely affect our city as well as the park areas on that. Rolling wood has its own park system. We certainly use zilker park quite a bit and we love being there most of the time. We really don't being there some of the time when we have too many events and traffic on that, but all in all it's a great place to be on that. We do provide our parks are open for the whole community throughout, the whole region for their ball fields. We have most of the ball fields in the area west of mopac that would be on that and we do provide that for everybody on that. We've held several meetings on this and we've been participating with the ctrma on that, and we wanted to let them know and we've told them that we appreciate the fact that they are addressing mobility issues. We have mobility issues that we have on this, but we wanted to make sure that we had our input on that and that we looked at how this plan was coming together and what impact it had on our community and the surrounding areas on that. To put some of the pros that we had on this, and there were some, would be that we would have a -- could have -- this is all subject to of course the final plans that would be on that. We would have a better access on to bee caves

[5:27:22 PM]

road that would -- that as you exit north mopac on that. If you've tried to do that, it's an interesting moment to try to get over three lanes. We have a lot of traffic on Barton springs drive that's coming up, and it's a lot of MIX and matching of cars on that. So we thought that would be a great thing. It would help with the access on to 2244 that we had in general and the entrance on to mopac in some ways in that we might be able to finally fully utilize the already -- [buzzer sounds] -- Concrete area we have on Barton skyway, which is a six lane bridge and we use -- it's probably the least used concrete we have in central Texas for roadways on that. And some ways that we had proposed that they come up with that. We do want to work with the city of Austin on this, this is a regional deal. And we've met with a lot of our cities. Westlake, lakeway and we will do what we can to help on that. And we would like to be a regional partner to help with the mobility in any way with we can. Thank you for y'all's effort on doing this. >> Kitchen: Let me ask you a question. You mentioned some of the pros. Did just to give you a little more time, could you mention some of the cons that you guys were concerned about? >> The cons we had were basically the first was the noise that we would be getting off of the upper deck on that. And then there's some light pollution that comes off of that. And how that would adversely affect not only our park system, but the zilker park system that would have on that. And we had some concerns about how the very short time that people that are coming off of bee caves road could enter the freeways and how the entrance and commits to the toll roads would occur on that.

[5:29:26 PM]

It's a way to do it. Bee caves road has about 50,000 customers and just from a business standpoint, mopac has say 150,000 people coming down it. So we would have 2,000 people going north and south. Truth of the matter, exit to be going down Cesar Chavez is not going to be something that rolling wood residents or patio people coming off bee caves road is going to use because we already have a fairly easy way to get to down here. The impact of all these lanes coming together on Cesar Chavez that would be at our situation with Austin high and with the park system at wia that we had down there and we were concerned that this plan really didn't look at the vast number of new employees coming on to Cesar Chavez and how that's going to impact this roadway as it came on. One of the other issues we were concerned about and that we believe that should be done, whatever is done on this should incorporate and have a fully vetted discussion on how this may tie into I-35. And if it's going to tie in, let's just -- let's just say it's going to tie in and how this is going to impact all of our communities and the traffic on mopac as it goes -- as it grows on that. Some of the other things that we were concerned about on that was the -- and was a pro and con is that the -- there were some hike and bike trails additions on that. We thought they could be done in a lot different way. They would be a lot more effective. The city of rolling wood has been working with the city of Austin parks department to enlarge some of the hike and bike trails that come

[5:31:30 PM]

off of the lake, and provide some extra safety measures for bike and pedestrian walkways on that. >> Kitchen: Okay. Amber Lentz. >> Thank you, madam chair. I'm going to read from a script actually. My name is amber Lentz. I represent the families of the students who attend the schools that track into Austin high school with Austin independent school district. >> Kitchen: And you're on the school board. >> I'm on the school board. Missed that part. I want to thank councilmember kitchen for inviting me to speak on behalf of the Austin high community. I'd like to plead for the council to consider the safety of our students and our staff and our families in all of your road and mobility discussions. There is also concern about the north mopac express lanes and the city's own plans to extend the Pressler street to Cesar Chavez. While these streets are position understand what people are calling Austin high's backyard, their current designs will have serious impacts on the side yards and the front yard of the school as well. Each project on its own has the potential to negatively impact the safety of our students, but all three together are creating a paralyzing scenario for the Austin high community. Toyed Austin high is a destination. More than two thousand students travel to this school everyday to learn thousand become grownups who can make a difference in the world. They come from all over Austin. In fact, the official boundaries of the school overlap with at least seven members of the new city council districts. So in addition to mayor Adler, mayor pro tem tovo, councilmembers kitchen, Gallo, troxclair, Renteria,

