

City Council Work Session Transcript – 08/04/2015

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

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

Original Air Date: 8/4/2015

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[9:16:01 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Morning. >> Good morning. >> Mayor Adler: We're going to go ahead and convene the work session. Today is Tuesday, August 4th, 2015, we're in the boards and commissions room of city hall. It is 9:15. We have items that have been pulled. In addition to the items that have been pulled, there's been a request to pull items 4 and 5, also 21, 22 and 23. And also item number 52. We also have a briefing today on the permitting process action plan, and we have an item to be considered in executive session, which is an update on the challenge petition. Ms. Houston? >> Houston: Could you read those items again, you went a little fast. >> Mayor Adler: No problem. The items that have been requested that we pull are items 4 and 5, 21, 22 and 23. And item number 52. Okay. We're going to start with the briefing on permitting and then we'll go into the pulled items.

[9:18:15 AM]

>> Pool: Mayor, question for you? Are we hoping for a hard stop at noon today? >> Mayor Adler: We had this last time too. We didn't set a hard stop. I think everyone's intent is to get out at noon. I'm going to try to push this along. I'm going to -- as we go through the agenda items that are pulled, we're going to give people a chance to explain why it is that they want the item pulled and then we'll check and see if there's someone else that also wants to have that item pulled. If not we'll put it on the back of the agenda. I think that moved us along faster as well. We're going to try that again. My hope would be that we would be done by noon, go back in executive session and then be done. >> Pool: Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, Ms. Houston? >> Houston: And I appreciate the reasons that perhaps councilmember pool has requested that, but we've got a lot of work to do and I don't want to put just an artificial stop when we have stuff that we need to talk about before we get to council meeting on Thursday. And so although I understand that and I appreciate her ask, to me it's better to get the information complete so we don't have to do this on Thursday. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. All right. Before you start, I want to kind of hit it at a high level, the conversation and the briefing that I requested on the permitting issue, kind of what the expectations are that I have, and I think several other of the councilmembers have as well. There are a lot of real big issues that I think this new council has been elected to resolve. A lot of them. But a few that come up a lot. One of those is mobility in

[9:20:19 AM]

the city issue. One is affordability in the city. And I would probably rank for me the -- in terms of what people came to me about and what people would talk to me about is I would go around the city last

year. The third one that I think ranked as high as those other two in terms of what people brought up was the permitting process in the city. There are a lot of people that believe that that permitting process to a large degree impacts both mobility issues in this city and impacts affordability issues in this city. When I announced my candidacy formally on the plaza just outside this door back in May of last year, I talked about a lot of things in this city. They were, I don't know, 5, 600 people gathered. I talked about affordability, I talked about mobility, I talked about equity, I talked about lots of topics. The largest applause line I got was when I said that I thought we should take a look at the permitting process, to work on that. As you go around the country and talk about the city of Austin there are a lot of things that get played back to you that are wonderful that we have great live music, that we have great food, that we're entrepreneurial and creative. But even nationally what gets back to you is that our permitting process has challenges, that it's hard to get through the system in Austin. There are certain values that we protect in our permitting process so there are reasons why in some instances things should be deliberate and considered. But overall I think the

[9:22:19 AM]

consensus is that this is a challenge that we need to be able to deal with. Now, I know that the manager and staff were seeing the same thing so the manager had -- even as we were discussing this issue directly with the community there was work underway at the staff level to take a look at this challenge too. And deal with it. Ultimately a consultant was hired to take a look at our permitting process. The report was -- I guess he was hired last summer, the report was finished and it was presented to the council this spring. And it identified I think 460 some-odd recommendations on things that could be done. A pretty general statement that the challenges were great with respect to permitting in the city of Austin. And that there was a lot of work for us to do and that-- there was a lot of work for us to do. Following that there was a resolution that was passed by the council which asked for a response from staff to the Zucker report, specifically asking for a forward looking analysis that would say we're going to fix the permitting issue and to define what that meant. What does fixing it mean? What does fixing the challenges mean? What were our goals at the end so that in a conversation between the council and the city manager we could agree on what those goals were by when those

[9:24:23 AM]

goals would be met so that we would know, the community would know what the goals were in part so that everybody gets directed and is on the same page to where we're heading, but also so that the goal posts don't move. So that we're real clear about where we're headed and everybody knows that. There were a couple of ways that the council could have reacted to the Zucker report. One way the council could have reacted is to have been to get into the details of the methods and means that were recommended by Mr. Zucker to meet the challenges that we have in this city with respect to permitting and to engage in a conversation with the manager about what were the right means and methods and that kind of thing. This council has opted not to do that thus far. This council has opted by its resolution to say we want to agree on what the goals are, where we end up, how we're going to measure those things. And to identify at what point in time as a community we should expect those goals to be met. Then the means and the method are up to the manager to decide and to employ so as to meet those goals. And to ask the council for whatever tools are necessary for the staff to be able to do that. So consistent with the resolution that we had earlier adopted and now there's been a lot of time to be able to analyze that report and deal with it, I've asked you to the manager to come back and give us that list of goals. And what are the goals, how

[9:26:23 AM]

are we measuring it success and over what period of time do we do that. There are there are wait times and counter times and processing times. I want to make sure we have at the end of this conversation, maybe not today, maybe next week, but it's my intent to put this on the work session agenda every week now until we can agree on what the goals are, what the objectives, how we're going to measure them and over what period of time we would expect those things to happen. My hope would be in the next two, maybe three weeks we could get that list and then everybody can know where we are and everybody can have that. Perhaps you can create a dashboard that would let people know what's happening with respect to those specific goals that we would agree on. And then they're the qualitative measures because what we hear a lot is that not only is the question one of objective standards but also qualitative standards. I think people are looking for a permitting process. When a permitting process works best and what I think the expectation of the community is is that the customer service would be very high and people come to

[9:28:25 AM]

the city expecting there is someone to help them and figure out the system and work through the system and that and that the culture might pervade the institution. So we also need a way that we can objectively measure that over time because it's such a large concern. So I'm going to turn this over to you now to brief us and the city manager to brief us. I think it's important for you to tell us whatever it is that we should know, but you want you to know that I, and I think at least several members of the panel are going to be less concerned about how you're going to get to where it is we're going and more concerned on having a real clear understanding of where it is that we are aiming to end up. Manager. >> Ott: Thank you, mayor pro tem. We do appreciate the opportunity to talk about the Zucker report and how it pertains to improvements we want to make in regard to the -- the permitting process, the development review process. This has been a long journey for the staff that quite frankly began long before the Zucker report that we commissioned some time ago. For me it began not too long after I arrived, recognizing after I arrived, recognizing inadequacy of the city's then comprehensive plan, which today we recognize as imagine Austin, which frankly is a celebrated comprehensive and vision document, not only in this community, but has been

[9:30:29 AM]

recognized and related likewise to our conversation today is codenext. And you're going to hear about that in the course of this brief presentation and recognizing the day-to-day challenges associated with the permitting process, much of which you characterize, mayor, in your opening remarks. I do want to acknowledge staff's efforts under sue's leadership and other members of my leadership team to advance improvements in that process over time, albeit very, very challenging process, as you've characterized, mayor, we all know that's the case, but along the way there have been efforts and I believe some improvements to that process, a lot yet to be done as evidenced by the recommendations contained in the -- in the Zucker report. I would -- I guess I would add that it is at least my perspective that the land development process and permitting and all the other processes associated with the developing of land in the city of Austin is complicated and I don't think it's by accident that it is complicated in the city of Austin. I think all of you perhaps around this table understand, perhaps even some of you better than I, the history of land development in Austin. And if you understand that history, then you understand why -- why we have -- why our land development code and the other things that drive that process are complicated. You'll recall a presentation from our consultants having to do with

the codenext process and looking at the existing land development code and how they say a picture speaks a thousand words, and I think they showed some images about what staff has to contend with, you know, in terms of that code and I can tell you throughout my tenure here on

