



EMMA S. BARRIENTOS MEXICAN AMERICAN CULTURAL CENTER

ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES

**Special Called Meeting
Wednesday, April 15, 2015**

The Emma S. Barrientos Mexican American Cultural Center Advisory Board convened in a regular meeting at 600 River Street, in Austin, Texas.

Board Members in Attendance:

David Carroll, Chair
Veronica Forsyth, Co-Chair
Anna Maciel, Member
Kathryn McMahon, Member
Juan Oyervides, Member
Velia Sanchez-Ruiz, Member

Board Members Absent: 1

Blanca Valencia, Member

Staff in Attendance:

Laura Esparza, HAND Manager
Herlinda Zamora, ESB-MACC Manager
Kelly Grajeda, ESB-MACC Administrative Assistant

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Carroll called the Board Meeting to order at 6:03pm.

2. BRIEFINGS:

- a. 64 Rainey Street Working Group; Lead, David Carroll.
 - i. Chair Carroll provided a history of the MACC Advisory Board's actions regarding 64 Rainey.
- b. C.J. Sackman, developer, presented on Sackman Enterprises/Freemont Holdings proposed project at 70 Rainey Street and the potential impacts on the 64 Rainey lot as discussed at the 3/4/15 regular meeting.

3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS:

- a. Members of the audience will be provided an opportunity to ask questions of the developer, PARD staff and the Board.
 - i. Michael Abelson asked Sackman what the possibility is for the two-lane expansion of the alley to extend beyond the developers' property. Sackman responded they are only planning for their lots, any lots north of 74 Rainey would not be their decision to make.
 - ii. Peggy Vazquez asked Sackman what the budget is for landscaping. He received an estimate of \$300k for the pocket park and annual maintenance of \$8k-\$10k.
 - iii. Anita Quintanilla asked what percentage of the developers' units will be designated for low cost affordable housing for the old residents of the Rainey Street area. Sackman spoke on the developers' recent history with the lot as well as the rezoning history of the neighborhood. He would like to add something to the benefit of the neighborhood's character as it is today. Quintanilla asked what character he meant, and he discussed the needed green space.
 - iv. Peggy Vazquez asked if Sackman owns the property north of 74 Rainey. He does not. She also asked what percentage of 70 Rainey will go towards affordable housing. Sackman stated the development will abide by all City ordinances and requirements.
 - v. Gissela SantaCruz asked if the developers had further plans for community investments. Sackman spoke on their plans for community gardening and a dog park

among other features within their building, and stated they primarily are offering the pocket park investment for the community.

- vi. One community member asked if the developers are willing to work with the MACC board on aesthetics of the wall, no matter the outcome of the 25 foot setback. The developers' goal is the most aesthetically pleasing façade. Another citizen inquired about the planned façade on the west walls. They have setbacks and the alley on each side, so they are able to achieve the same materials on each façade side. They intend to have a restaurant, retail space, and second floor patio for tenants on the bottom floors of the building.
- vii. Manuel Jimenez commented that the developer was not willing to talk about affordable housing but was able to discuss the retail space.
- viii. Peggy Vazquez asked how many stories the building will be and how many stories are for parking. Sackman stated eight levels of parking above the ground floor retail, and 35 whole stories are planned. Vazquez also asked if the property lines of 64 Rainey will be intact. In the developer's proposal, they will take 4 feet off to expand the alleyway. Besides that, no other square footage will be utilized for any use besides the park.
- b. Upon signing up, 10 members from the audience will be provided up to 3 minutes to state their opinion, suggestions and commentary regarding the agenda item.
 - i. Paul Saldaña spoke on his own behalf. He hopes the integrity of the ESB-MACC is maintained and asked the developers and Board to consider and respect the compatibility and design standards of the ESB-MACC. He asked if there will be wastewater line improvements. He also asked what would happen if 64 Rainey were already Dedicated Parkland and how much longer the community will have to wait for that transfer.