[5:33:30 PM]

pool and Houston, all have Austin high bound families looking to you for support. And what they need you to hear is that they are gravely concerned for the safety of their kids. As I mentioned before, Austin high is currently a destination location. All of these new roads however position the school along the path of a thoroughfare. Because cars can enter and exit the express lanes from Austin high roads just east of the school. Stephen F Austin boulevard and potentially Pressler if it is built as planned will become the access roads into west Austin for anyone using the new mopac express lanes in either direction. You need to know that the south mopac express lane team through the efforts of Melissa Hurst, is the only group that has reached out directly to Austin high, they're trying to incorporate our specific suggestions to mitigate any safety issues that could come from the new road. This is in stark contrast to the work around the north mopac express lanes and the Pressler road. Both of which are

designed to allow and even encourage drivers to use the roads around Austin high in new ways. And neither of which proactively sought input from the Austin high community. Please know that this community understands the needs to ease traffic congestion and create connectivity. [Buzzer sounds] We are not against these new roads in principle, we just ask that they be built in ways that do not put our children in danger. Decisions supporting student safety should trump any past promises or any ideas to ease congestion. I have a few more things I would like to -- >> Kitchen: Please go ahead. >> One of the city's responses to our safety concerns has been that more traffic does not necessarily mean more danger. What planners are refusing to acknowledge is that this particular street, Stephen F Austin boulevard, is not like most areas.

[5:35:30 PM]

It is already more dangerous by the nature of where it is placed and how it is used. Try to understand that any new traffic will be directed into a very small, already very congested space to merge with about a thousand newly licensed drivers every year. The center for disease control and prevention identifies teen drivers as three times more likely to get into a car crash than older drivers. With risks particularly high during the first months of licensure. The new drivers are already mixing with any austinite who may enjoy town lake, Austin pets alive or wia. However these drivers are driving slowly looking for parking. When you make Stephen F Austin boulevard go to the west drivers will be sipping through this space as quickly as possible. The increased and hurried traffic will also put kids at risk throughout the school day not just drivers. Austin high students walk across Stephen F Austin boulevard Monday through Friday to use the baseball fields, the rowing center and the trail for athletics and pe. The softball and lacrosse teams teams practice on the wia fields on the north sides of Cesar Chavez. All these roads are currently decide for new traffic and hurry drivers across these walk paths and across the walking path of anyone who wants to use the city parks and spaces. Austin high students are not the only ones at risk. Spend just a few minutes around the school and you will witness moms pushing strollers across the street to get to the trail. Dogs runningback and forth across their jogging owners, bikers going through the traffic and small children chasing balls between the parked cars. The Austin high community embraces these neighbors. We ask that you embrace them too. Help us encourage road designers to protect this space. None of these streets should be designed in any way that turns

[5:37:31 PM]

Stephen F Austin boulevard into a cut through. Safety is our number one concern. Please make it yours as well. And work together with us to design safer routes for our kids. >> Kitchen: Thank you very much. >> Kitchen: Thank you all. Let me do a time check here. We have two more items. 6 and 7, right, for briefing. And we don't have anyone signed up for either one of those. So do you guys think we can address both of those in the time we have remaining? Yes, I guess it depends on our questions. Do you want to take -- six was going to be one of our items. We should have a luxly right-of-way that this is the first meeting and campo is the second Monday that we should be able to come to you with a briefing to talk about the items on the next agenda so you will have that as we move forward. Other than that the items we pretty, already talked about, about relating to the 2040 plan, and the item related to the campo appointment to the capital metro board, I don't know that there's anything that we need to take a lot of time looking at at this point. Laura is here with our active transportation division for item number 7. >> Kitchen: I think that's more time sensitive, right? We're on item number seven, you U.T. >> Good evening, madam chair and members of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today. The reason we're here is at last week's mobility committee meeting, you