[9:32:30 AM]

any given Thursday that code was being amended it's really deliberate decisions that were made about the push and pull that has a long history in Austin with respect to land development. So the presentation, our desire with respect to the permitting process and improvements and the development review process really sits on top of all of that as we seek, as you do, to make that better for all of those that live in our community and have their lives and their interests impacted by going through what admittedly has been and continues to be, you know, a very challenging process. So I am proud of the work of the folks that are seated in front of us today and the people that sit behind them that have had a great deal to do with all of the work that I just mentioned, whether it is the imagine Austin or codenext, which is currently in play and certainly our interactions with Mr. Zucker, and I suspect Rodney will note it when we talk about the several recommendations that are in that report, least half or more of them actually come directly from the city staff. And I think that that is evidence of the fact that this staff is really focused, as this council is, on improving that process. So we welcome and embrace the opportunity to engage council about this conversation of goal setting

[9:34:31 AM]

relative to how we go forward to improve what we do everyday. So with that I'm going to turn things over to sue. I think sue is going to start and then we'll hear from Rodney and Greg. >> Thank you, Mr. Manager. Mayor, thank you for your words and your guidance. I think that it is very appropriate to provide for us your words that you found when you were on the trail peopling in the community. I think that those are really important and significant comments and feedback that we have received from you, and the rest of the community, as we have moved forward to work toward making some recommendations that we hope will be very successful. I wanted to just briefly remind the council that we divided the planning and development services department into development services, which is really permitting an expectation and review and the other part of that was planning and zoning. Planning and zoning dealt with neighborhood plans and urban planning and a number of other really important issues. And the reason we did that was simply so that each one of those could concentrate on the very important things that they have to do. Zoning and zoning as you well know will deal with codenext and imagine Austin. And will work closely with development services so that those two are coordinated in an effort that really produces what we hope is great customer service, great technology, and a smooth transition into what we hope is one of the very best planning and zoning and

[9:36:32 AM]

development review services that the city could possibly have. So I'm going to turn it over to Rodney Ellis and Rodney will talk about the goals that we have put together and talk about measurements and how we move forward in a very structured way to provide what I think all of you are looking for. And we are going to give reports every 60 days and you mentioned looking at a dashboard, and we do have a dashboard to put up so the public can see the process as well as everybody else and the council can see that progress. Thank you. >> I'm Rodney Gonzalez and also with us today is Greg Guernsey with the planning and zoning department. You recall on July 10th we released the roadmap for making improvements to both departments over the next two years and we're here today to discuss a briefing

on the action plan and as well as to the end we will discover the metrics that we will be looking at, the goals, if you will, that we're attempting to achieve through the various improvements. And mayor, you mentioned this, we want to thank you for your support of all of our efforts, you have been extremely supportive. You've expressed your concern to us about the need to make improvements and we've heard you and we greatly understand and that's what this action plan intends to accomplish and we understand that you've talked about and you've heard about the development process on the campaign trail. So we want to thank you of course for prioritizing the development services and planning and zoning pieces of this as your priorities. And also, mayor and council, as you may recall on may 1st we developed a plan to eliminate the backlog which we've had a healthy backlog since the

[9:38:32 AM]

beginning of this year. And I am very, very pleased to tell you that as of Friday that the backlog has been completely eliminated in our department for commercial review, residential review and land use site plan review. And I want to applaud the staff, not just the staff behind me, but the staff in our offices that has worked nights and weekends to make that possible. And that is a huge starting point for beginning the action plan, and especially when we monitor the goals so that way we have a good base to start from. So the backlog that we talked about in may has been completely eliminated. >> Houston: I think we need to give I applause too. [Applause]. >> Mayor Adler: The three areas was commercial review, residential review and -- >> Land use site plan review. And the dashboards that we mentioned that we've been recently implementing have helped us tremendously in doing that. It's helped us with the work load distribution. It's able to help us to pinpoint where the reviews are in terms of late reviews. And we've been able to use it successfully. That's a great piece of technology that we've implemented. And before I begin I want to talk about what the city manager did, which is linking the action plan to previous efforts. As you recall, the imagine Austin comprehensive plan replaced a 30-year old citywide comprehensive plan, 30 years old. That effort was initiated by the city manager upon his arrival and it is the beacon that will guide Austin's development well into the future. Subsequent to the imagine Austin plan, as the city manager had mentioned, was the optics analysis of land development code and it supported specifically what we suspected and it confirmed that the code is overly complex, it's in effective in some areas, and the result of the code, as we mentioned on any given Thursday, the code has been amended 180 times since 1984. 180 times the code has been amended. Every time it gets amended

[9:40:34 AM]

it involves the retraining of our staff and you end up in some cases with inconsistent reduce because of the number of times that the code has been amended. So subsequently we're currently underway to amend the code and that project is called codenext and that rewrite will impact some of the changes that we're talking about that we're talking about today. Also in 2013 we recognized that there were issues in the previous planning, development and review department or planning and development review department and we convened 24 stakeholders to talk to us to give us feedback on what type of improvements needed to be made and collaboratively we developed 61 initiatives for improvement. One of those initiatives from 2013 was to hire an external consultant to further look into the department and give us a detailed analysis of additional improvements that need to be made. L are R. The city manager brought in that he he external consultant and they have provided what we need and that is the basis for our action plan. So we'll review that Zucker analysis. As well we'll get into the specific action plan goals that we've delivered to council and we'll talk about the key areas of focus for these improvements we'll talk about the measurable results that we'll be using in those key focus areas.

I won't spend too much time on slide 2. This is a comprehensive review of the Zucker analysis and points I want to make is that there are seven priority areas that Mr. Zucker delineated in his report. Within each of the priority areas are the different recommendations by priority area. Not every recommendation requires funding. I may be shouting a little bit too much. So there are 54 recommendations of the 462 that require funding. The other recommendations deal with policy and processes and procedures. And as the city manager

[9:42:35 AM]

pointed out, of the 462 recommendations, one-half of those came from employees. We have a vested interest in ensuring that our processes meet the expectations of our customers. Also, to point out, Mr. Zucker believes that the recommendations should be implemented over a two-year period and we agree with him on that and our action plan is over a two-year period. So from the customer and employee survey results and the 760 page analysis of the Zucker report, we've identified the key areas that will require improvements. Those areas include reducing the wait time, ensuring quality reduce, providing exceptional customer service, implementing effective use the current technology, coordinating our reduce with all departments and investing in our employees, which are our greatest assets for getting the job done. In the fiscal year 15-16 budget we've requested a number of staff positions based on the Zucker report and if the council is able to fulfill those requests we'll be able to move forward on many of these improvements. Customer service is a major performance area where we will be making many, many improvements. One of the customer feedback was that customers didn't believe that staff was responding in an appropriate amount of time to phone calls. There was talk about developing a policy with regard to phone calls. We believe that the matter is one of training as well as setting the expectation for phone calls. Currently there is a city administrative bulletin that requires that phone calls be returned the same day or within 24 hours. We're going to remind our staff of that specific city administrative bulletin during our customer service training and we'll ensure that that expectation is set in every employee's performance strategy expectation and we're going to do that as of October 2015.