4. ITEMS FOR BOARD DISCUSSION:

- a. Board Members will ask the developer and PARD staff questions and then discuss the proposals of Sackman Enterprises/Fremont Holdings.
 - i. Member Sanchez-Ruiz asked that the developers include Board input to ensure there are additional uses for the community in the pocket park if the Board decides to accept the proposal.
 - ii. Member Oyervides asked Sackman what the proposed \$300k will be going towards. Sackman responded streetscapes, sidewalks, lighting, ADA accessibility, irrigation, site furnishings, etc.
 - 1. Oyervides asked if those would all be costs covered by the COA once 64 Rainey is Dedicated Parkland. Ricardo Soliz, Park Planning Division Manager, responded yes. Sackman briefly discussed the benefits and zero risk of the proposal in terms of funding as well as the uncertainty of the 2018 bond results and PARD maintenance capabilities in the case the Board does not accept the proposal.
 - 2. Oyervides asked Soliz if there would be COA funding for the pocket park once it becomes Dedicated Parkland. Soliz stated there would be Parkland Dedication fees that development in the area would pay (dependent on the number of units). He also reminded the Board of the Rainey Street Fund.
 - 3. Oyervides also asked if the developer thought about a mural for the concrete wall which would be an appropriate alternative for the neighborhood and ESB-MACC. Sackman stated they are not intending on putting a mural on their property.

4. Oyervides also asked if the developer will be selling the property at any point in the future. Sackman said there is no foreseeable option of transferring it to anyone else.
5. Oyervides asked if they thought of any form of benefit or programming fund for the ESB-MACC during the time of the construction staging. The developers will talk to Public Works to see what their intention is for the land, and they are open to discussing it if it is for a rental. Oyervides asked Soliz what the rental would be. Soliz stated that because it is not Dedicated Parkland, there is a process to rent the land for staging. He would recommend that the rental fees, using the park formula, go to the ESB-MACC. Soliz stated that PARD's preference is for the developers to deliver the park to them because it would be less complicated and quicker than giving PARD the money to then complete the park.
- iii. Member McMahon asked if the Dedicated Parkland issue would be put on hold if they went forward with the proposal. Soliz stated it would be PARD's preference to have the lot Dedicated this year, and the contract could be signed when the lot is COA, and then Dedicated.
 1. McMahon inquired about 58 Rainey. Sackman stated it would be the same theme of a pocket park, but the timeline has not been discussed yet.
 2. McMahon asked if there is any way to ensure the protection of 64 Rainey in the future if the developers decide to sell their property. Sackman is open to discussion if the proposal is accepted.
- iv. Co-Chair Forsyth asked if the developer would be open to exploring the possibility of a fountain to showcase the history of the community. Sackman said if there is an arrangement with the City for additional assistance, then the possibility is there.
- v. Member Maciel stated that she has not seen the openness the developers have said they are demonstrating. She also stated she is disappointed with the City because the lot could have been Dedicated Parkland already.
- vi. Chair Carroll asked if the no-build setback is permanent. Sackman said yes. Carroll said he would not want to restrict any future expansion of the ESB-MACC and limit the possibility to widen the entrance.
 1. He would like to see more openness and collaboration with the community for the pocket park.
 2. He asked if using the alleyway would increase traffic. Sackman said it would relieve congestion of the alleyway.
 3. Carroll asked how the additional 4 feet of 64 Rainey on the alley side be used. The agreement could be conveyed similar to an easement.
 4. Carroll asked what the developers' alternate staging option is. Sackman would utilize parts of 70 Rainey and parts of the right of way and the alley.
 5. Chair Carroll also requested Sackman email the Board renderings and elevations of the building.

5. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS: None stated.

6. ADJOURNMENT: Chair Carroll adjourned the meeting at 7:43pm with a motion from Co-Chair Forsyth and a second from Member Sanchez-Ruiz without objection (6.0). + Chair Carroll, Co-Chair Forsyth and Members Maciel, Sanchez-Ruiz, McMahon, and Oyervides.