[5:39:33 PM]

heard from our director and others about various ways that projects are funded inclusive of grants. We do have a number of opportunities coming up in the near future by way of federal grants for bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements as well as overall safety and mobility opportunities. So what I'd like to do today is share with you some of the projects that we're developing under the transportation alternatives program as well as bring to your attention two other federal grants that are coming up. Thank you. Ultimately we're here to brief you on these opportunities and then seek the opportunity to take requests for resolution to the full council, which would enable the city manager to authorize city manager to submit a list of projects. For funding to these various entities. >> Kitchen: What's the deadline for those? >> Yes. I will -- >> Kitchen: You will get to that. Go ahead. >> I will get to to that, yes. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Ultimately this is an opportunity to leverage existing bond funding as well as other sources of funding to bring in more resources to address some of the transportation improvements that we seek. So the three opportunities that are before us in the near future in the next couple of months are the transportation improvement -- alternatives program or tap. So this program that mentioned is for pedestrian and bicycle programs only, projects only, excuse me. Total of a little over \$10 million is available. It does require a 20% local match. And all -- in this particular call, all of our metropolitan planning organization partners are eligible to apply.

[5:41:34 PM]

The tentative schedule that we anticipate campo announcing following their policy board meeting would be a call for projects on may 12th with applications due July ninth. >> Kitchen: Go ahead. >> Gallo: A couple of questions. One of the land development projects in district 10 is the bull creek property, which is now the [indiscernible] At shoal creek. I need to start calling it that. And there's been a lot of discussion about the connectivity of the shoal creek trail. There's a component of it that's kind of stops at 35th and it doesn't complete to 45th. So I'm looking at your list of trail projects and that is not listed as one of those, but if the parties were interested in making an application for that component to be addressed, would that be appropriate for this funding? >> It theoretically these are projects for pedestrian and bicycle connectivity. So those types of projects are definitely eligible. I should elaborate a bit on the full eligibility for campo projects, inclusive of public involvement as well as match funding availability and project readiness in particular? So these are projects that really need to be ready to go very quickly. They have gone through their environmental process, have -- in the case of the first round of funding in fiscal 16 it's limited to only construction, not planning and design. So if there was any planning and design involved it would be only eligible for funds in the later years, 17 and 18 in this call. So there's a lot of things to consider in terms of the eligibility and the ranking of one

[5:43:35 PM]

project over another. We also have a division manager for the urban trails program who can speak specifically to that project. >> Gallo: It was just a question of is it a possibility, and if it is we can have that conversation later. >> Kitchen: Yes. To follow up on that, it would be helpful and maybe you can point me to this. Is there a place that we could see a list of all the potential projects that would be eligible? Or can we get a copy of that? >> They are in our planning in the urban trails master plan -- oh, excuse me. >> Councilmember, so what we've done is look through what we think the -- the criteria might be. For these. And looked at the projects that we have currently working their way through the process and so those projects that are ready to go to construction we've looked at which ones might best match the funding requirements that we anticipate. So the list that we're providing is really those

projects that we think are right to go for funding. These calls come periodically, so just because a particular project that may be in a district that's of interest isn't quite ready for this, I would certainly not discourage continuing to work towards getting that project ready. Because the next time this call might come out, then it would certainly be on that list. And so that -- again, as I explained, I think last council meeting or committee meeting, what we try to do is anticipate what the requirements might be and try to match the projects as best as possible. Traditionally Austin has been in a good position, the city proper, to compete for these federal funds because we have a high need and we have a sort of a mature program that develops them. And so I would just offer that as a thought. But we can provide a full work list of the projects that we're working on and just know that some of those

[5:45:36 PM]

may or may not be well suited for the grants. >> Kitchen: Sure, it would be helpful to have the list. So it sounds like what you are saying is that -- that all of the projects that are ready, in terms -- by ready I mean meeting the criteria for the grants, go on the list. Is that what we're saying? As opposed to some kind of selection process. >> Yes, pretty close to that. So part of it is we have to fill out a grant application for each one, too. There's sort of an understanding of how many grants we can actually put together, as they say in the fishing business, when you are fishing for funds, it's best to put as many hooks in the water and that's what this is about. >> Kitchen: It would also be helpful to have the first list that you mentioned because that would help us understand particular projects that might be going in areas that we're interested in, where they are in the process. >> That would be a more illustrious list of projects whether they be in design or plan or construction. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> With that, I can go into a little bit about some of the candidate projects we have been developing for the tap call, we are working with the department of public works on a number of these projects. One of the areas we are keenly interested in looking at is pedestrian safety enhancements. As you have probably heard in the news lately, perhaps through citizens communication, there's a backlog of requests for what's called pedestrian hybrid beacons, these are devices that assist in pedestrians being able to cross more safely. Also devices called pedestrian countdown timers and accessible pedestrian signals, that are particularly helpful and necessarily for visually impaired. Because these grants are limited to just pedestrian and bicycle safety and connectivity, these types of