[9:44:36 AM]

I did mention training. One of the customer feedback areas was that we do have inconsistent reduce. That some of our reviewers don't catch issues until the second or third review. And sometimes issues aren't caught until the field inspection. We believe that that's a training issue and so we're going to work to put together training curriculum for our training reviewers and inspectors so they have the training at the same time, how to apply the code, and the goal will be to get to a consistent review and consistent inspection. We're also going to be implementing a citywide customer service training and all of our employees will be going through that twice a year and that will begin in October of this year. And our department does not have a policy for formally supporting certifications and licenses. One of the recommendations that we have is to start supporting that. We believe that our staff should have the advanced skills when they're going through the reduce and when they're going through the inspections and we are proposing funding for that and that will be implemented December of this year. Additionally I don't have to tell you this, but Austin has experienced a high volume of development activity over the last five years. And we've had peaks in work load activity. We intend to use contracts to help with some of that peak load rather than adding too many permanent staff for peak workloads. So what we plan to do is use contracts beginning the next fiscal year to shift some of that work load over to contracts. Looking at our partner reduce, there are 12 other city departments that are involved in the development review process. Mr. Zucker did not go into any great detail with regard to the partner reduce, however he did recommend that a second analysis be conducted to look into how we

interrelate with our departments. So on August 20th we'll bring forward for council consideration a contract with Mr. Zucker to bring him back to look at our specific -- our interrelationship with the

[9:46:36 AM]

12 other departments. We're intending to streamline our processes that we have amongst our departments and that way our customers understand and they have a streamlined process as well. The other area of customer feedback was the lack of community engagement. Additionally we don't have the resources to update and to refresh our handouts and our informational material to our customers. Subsequently our information -- our customers don't find that the information that we provide is useful for them so what we are proposing is the staff resource specifically geared towards community engagement that will help us to keep our information updated, that will help us deliver professional handouts and that will help us develop an engagement strategy for customers and for stakeholders. Additionally our other method of outreach and engagement is our website. Currently we don't have the dedicated resources to maintain our website. And I've personally heard the stories of other organizations in the city who have to develop the information on their website because our website doesn't have that. And so we're proposing the -- a specific dedicated resource to maintaining our website because that is a valuable touch point for us and our customers. >> Kitchen: If this is an appropriate place to ask a question, I wanted to ask a question on the community engagement. I realize I may be confused now. So do the neighbor liaisons play any role in this process or are they over more on zoning issues as opposed to permitting kinds of things? >> Greg gun any, neighborhood planning department. They have two neighborhood liaisons that work throughout the city, not just on issues that deal with zoning and planning issues, but also on development as far as site

[9:48:37 AM]

plan, subdivisions, building permits. So they are instrumental as part of the developmental process to make sure that neighborhood organizations are acquainted with how the process works. They certainly will work with an individual if they call, but their main purpose is in orientation is in working with organizations. But they are fundamental to the development process and they do get involved on cases where they may be more high profile and neighborhood organizations don't know how to interact with the city. >> Kitchen: Okay. We can talk about this further. My thought is simply that perhaps some additional support in that arena would be helpful also. >> I do want to make a distinction between the community liaisons and neighborhood liaisons we're talking about here. Those neighborhood liaisons do engage with the neighborhood associations and what I'm talking about here is getting the staff and planning review and inspections engaged with our stakeholder organizations, folks like the Austin contractors and engineers association, folks like the real estate council of Austin, folks like the home builders association. Myself, my team, my staff should be engaged with all of those stakeholder organizations and we need a plan, a strategy, if you will, to do that. >> Tovo: Since the subject of the neighborhood liaisons came up, as you mentioned we have two of those positions staffed and funded. As I recall, there are -- there's another one or two fte's in the budget, but those positions have not been ever funded. Are there any proposals -- I haven't had an opportunity to check in this year's proposed budget to see whether the city manager has proposed filling those currently vacant other neighborhood liaison positions. >> Mayor pro tem, I don't believe those fte's are still in the department. They had gone unfunded I think for five years or

[9:50:37 AM]

more, and I don't believe that they're in my budget anymore as unfunded positions, but I will follow up with a response. >> Tovo: I will check too. I believe there were there -- if they've been removed I would be very surprised because I certainly hear from the community and interest in seeing those funded. And so I've kept my eye to see that they're in the budget each year, but unfunded. Are you suggesting that they may have been removed in this upcoming budget or they may have been removed in previous budgets? >> I believe it was in a previous budget. I'll follow up with you and the other offices. >> Tovo: Great. But in any case it sounds like the answer to the question whether or not it's proposed to fill those is no. Okay, thanks. >> Zimmerman: Point of order. Could we give staff another 15 minutes to finish up and then hold the questions until they get done? Could they be done in 10 minutes or so. >> Yes, sir, thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Go ahead, Rodney. >> Mayor, as he pointed out we do have a complicated development process as the city manager has pointed out. A lot of that is rooted in the city's land development code. It's complicated for folks who come in for folks who use our services or don't use our services often so we're proposing the biz right solution which is an interactive portal that we'll be developing in concert with [indiscernible]. It will be online and allow the customers to share circumstances and forms so that they're learning from each other as well as from us. We've talked about some of the technology improvements that we've implemented. One of those which is very important for our monitoring is customer wait time

[9:52:38 AM]

monitoring software and we've implemented that at the permit center so when our customers come in they can check in and they can be free to leave the building and be either messaged via text or email when they are fifth in line to allow them to conduct their business and then come back and transact their transaction. We have also implemented as we've talked about the dashboards, which are work load monitoring software and they've been helping to eliminate the backlog. And recently we implemented a value centralized phone number and routing system so that way our customers have one phone number to call. With regard to permitting and faxes we currently process on average 73 faxes for trade permits per day. Faxes, I don't have to tell you this, are outdated technology. And we're going to be automating our fax trade permits. That system will be online in January 2016, there by allowing our permit specialists more time to transact with walk-in customers. As well as in March of this year we've for the next year put trade permits online. We'll be expanding the number of trade permits that can be paid for online there by eliminating the need for customers to come to the permit center. They can transact that business online as well and we will complete that by January as well. Another large component of our technology improvements is in electronic plan review. It's not unusual for our customers to bring huge rolls of development plans to the permit center. Not just in one copy, but multiple copies. Electronic plan review will completely eliminate that. Our customers can submit those plans electronically and they get distributed to our reviewers simultaneously so our reviewers can comment and review those plans simultaneously. So we're talking about eliminating the cost of customers in terms of printing those plans as well as the cost of their time bringing those plans to the one Texas center. We've covered the

[9:54:39 AM]

dashboards. As sue had mentioned we'll be wrapping up the implementation by December of this year. Another part of that process will be to bring some of the dashboards to the community. We'll be posting that information online so the customers can track our measures as well. With regard to upgrading the Amanda system which stands for application management and data application. Ctm manages the Amanda software for us and we are looking to upgrade it it to version six and that will be by December

of this year. Mr. Zucker did point out the Amanda system in his analysis and in that it would be counterproductive to move away to another enterprise system at this time. His recommendation was to continue with our upgrades for the foreseeable future for at least the next three to five years so we can take advantage of the features and functions available through the Amanda system. Ctm will install another Amanda functions, one is some excel databases that we use to track fiscal surety and underground storage tanks. That will be completed by December of this year. Additionally we have some fee and security configuration issues that date back to the original installation of Amanda and ctm will be installing those configurations by December of this year. One of the other uses of technology is shifting our field inspectors from laptops to tablets. The laptops are not as convenient to take on to the job site, especially if there's no tables to put the laptops on. And the advent of tablet technology makes those -- makes tablets a lower cost alternative than laptops and it makes them easier to use on the job site and we'll be connecting those tablets to the Amanda system. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool, did you have a question? >> Two quick questions for Mr. Gonzalez? One is the costs for these

[9:56:40 AM]

items that you have gone over, so far technology and the customer service and staffing. Are those Numbers already in the city manager's budget? There was a 2.8-million-dollar price tag on the Zucker report spots response. >> Yes, there are, there are in our budget as well as ctm's capital budget for the Amanda upgrade. >> Pool: The other side of this question and you can bring this information later, is what items are left on the table? I think his number was four million and whether that was expected to be implemented in the first year or not, just some additional information on that. You don't have to do it now. I think my staff may have submitted that as a Q and a. And then the other question I have as you're going through talking about Amanda and the dashboard and plan review and software in general, what is the ctm's or the city's standard software update schedule? For example, when was the last time we updated Amanda and do we do these regularly as upgrades and updates come available? >> We have Steve Elkins here I believe from ctm and Steve will answer that question. >> Pool: Thank you. Here -- >> Mayor, council, Steve Elkins, the cio, city of Austin. So as far as the upgrade schedule, it's really based on the vendor, when the vendor has an application upgrade for these enterprise solutions. So system was put in place, I think, in 2004, 2005. We've gone through several upgrades. I want to say, typically, it's every two to three years that an upgrade -- major upgrade occurs. Annually there's probably some bug fix upgrade that's happen so we've -- ctm has been doing some of the code fixing ourselves internally, working with the vendor. This -- Rodney had mentioned the Amanda 6, that's considered a major upgrade,

[9:58:42 AM]

and csdc, the owners of Amanda, they're actually working on the next major upgrade, which would be Amanda 7. So we're staying pretty current, every couple years, doing major upgrades to our enterprise solutions. >> Pool: And that's as the vendor updates and upgrades as well. >> As the vendor upgrades as well. >> Pool: That's great. Is that also the case for the regular applications that we use throughout the city, for example, the Microsoft suite? Do we get the automatic upgrades? Is that on a standard upgrade schedule as well? >> Some of that depends. If we're talking about, like, Microsoft windows, for example, you hear they're advertising windows ten coming out. We're on windows 7 and that's because a lot of our applications are dependent upon our -- configured to work with windows 7, not 8 yet. So if we work to upgrade before the other systems that depend on the systems are upgraded, then we would break a lot of the systems. So we have to make sure everything is pretty much in line before we do major upgrades. >> Pool: Okay. >> So yes, but it depends if it's right for us as a city. >> Pool: Did Microsoft skip

9? >> There's -- yeah, I don't believe there was a 9. >> Pool: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Pool: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: All right. Let's go ahead, work your way through the presentation. We still have this presentation and we have all the pulled items that we have on our agenda and it's already 10:00. >> Gallo: I was going to wait to ask questions. As we have heard from other departments like code and housing, that there's a difficulty or maybe not even able to connect to Amanda to be able to share the information across the board, is that issue going to be addressed in the Amanda issues that you're talking about here? Or is that part of what you're looking for the newest Zucker

[10:00:43 AM]

report -- or the newest Zucker contract to address, as far as all of the communications from all of the departments being on the same system so that each department can access the Amanda information? >> Sure. I want to answer that question for you. You may recall that on May 1, with the plan to address the backlog, that at that time we had announced that the law department and Austin water utility would be joining on to the Amanda system. We don't have to wait for Mr. Zucker's second analysis and we don't have to wait for an upgrade to make that happen. And, also, recently the Austin music industry is you consensus, one of the comments there was that the music office is not connected to the Amanda system as well so we've reached out to the music office to get them connected to Amanda as well. >> Gallo: What about code and housing? Those two departments? >> My understanding, I believe, is that code is connected. With regard to housing I'm not sure, but the system is open to other departments to join on board because we do want to make sure that the information gets shared across all departments. >> Gallo: So I guess what I'm hearing, then, it's up to the individual departments to bring their department up to being able to facilitate the system? >> It is. So in that regard, bringing back Mr. Zucker, he'll highlight some of the recommendations as far as which departments really should also be on Amanda that aren't currently on Amanda. >> Gallo: Okay, thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Please proceed. >> Okay. Thank you. Second to last piece is we are proposing a dedicated resource to bring a lot of these online resources in an expedient manner. Err. As well our current model requiring our models to come to one Texas center is an old model. We're looking to go truly be engaged with the community and stakeholders and bring our services out into the community, and we're proposing a remote access application for that as well. I won't go through this next slide in detail, in the

[10:02:45 AM]

interest of time. Mr. Zucker did point out that our facilities are inadequate for our customers, our wait areas just aren't large enough to accommodate the volumes of customers that we receive on a daily basis. And our work areas are improperly configured for our employees. So between beginning of the fiscal year October and through March 2016 we'll be making a series of facility improvements. A lot of these are one-time funding allocations requested in the fiscal year 15-16 budget. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> We do have an action -- our action plan does cover every single division in both departments. As I mentioned we won't go through the specific detail for each division, but it is delineated in our action plan. Mayor, council, shifting over to the metrics we'll be looking at with regard to looking at metro results, we know that you and the public are expecting specific performance improvements as a result of the action plan. And over the next three slides I'll be covering 18 of the key performance metrics that we'll be using. We do use a lot more metrics than what is presented to you, and that was recognized as a strength by the Zucker analysis. Some of the key wait time metrics that we'll be looking at are zoning and site plan consultation, site and subdivision application intake, commercial plan review. So specifically for zoning and site plan consultation, we're proposing an additional planner, which will take our wait times from 35 minutes down to 25 minutes. And site and subdivision application intakers we're

proposing additional customer service representative which would take the intake days down from seven to two days. We're proposing to add two additional planners our land use review, which would bring our on-time reviews from 60% to 90%. We're proposing an additional reviewer. Currently we only have one. That would take that consultation wait time from 28 minutes down to 19 minutes.

[10:04:45 AM]

We're also proposing four additional engineer associates in our commercial plan review division. That would increase our on-time reviews from a low of 35% to 90%. As I mentioned earlier, we're going to shift all of those 73 faxes we receive every day to online, decreasing the wait time from two days to seven days. That service will be available 24/7 for all of our customers. And with regard to our call center, we're proposing to add two additional customer call center representatives that would take our answer rate from 47% to 75% and we're currently in the -- in a discussion with 311 to take that answer rate all the way up to 100%. Looking at some of the qualitative measurements, which the mayor had mentioned, and these are subjective and the way they were measured by Mr. Zilker was through surveys. We're proposing both anecdotal and scientific surveys of our customers. In terms of surviving surveys we're looking to hire etc institute, the not that I remember does the city's annual citizen survey, as well as we're looking at doing constant and continuous anecdotal surveys either online or when we transact with our customers in the field. Some of those survey questions include did the staff apply codes and policies in a fair and practical manner, did we provide option that's were available? And did the customer understand the development review process? Those are very good qualitative measures that will give us a guide as to whether or not we were making significant improvements in those areas. With regard to training and certification and market pay, we'll be surveying our employees on the effectiveness of our training program to make sure that we are targeting those areas that they lack the training in. We'll be monitoring employee retention rates, which were identified in the Zucker analysis, as being somewhat high, to see if our

[10:06:46 AM]

certification support, as well as the market pay for certain segments, has taken hold. Additionally, with regard to providing exceptional customer service, which is one of our primary goals for these improvements, some of the survey questions will be did the department provide good customer service? And were our reviews completed on the date that was promised, and was staff easily accessible when I needed access in resolving problems? On the technology front, which is one of the key components of our improvement areas, we're going to be looking at the percent of all available online transactions that can be conducted online. We're going to be looking at whether or not we are using the latest software version, because that's very important to us. And the degree or the percent of technology solutions. Mayor, council, I'm going to move this over to Greg Guernsey, who will cover the planning and zoning department. >> Gallo: Mayor, can I ask one quick question? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Gallo: So, I think you would have a lot of customer certification if we can quickly get to the online permitting and payment online. I'm trying to understand why that would take a file six months to implement? Why that can't be something done more quickly than that. >> Well, we're currently working on it. Steven can help me with regard to the time line but our staff is focused on it. Part of it is also updating the Amanda system to version 6 and that way we can also develop the online technology, but we fully anticipate it being completed by January. >> So I think what Rodney said is correct. We're doing an upgrade which is going to enable some of the other functionality. When we but the together our time line, we try to put together a time line that gives us some flexibility in case things -- unforeseen things happen. It could happen sooner. The implementation, as you're asking. But right now, we're putting a --

instead of being aggressive, we're putting together a conservative time line. So we're -- as we're working on these -- we're working on

[10:08:49 AM]

these as aggressively as we can, along with other initiatives that we're taking on. >> Gallo: Okay. Thank you. >> Councilmember, I might also add that there are improvements that we've got underway to reduce the wait time at the permit center. We've been working on adding more services to what we call our express lane and we did that in the last squeak that's helped us to reduce -- last week and that's helped us. Which allows our staff to focus on fax permits and get them out sooner. We're doing other things in the interim before bringing those services online as well. >> Gallo: I think as we talk about mobility and traffic and parking and pulling people downtown to make them do the permits and also pay for things, you know, that's really an archaic process and customer service and having express lanes are great, but if we could really focus on enabling people to purchase from the city the way people purchase from every business everywhere, I think it would add a great, substantial improvement to our customer service. >> Thank you. We agree. >> Mayor Adler: I have a lot of questions but I'm going to hold off asking those until you have a chance to complete the presentation. >> Thank you, mayor, council. Greg Guernsey, planning and zoning department. Thank you, again, for having us here to give you this briefing. I'm going to cover three areas within the department, and talk about seven of the major recommendations that Zucker provided to us. The first area I'm going to talk about are planning and urban design area. Recommendations and there's concerns been raised about updating existing plans, neighbor plans, so by January of next year, we're going to create a process, create a matrix and it will be a weighted matrix, taking input from citizens and other city departments, to prioritize our resources. So we can effectively use them to update these plans.