[5:47:37 PM]

devices are well suited for the grant. And there are areas throughout the entire city, in all districts, that could utilize pedestrian hybrid beacons. There's -- with a grant the size of about 2.3 million, we could look at approximately 20 pedestrian hybrid beacons with sidewalk improvements around them as well as the number of pedestrian countdown timers and accessible pedestrian signals. We would need to further evaluate exact locations and eligibility based on criteria that atd has developed, but that is certainly one of the projects we are looking closely at. Another one is looking at our corridor studies, we've done a number of corridor studies. As you know these are very -- you know, intense looks at an entire corridor and how we can improve safety and there's often short term, midterm and long-term improvements. >> Kitchen: I'm sorry. I had a question on the pedestrian. So is this something that's appropriate for sidewalks? Or not? >> Absolutely, it is. And the idea here would be to look at pedestrian hybrid beacons in conjunction with sidewalk accessibility around them. So there's an opportunity to kind of do both. As I mentioned, our corridor studies have identified improvement that we can make in the short term, midterm and long term and airport boulevard was one corridor that recently underwent a study of an airport boulevard corridor development program, it was completed last April. And there were a number of short-term, low-cost solutions that were identified and one of the recommendations

in this corridor study was to look at learning state and federal funds to improve --

[5:49:40 PM]

improve the safety of this corridor. So we have an opportunity before us to leverage corridor step funds that were dedicated to the airport boulevard corridor. And really get much bigger return on our investment for some of these short-term solution, inclusive of pedestrian hybrid beacons as well as sidewalk improvements, which are in great need in this area. In addition, the public works department under the urban trails program has put toward two trail projects, again, we have Mr. Craiger here who can speak more specifically to these projects. I will yield to him on these. >> The first of these is the -- I'm sorry, Chad Craiger, division manager with public works department. The first of these is the mopac mobility bridges project that is currently under construction right now in district 8 under mopac, directly south of Barton creek mall. That project had some significant unforeseen conditions that we will be bringing to the April 29th mobility committee to discuss. With those unforeseen conditions comes some unforeseen costs, so we'll be applying for that. The second project is the upper boggy creek trail, which is -- connects 12th street to the mlk train station and the transit oriented development up there. That's a project that's at 90% design. Like director spiller said, anything that's further along in design, almost construction ready, the higher the chances of that getting picked. That's something that's 90% in construction and we are seeking funding for that project. >> And finally, we have been looking at an opportunity to -- or excuse me, there's a couple more projects.

[5:51:41 PM]

Revisiting the corridor opportunities, burnet road is another corridor with currently undergoing a study and we have identified some opportunities for intersection improvements that would assist bicycle and pedestrian travel in the burnet road at 2222 and Koenig. There's been public meetings held looking at east-west bicycle connection there, as well as we've been looking at some pedestrian improvements around the intersection. And this is one that perhaps could take advantage of bond funding that's devoted to burnet road to again leverage more funds for improvements to that area. And finally, as you may be aware, the city has been quite successful in bringing bike share to Austin. A couple of years ago, by way of a federal grant just like this. It was -- it was a way to fully fund stations and bikes with no city moneys devoted to it. Other than the staff support that was provided. So this -- again, this is another opportunity in that -- in that first phase of bike share they did identify a need to expand to serve, better serve the community and this is an opportunity to look at additional stations. >> Kitchen: Where would those be, do we know? >> They would largely be in the current service area of -- of the bike share system right now. It would just be a way to -- to put stations in -- in closer proximity to origins and destinations that people are likely to essentially start and end trips. So -- >> Kitchen: Okay. With that I'll transition to the two other opportunities that have come to our attention in the last couple of weeks that are other