[10:10:49 AM]

Related to that, there's an emphasis that recommendation came back from Mr. Zucker about imagine Austin. And I'm encouraged by that and our matrix will be weighted for those areas, those centers and corridors that are identified in imagine Austin. Another item that Mr. Zucker pointed out was about our neighborhood boundaries and our neighborhood planning areas, contact teams. We have a vast number of neighborhood organizations that we have in the city, close to 300 or 400 neighborhood organizations and contact teams and how that he work and interact. We're going to talk to other cities and see what some of the best practices are and then come back to you probably with some recommendations in March about how we can possibly make some improvements and make it easier for citizens to interact with you and us and our development process. The current planning area, a lot of Mr. Zucker's recommendations really talked about some internal controls, creating policy and procedure manuals. Our zoning manual is out of date, needs to be updated so we're going to update that by January. And then actually create some additional manuals that deal with our annexation process, extort preservation and the code amendment process. We'll be tying this to codenext, certainly, as we talk about code amendments and these different manuals. Another key component that Rodney mentioned, to make sure that our process is predictable and consistent. Mayor, you mentioned helpful. And really this really is helpful also to staff and to our customers about doing training, both within my department, but also with other departments, such as development service departments. So we're all in lockstep. We're all talking the same line. When a site planner makes a comment, it will be the same comment a zoning planner might

[10:12:50 AM]

make down to the building permit process. Finally, the jewel that's codenext. One of the items that Mr. Zucker pointed out was that our zoning code amendment coordinator was not part of the codenext you believe team. Well, he is now. In fact we've created a core team earlier this year. Council, you had some interest in making sure that the environmental community, landscape architects and what not are included. They are members of our watershed protection department now that are part of that, as well as Austin transportation, our public works department. They're all members of that core team. Very exciting part is applying the mapping of our new code. I'm having -- having electronic codes. The public and staff can use it easier, there's more certainty when customers contact us. The first step is in our budget proposed at phase one, about \$40,000, that's going to be dedicated to the electronic code. I'll be coming back next year in fiscal '17 to really probably ask for more funding to finalize that. But this is fundamentally to make Rodi's job a lot easier, my job and everybody's sanity because if you can find the answers quickly and that everybody is seeing the same answer simultaneously, we'll all sleep better at night. So with that, that concludes the presentations, and we're ready for questions or we can answer questions later if you want to save them and come back another day. >> Mayor Adler: Let me go ahead and begin with some questions. And then we'll pass it around. It's great to hear about the catching up on the backlog. And that was a goal that you had set, the council -- and that resolution had broken it up into backlog and long-term and had set some hopes or

[10:14:51 AM]

expectations with respect to when that would be done. You responded in the review to that, and hit those marks early. So that's great that that has happened. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: With respect to the more permanent things that are going, I hear that a lot of the Zucker recommendations, some of which came from city staff, are things you're adopting, which is good. I just want to be clear, from where I'm sitting, whether you adopt all of the Zucker recommendations or none of the Zucker recommendations I don't care because ultimately that's a call I think that you make and the manager makes. What I'm real concerned about are what the results are at the end. So adopt the Zucker recommendations you think are worth adopting, don't adopt the ones you don't think are worth adopting but we're all pointing toward what those goals are at the end of the process, I think. I like that when you identify the performance measures that you have in this -- and I don't know if it's possible to reduce to one document just what the goals are that we're trying to shoot for, but I think that would be helpful so that people are not having to extract the goals from different sections or different places and different reports. But so that we could have one document that says these are the goals that we intend to meet. If there's a way to take those goals and to give us a feel for what they look like over time, that would be helpful. So in an area you might have a six-month goal, 3h month goal, six month, nine month, 12 month goal, that would be helpful. There's some frustration, I would imagine, already, with having a goal that's two years away, as expressed by councilmember Gallo, because

[10:16:52 AM]

by that you're not intending to say that people aren't going to be able to see changes well before two years. But I think if we could set those in terms of what the goals are so that people know and understand that we're not going to hit the ultimate goal in two years, but in six months we -- this is where we intend to be so that people can see that and follow that. As I go through the presentation this morning, as we get to the goals that you have, which are beginning, I think, on page 8 of the report, there's a real specific objective goals, which I think are good. If we could know by when or what time or how that progresses on those things on number 8, that would be good. You said that there were other

end product goals that you're also going to be measuring or taking a look at. Look at. If you could put those in one document, one place, I think that would be really helpful, in part because I think it will best explain to the community what the ultimate vision looks like. If it's all in one place and set out that way, I think that would be helpful. On the customer survey section on page 9, we talk about anecdotal and both anecdotal and scientific. I'm less concerned personally with the anecdotal information than scientific. Which is not to say the anecdotal is not important. I think that's a really good tool for you and the manager and your office in terms of being able to assess what you're doing or not doing, but what I'm really hopeful is we'll be able to have something that measures the consumer or customer experience in a way that is objective enough so that we can benchmark it now. So I think that the scientific

[10:18:56 AM]

poll you do, I would -- I hope it's the intent to do one as quickly as you can develop the proposal so that we have a baseline that we can take a look at. And then we can repeat that every four months, say, so that we can see what's happening with respect to a repeatable and replicatable working model. So if you could come back to us with that because contained in that protocol will be embedded the performance measures that we're trying to hit. So if you could bring that back to us before you launch that poll so that we make sure that we're all on the same page with respect to what it is that we're measuring, to make sure that that -- from an ultimate end goal purpose we're interested in hitting the same -- the same mark. >> Mayor, if I may. >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> I guess I'm not quite sure I understand what you just said to me, to be honest. Can you say it again for me, perhaps another way? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. There are certain -- when you're measuring something that is qualitative, you're asking people about the experience that they had. And the experiences that you're going to be trying to measure then become where you set your priorities, where you spend your resources or your training because you're trying to hit marks. I want to make sure that the marks that you're trying to hit are the same ones that we, in our roles as kind of the community voices here, is reflective of what it is that the community wants to see hit. There are, in the Zucker report, a statement in the community section as to concern things which I guess -- certain things which I guess could also be characterized in terms of, like, value responses, the customer experience. I would imagine what you're

[10:20:57 AM]

going to be doing, as you develop the protocol with the poll person, is to include things like out of the Zucker report and table 3, they had talked about one of the things were that people shouldn't feel like submissions are being nitpicked, that things are being rejected if they fail to cross a T or dot an I and they have to go back to the beginning of the line, that we're going to be doing things that focus more on the substantive purpose. There are lots of different kinds of qualitative measures that you're going to pick. My point is that of the 150 that you could pick and measure, I want to make sure that the ones that you actually pick and that you put in your poll are the ones that we say, hey, ed, that's ones we think are important. >> I guess I'm trying to recycle that with your desire to keep council's -- perspective elevated to the goal level. It seems to me that those things that we pick, given that we're going to be committed to achieving the goals that we all agree on, at the left that you're talking about, the things that we pick, I hope, would roll up into that and be congruent with the goals that are agreed to between -- at the table today. So that just strikes me as at a more granular level than what I thought I heard you say at the outset. >> Mayor Adler: Let's keep talking for a second because this is something that I want to make sure that we end up on the same page here. There are some goals that we can set that we all agree on that are end goals, that are clear. The ones that you've laid out in -- some of the ones that

you've picked are the wait time goes from 35 minutes to 25 minutes. Site plan subdivision application goes from seven days to two days. That's an objective measure that you're going to be able to measure and if we all agree that that's how ultimately we're determining success, that's very clear. >> I think Rodney characterized those as

[10:22:57 AM]

metrics. Again, you know, it's the vocabulary that we're using when we talk about goals and we talk about metrics and measures and different things like that. And so, again, it's the source of my question, trying to reconcile what you're talking about now with the preamble of your comments about elevated conversation, not wanting to get into the ways and means. >> Mayor Adler: Don't want to -- >> And to establish a 70 goals, if you will, that then we would be able to define the ways and means in terms of how we're going to accomplish that. Key metrics, as Rodney talked about in this section of the presentation, strikes me as a first-level attempt at responding to goals, which frankly are alluded to earlier in the presentation, if I'm not mistaken. Is that correct, Rodney? >> They are. The goals that we talked about, overall arcing goals, are reduced wait time, and I'll get to that slide if you don't mind, ensuring quality reviews, providing exceptional customer service, implementing current technology, coordinating reviews and investing in employees. Those are the overall performance goals we attempted to meet. >> Mayor Adler: I understand that. What I have a problem with and I don't think gets us to where we needing to is to say those are our six goals because there's not enough detail for me to be able to, at the end of six months or a year or year and a half, I don't want to debate between us whether or not we've reduced wait times when some people will think in good faith what happened was sufficient reduction in wait times and the other part of the community says, no, no, that didn't get anywhere near where we needed to be. So that we're not having that debate at the end of the process, I wanted to have an agreement now as to what is the appropriate level reduction and wait time. Now, the wait time -- >> So you do have a conversation, though, that's at a level lower than goal setting, then. That's really what you're saying. >> Mayor Adler: Well, in my mind, that is the goal.

[10:24:59 AM]

>> I would consider it an objective, but -- okay. But, again, it's the terminology. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> I guess. Goal setting is one thing. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Right? You know, the objectives, the ways and means that how you measure that underneath. >> Mayor Adler: How you reduce the wait time I don't want to get into. But the fact that you reduce it from seven to two days is something that's fair game for council. How do you that is an operational issue I don't think we should get involved in. But if the expectation of getting down to two days is unrealistic, then you need to say that so that the community isn't expecting it to get there but if it is realistic, then the community needs to know that at the end of the some date or some process, it will have gotten down to two days. >> All right. I'm happy offensive us to have that conversation with you. I just want clarity on -- >> Mayor Adler: That's okay. >> - When we say goals and these other things, what we're talking about are that we recognize the distinction between them because they are distinct and at that lower level that, it is appropriate conversation for us to have, but I think ultimately, in terms of what we can or cannot do, what we can or cannot achieve, I'm going to really rely on the staff because at the end of the day they're in the best position to tell us whether or not those things are realistic from an achievement standpoint or not. >> Mayor Adler: They have the expertise and I welcome that in today conversation as well as next discuss the Tuesday after that. Then we will have -- after the council has gotten staff's advice and you've gotten the staff's advice, then at the very end, you and the council will sit down and pick the goals that we all feel haven't gotten the advice from staff, what are the reasonable goals over what period of time. And

that would be -- and I say goals, but I guess I mean both goals and objectives.

[10:27:00 AM]

>> Metrics. >> Mayor Adler: Metrics,. >> Zimmerman: Metrics irks how about that. >> Mayor Adler: So we agree on what those metrics are. >> Zimmerman: Objective metrics. >> Mayor Adler: Then I was saying I also think with respect to metrics, it's hard for me to get a good metric from an anecdotal measurement of a qualitative assessment so that's why I was saying that we -- so the question that I asked that I think precipitated this was, I want to know what the metrics are that will be the goals -- what the metrics are that we will use, the qualitative assessments as well, so that when we're developing the protocol with the questions as to how do we measure good customer service, are we measuring it in terms of people don't feel that they're being nitpicked or that when they come in they're greeted by somebody who is there to help them achieve what it is that they wanted to achieve? To help them negotiate the system, negotiate the paths in a successful way, as opposed to the opposite of that, I guess would be like playing a game of go fish? You know, if you say the right words you can proceed, if you don't you can't proceed. And it's up to you to kind of figure out why it was you weren't able to proceed. All those things are things that you can't measure objectively, that you can measure subjectively, but it's important for us to develop this tool with the pollster, and all I was saying was is the -- the metrics out of the qualitative deal are things that we need to also agree on the same way we agree on the metrics in the quantitative areas. So as I look at that, it's getting a better feel for the metrics. If we could have those metrics all in one place, if we could have time lines for those metrics, if we could have time posts, you know, every six months this is where that metric is anticipated to be so people don't feel like nothing is going to happen for two

[10:29:01 AM]

years, that would be helpful for me. And if you could develop that document and get it back to us, you know, before next Tuesday -- I think you already have that. It's just a question of extracting it and putting it in one place. But if you could get that back to us, then next Tuesday at the work session, having looked at that ahead of time, we could look at that, the manager could look at that. What I'm trying to do is get to a place as quickly as we can where we've agreed on what the metrics are and then you guys, without us interfering operationally, you just go achieve those metrics. Councilmember Garza. >> Gallo: Thank you for bringing that up. I think that's an important piece of this point also, I think we have a huge community of stakeholders that could probably tell all of us better than anyone elsewhere the problems are and what they think reasonable goals would be. So I'm talking about rica, the builders, the board of realtors, all of those entities. So could you share with us? Because I think their voices are also important to be heard within this process of determining goals and reasonable expectations because I think those will be the voices that I think we hear when that level of expectation has not been met. So it seems like pulling them into the conversation, as do you that -- >> Mayor Adler: There's two ways -- >> Gallo: So I was just curious what staff is thinking, and I want to just make sure that they are thinking a process that brings those groups into the discussion. >> If I could -- thank you, councilmember. If I could, I may have not elaborated on this in my presentation, but there's a 760 page analysis that we've been using. There's a lot of stakeholder feedback from rica, hba, from tons of neighborhood associations. They not only completed surveys with yes or no, one, two, three, four, they gave us written responses as well and appropriate feedback. These performance goals that we're talking about, that's

[10:31:03 AM]

the synthesized analysis that we've done in going through that 760-page document, and so the comments that they've given us are applicable to wait time, to the quality reviews, to the nitpicking, to the use of technology, to investment employees. So I don't want to dismiss that Mr. Zucker did a great job in reaching out to those stakeholders. He held 16 stakeholder forums, interviewed the chairs of nine boards and commissions, met with -- bless you -- 274 employees. And so he did that over a course of nine months, which he really put some Ernest time into doing. And to -- I think we've got that information before us, and that's what we've been using as the guidepost to develop these goals. >> In addition to that, councilmember, previous to that, the 20 some odd individuals that Rodney talked about, where we had meetings with individuals and collectively, we had two kind of half day, maybe a little bit longer, half-day sessions with feedback from those individuals from those communities. The engineers from rica, from home builders association, from the contractors association. So over the past two and a half to three years, we have been gathering that information. It has been consistent, and so I think we do have a real good, solid foundation of where they're coming from. And I would agree with Rodney, that when Zucker went out, he did not hear anything different than what we have heard. He just probably heard it more forcefully, but -- and in many different ways. But we have incorporated all of that. So I feel very comfortable that we have listened for a number of years, unfortunately, and not made as much headway as we would like to. >> Gallo: And that's really good to hear that, and I appreciate the time and effort it's taken to do that for both