[5:53:42 PM]

federal funds. This particular funding source called highway safety improvement program is through txdot. So not -- not through our campo partners, but through txdot. This is funding that is for highway safety improvements to reduce serious crashes. There's approximately 155 million a year, made available for this. It does require, if the project is off of the state system, it does require a 10% match. If it's on system, it's -- there is no match. The types of things that hsip or h-sip fund make a fund are traffic signal installation and improvements, raised medians and other ways to provide safety in conflict areas

between motor vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles. It does include pedestrian projects. Such as signals, we spoke about a moment ago crosswalks, sidewalks and safety lighting. We do see some opportunities here. Just in terms of general safety and mobility, not just bike and ped. For intersection improvements. Our next step here would be to meet with txdot to determine what on system or off system opportunities there may be. We have yet to hear the official call for projects, so we don't quite know when those applications will be due, but we anticipate it will be a may-june time frame and I will review all of those deadlines in a moment. The third opportunity that's just recently been brought to our attention is called tiger, transportation investment generating economic recovery. You may have heard of these before. This is the 7th round of tiger funds. These are funds uniquely offered directly from the U.S. D.o.t., directly from the feds, not through state

[5:55:44 PM]

or npo partners, they are very highly competitive and they are looking at projects of regional significance. We -- we are -- we would love to find a way to work with our regional partners to address some of the mobility issues that councilmember Gallo mentioned a moment ago. This is the type of grant that can look at big -- those big picture challenges. They need to -- the projects need to address safety, economic competitiveness, maintenance, livability, environmental sustainability. And be able to contribute to economic recovery. Which is really the founding reasons for the tiger program. So we again are looking at opportunities there. And if it would please the committee, we would be prepared to return on your April 29th meeting to further vet candidate projects for the hsp and tiger funds, if we do find, you know, feasible opportunities there. I will say that we're in the very early stages of looking at these opportunities and we're somewhat constrained in our -- constrained in our own capacity to pull these things together, so it would really depend upon partnerships within our region to pull this together. With that, I'll point your attention to the rest of the -- rest of the month moving forward. We would anticipate if -- if a tiger application were to be pursued, a very basic preapplication be due may 4th with the full application due on June 5th. As I mentioned, hsp, we haven't heard yet exactly when that preapp and app are due, we anticipate the policy board to determine the eligibility criteria and to announce the tap call in may with a preapplication in

[5:57:46 PM]

June and then the app in July, so it does give us more time to develop these projects further. I would be happy to take any questions. >> Kitchen: My comment would simply be, I know you guys are doing this, this is for us to understand, when we're looking at projects to fund, think about them from two aspects, one aspect being the -- the distribution throughout the city because I think one of the things we heard from, you know, from our constituents and from other councilmembers is that it's important to make sure that we're reaching the whole city. You know? So we want to be thinking about that in terms of both equity and just also in terms of perhaps thinking about areas of the city that may not have been at the-- at the forefront. That's one thing, the other thing is as we work towards developing I'm going to call it a strategic mobility plan but, you know, overall picture of what we're working towards, it would be good for us to understand how these things fit into that. So ... So do y'all have any questions. Go ahead. >> We lost him. >> So I have a question on the highway safety improvement program, is that only for high projects or projects on highways and if so what would those be in Austin? >> Yes. These are projects that are the eligibility is essentially counter measures that are described in the Texas strategic high safety plan. So these are proven counter measures that address safety on highways we're talking, you know, Lamar, burnet, things like that. >> The state defines highways generally, so there are some projects that could be on smaller roads, they don't necessarily need to be on highways. A lot of the

highways are on

[5:59:47 PM]

system but they're talking about off system here, also. One of the things we talked about is red bud trail going up from the dam up, that that's a curve, that's a safety concern, maybe we get new surfacing that has more -- that's better there. But highway is a more general term, usually when the state is talking about highways. >> So at this point do you have the projected projects that -- that you'll be applying for? I mean, are you already to that point in this process? >> We are not. We are not to the point in that process, no. We are still evaluating opportunities, so. >> Gallo: Okay. But what I understand is it's not just my perception of a highway but mostly any roads that are highly traveled would qualify? >> Yes. Those would be the ones with the 10% match with -- not state highways. >> Gallo: Okay, thank you. >> Kitchen: Any further questions? Thank you very much. >> You're welcome. Okay, we appreciate all of y'all's efforts and good information that you've brought to us. So I would just call the -- the committee members' attention to future items. I've listed some of the major future items here. And I invite you all to add to it. Just let me know and we'll add them as future items. Our next meeting is scheduled for April 29th, I believe it is. So we'll get back on a regular schedule and that's on our regularly scheduled day. So do you all have any further? Okay. With that, we will adjourn. Thank you very much.