[10:33:03 AM]

sides, for all the parties. But I guess my concern is I want to make sure that that communication and process with the stakeholders will continue as you establish the metrics for determining whether we've reached the goal because I think the metrics that they have in their mind for being successful is real important for us to understand and be part of our process in the metrics. So that's just my -- my comment is to continue it forward and to make sure that they're part of the metric conversation also. >> I would agree with that. I also think that one of the things that I'd like to point out, that this is a two-year process. When we are asking for ftes to implement some of these changes, the hiring process will take us a while, and I know that the public already has this great anticipation that we are going to improve absolutely immediately. And I want to lay out there that we are going to do everything within the time frame that we have said we have. But I think it's going to be an incremental change in some areas. I hope in customer service it's an immediate change. I think some of the timing deals with how quickly we can get staff aboard. So those are the things that we recognize are the difficulties as we move through this process. And as I said from the beginning, that we will be doing 60-day reports initially so that everybody, both the public and the council will know what we're doing and how we're doing it. >> Mayor Adler: And by suggesting that we bring it back next week and move through it, I don't want to push -- and I'm not asking the council to move more quickly than the council can. So when the metrics drafts come back and we post those for the public to take a look at, we'll be able to get feedback from neighborhoods and from all the different stakeholders to us because there's going to be a metric proposal that is very publicly proposed so we can all comment on it. If we're not ready to finalize

[10:35:05 AM]

that by next Tuesday, by all means, we don't have to. But what I do want to avoid is a two-month metric-setting process that goes back out into a -- I hope -- my hope is that we'll be able to handle this, get it out to the public, get that kind of feedback and decide what those metrics are and in part, sue, because you're right, there's certain things that are going to be able to happen quickly and other things

that aren't. I want us to have a metric that lays that out so that no one can have an unrealistic expectation, I thought you would have gotten down to two days by now. Well, no, that was the benchmark that was here. So I think part of this process is going to make sure that we're all on the same page and all knowledgeable. Ms. Kitchen. >> Kitchen: I just want to concur with everything said so far in terms of setting metrics and also having the time to get feedback from constituents on those metrics. I think that will be very helpful. I have a different question that's on page 12 that really relates to the action step related to the weighted metrics to prioritize planning areas. So I just want to understand. A couple of things. I would assume -- or I guess I should ask, if this process is going to be coordinated with codenext, and I'm curious about the time line, why we're talking about January 2016 as opposed to more immediately. My guess is that, you know, if you need to prioritize -- if you need to align it with what's happening with codenext that would make sense. Also, I just wanted to make sure that this item relates to not only updating existing neighborhood plans, but establishing planning areas for parts of the city that have not -- that have -- that do not have neighborhood plans. I mean, this goes back to the whole question of how we

[10:37:07 AM]

prioritize what neighborhoods have access to resources to create a neighborhood plan and how -- and how that dovetails with what's happening with codenext. You know, in the past there's been a -- an approach to prioritizing planning areas that made sense. I just think we need to rethink them, and I think that's what you're talking about here. So I know that I've had feedback from some constituents in the far south, for example, that are interested in having the opportunity to have a neighborhood plan and in years past that's not been possible just because of the way we've focused planning areas in the more central core. So that's a lot said, but I think -- do you understand the questions that I'm asking? >> Yes, councilmember. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> I think it would take me a while to probably go through all of it generic we can talk about it offline if you need to. >> I'll certainly follow up with you and getting you a response and we can share that with the other council offices. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, Ms. Pool. >> Pool: Thanks, mayor. And I want to concur in the comments that have been made previously and build a little bit, just to make a note on the neighborhood plans that not every part of town has the neighborhood plan. But if we are basing their future evolution on a neighborhood plan and we don't have one, then we need to get those pieces in place first or have some process to take in that information without having the plan. Some way that we can explain to the community, if they don't have a plan, what have we provided them to be sure that their vision for their community is recognized by the city. Then along those lines, also on slide 12, I'm hearing some -- I'm getting some input that's a bit disturbing, that somehow along the way, the planning process in our comprehensive planning and urban design, O. -- Codenext

[10:39:11 AM]

and so forth is overlooking or not remembering to bring into the conversation our green infrastructure. There was a green infrastructure work group that worked along with imagine Austin, and I don't have -- I'm not confident that the recommendations from those stakeholders, which had been developed over time and at a similar depth as other stakeholders that had been mentioned here today, I don't have the confidence that those recommendations have been integrated into this plan going forward, and I would like to see very clear evidence of that. We will be appointing people to the codenext advisory group from the open space committee at the end of the this month, and I hope that person -- I intend for that person to have strong credentials in order to bring that voice forward and make sure that the concerns that are being raised to me very explicitly are addressed. We address lots of different concerns, and I

want to make sure we address those as well. >> Councilmember, when I was going through the slide earlier, talking about the response on codenext, bringing the core team as part of that was -- part of the response to that discussion, the green infrastructure, bringing in more watershed staff as part of that code team. So we'll -- certainly we'll follow up with you on that to rest your concerns. >> Pool: That would be great. One specific element of that, to show that conversation, would be to take the map of our watersheds and overlay it on the village and town centers graphic that we have for imagine Austin and show where we have flood-prone areas, for example, where the pervious and impervious cover is really going to have a large effect. This work -- all that we do here knits not one -- together in one whole and we have the flood mitigation task force ahead of us, where we've talked about the amount of money that we have to put out for buyouts in our floodplains and the fact that we continue to approve development in

[10:41:13 AM]

flood-prone areas. So that conversation also needs to be included in this discussion so that we really are looking at things comprehensively. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Ms. Troxclair and then Ms. Houston. >> Troxclair: Going back to the conversation about metrics, I just wanted to suggest that it seems like another good metric to include in addition to these specific, you know, weight times, et cetera, would just be the total time from application to approval for the different classes, which would be kind of a combination of all of the -- all of these things that are on this list. >> Councilmember, I think that's a good thought. Sometimes, though, what you're seeing are different applications and different sizes of site plans and subdivisions and some of them, this big and some of this can be this small. So we'll work on that. I'm not sure exactly how we'll come up with something like that. We can get total times on average for looking at a hotel as opposed to looking at something much smaller, residential, and then on the application process and other things. But understanding that they're all different sizes and different sizes take different times. One of the dashboard, Rodney mentioned, will give us that information on how long it takes to review certain types of buildings and certain types of subdivisions. So we will have that information. >> Troxclair: Sure, yeah. If you want to subdivide the categories, however you think is appropriate, small versus large or, however, it is. I just think from, if we're talking about broad goals from an overall perspective -- >> Mayor Adler: In fact if you look at table 16 in the Zucker report it was broken into categories. It had 20 -- less than \$1 million, greater than a

[10:43:13 AM]

million dollars, smart housing, demolition, relocation, there were accumulated data with respect to how long those processes were taking. So I agree with Ms. Troxclair, that we should have some metrics that we can measure, that break it out by categories. Because if we don't have the metric, then people will -- may have unrealistic expectations in the community. We won't all be on the same page. When we reach the day, I want success to be clear. We've made it and we don't have to then debate as to whether or not that really meant success or not. >> If I could add to it. We do have different standards, as the mayor is referencing, with regard to the table, different timetables for the different types of permits and review that we do. And there's a number of them. Some of them are actually embedded in the code. We think that some of those should be moved administratively. The metric we use is whether or not we did that review on time. Regardless of what the day was, as we have it, whether it's a two-daytime period or four-daytime period, that we have established for us to complete that review. What we're looking at is did we complete the review on time and our target is to get to at least 90% on-time review for those metrics. So we can certainly provide the table of what those time lines are. As sue mentioned we can certainly use our software to gauge the number of days for those reviews. The metric that really is

important for us is whether or not we met the on-time reviews as promised. >> Troxclair: I guess I would just add that -- that point is well-taken. If we have the actual number of days, then that will help y'all and us to know whether or not our on-time deadlines are appropriate. >> Councilmember, we do have the number of days. And that's one of the things that we are looking at now, is -- and I'll give you an example. For one particular kind of

[10:45:14 AM]

review, it says we will do the review and complete it within three days. Three days. So if somebody hands something in on Friday, it's due on Monday. And so we want to change that to say three business days. So we do have very specific amounts of days for the types of reviews that we're doing. But as I said, we do need to correct some of those so that they are more realistic. And looking at some of the larger hotels, which are site plans, maybe two of them this big, we need to look at whether or not we need to change some of those criteria and the data points for those too. So we are going to be bringing back to you some changes that are now currently in code that -- performance measures that probably shouldn't be in code but should be adopted as policies. >> Mayor Adler: I think that will be helpful. I hear from some people that we have a formal review process and then a practice is developed, kind of like a prereview process, where you can get suggestions. And now the review process works really well. But it takes forever to get through the preview process because that had kind of dropped off of the timing schedule. So by putting all these things in and with all the times in, that will trick out from the community and "Trick" is a pejorative word, it will enable us to ferret out from the community all of those concerns and measures so that as we start the process here, everybody is on the same page as to what it is that we're addressing. >> Thank you for recognizing the consulting service that we do provide. We are very unique in north America or in the U.S. In providing that service. It does help with the actual formal review. So some of the proposals that we've recommended are specifically to the

[10:47:14 AM]

development assistance center, in terms of staffing. So some of the wait times that we're talking about are the wait times with regard to consulting and the wait times for intake. >> Mayor Adler: I understand. Thank you. I just didn't know if there were -- okay. That would be good. Further comments? >> Houston: Yes, I've had my light on for four hours. >> Mayor Adler: I did put new the queue as well. >> Houston: Mine is very quick. On page 6 of -- I'm sorry, nine, one of the things that I hear a lot is that you can be fair and practical but sometimes we're not consistent. And so that's one of the analytics people -- metrics of the people in the community I hope would like there would be constantly in what you do. Did you say 12 department heads? I missed it. >> I didn't spell them out for you. We can go over the 12 departments for you. >> Houston: If you'd send me an e-mail so I know which 12. >> We will provide you the list. >> Houston: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Zimmerman? >> Zimmerman: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I appreciate all of this. As you know, this has been a huge issue. My office has been full of people complaining about the process since I got here. I have two things to say here quickly. If I'm on your side of the table -- and, you know, I've been in the engineering field and I deal with metrics and measurable stuff. I made a career out of it. And if I'm on your side of the table, I don't want to create metrics that can cause me to fail. So there would be a motivation to be vague, to be really general and to not be specific because if you make really nonspecific and kind of vague objectives, then you can never fail. So it is a hard thing, you know, to commit yourself to something that's concrete, to something that's objective, something that's measurable. Because once you commit yourself to that, there's a potential for failure. If we can't make the targets. So I'd like to see, just a

[10:49:16 AM]

suggestion here for our council, that we set some reasonable metrics that are at a three month, six month, 12 month interval, something that we can check up on sooner. And we suggested something many, many months ago about returning phone calls quicker than 24 hours or -- these are some Zucker ideas, if appointments were not going to be met, that persons would be called back and said, hey, we're going to miss this appointment. It just seemed pretty simple, even courtesy things that could have been implemented immediately, not two years from now, but within the next one or three months. So I'd like to see that in the next round as some -- some targeted measurable metrics on a calendar basis, three months, six months, 12 months, in addition to two years. The second thing is I think I have a representation for not being sympathetic to bureaucracies but the one area I'm completely sympathetic with here in planning and development is the complexity of our code. I'm going to cite one thing that's recently been added and that's visitability. The wheelchair access ordinance. From my technical mind, when I look at that, I say this is a nightmare. It's potentially the straw that broke the camel's back because I've got so many ordinances I've got impervious cover ordinance, floor-area ratio, heritage trees, all these constraints put on-site plans. And then you add wheelchair access ramps. In some case it's seems to be physically impossible, impossible to meet all of these constraints in your development project. So if I'm a -- reviewing this and I've got hundreds of pages or thousands of pages of stuff to go through, it's impossible to review it and say that it complies because it could be impossible to comply with all these restrictions and all these constraints. Okay. So what we need you to do is

[10:51:17 AM]

bring those back to the council and say, look, we can't get these site plans approved because there's too many constraints. You've put so many constraints on us but we need that feedback from your department, that your job is practically impossible because of all of the constraints that have been put on. I'm not hearing that feedback. >> Councilmember, I appreciate that. That's exactly what codenext is about. Codenext did a review of all of our code, and said the same thing that you have said. And so codenext is working through the process to simplify the code and to look at those conflicts and to make recommendations to us on those. And they're working through a fairly stringent process to have that occur. We would appreciate, during this interim process, that we don't change the code any more until we get codenext recommendations and can be adopted. Because it just continues to confuse the code. So I appreciate very much your comments. >> Zimmerman: Okay, that's good. But on codenext, I just want to make a statement here, I guess, in public. I have pretty much zero confidence that codenext is going to solve the problem. Because when you have mutually exclusive constraints, you can't solve them by redoing the paperwork. How are we going to fix the impervious cover, heritage trees, visitability? I've got all these constraints on me. I can't go to codenext and magically make mutually exclusive choices work together. I don't think it's going to work. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, got it. Should we -- anything else on this before we go to our pulled items on the agenda? >> Tovo: Certainly this isn't the place to have this discussion, but I feel like it's necessary just to make a comment, given that, you know, councilmember Zimmerman, you

[10:53:17 AM]

and I may not agree on visitability and other ordinances but because there have been several comments made about the fact that there are code amendments that have been made at council meetings and others, let me point out some of those are really critical and if you're somebody in a wheelchair who wants to have access either to a house you might purchase or to a house you might

visit, that was a real important provision. We spent a lot of time talking about it, and I'm really happy that we made that change. I think it was an important one, I would say. Other things that are frequently under attack and I hope won't be in the codenext process, the single family compatibility ordinance, otherwise known as mcmansion, those are, again, code changes that happened that were enormously important to our community and to large segments of our community that had run into trouble. So, I mean, we can talk about this as codenext moves along. I think there are inconsistencies in the code, complexities. I understand that is the consultant job to work on eliminating those but certainly it's my expectation and I think the community's as well that some of those really important provisions in the code are going to remain even after codenext. Are, I mean, that's what you get when you build within a - within the limits of a municipality. There be constraints. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, thank you. We're going to move now to the pulled items. Thank you, guys, very much. A lot of work. The sooner you can get us that list back so we can post it and get community reaction to it, the sooner we can be done. >> Thank you, mayor, council. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. >> Gallo: Thanks for the great work. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston pulled item number 4, which is electronic filing issue. >> Houston: Yes. I just wanted to state publicly that I appreciate transparency, but the 10-1

[10:55:20 AM]

council, form of governance, was put in place to be able to allow people of various income complexes -- levels and occupations and no occupations to run for city council and I'm concerned about what this requirement might do to people who don't have financial resources to do it all electronically, depending on what that comes out to look like. There may be some people like Leslie -- no, who was the flower vendor? >> Gallo: It was max. >> Houston: Max [indiscernible] >> Gallo: The list may have ended -- Leslie may have provided flowers at one time as well. >> Houston: Thank you. People like max might not be able to abide by the ordinances that you are suggesting, and I just want to make sure that y'all are aware that there may be people in upcoming election that's not tech savvy and they have an opportunity to file theirs in some other way >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Troxclair: We can look at how we could incorporate that. I think the only way we could is if council wanted to set a dollar limit that anyone that didn't raise more than a certain amount was excluded. >> Gallo: And my understanding, if I can jump in, is that this ordinance includes all of the language that is in existence, which does include the ability for someone currently who doesn't raise over a certain threshold -- and I can't remember what the number is -- either not to submit, to submit abbreviated report, or to submit a paper copy. That does not change -- >> Actually, I think we have repealed everything because we thought you wanted to do a complete repeal and replace. >> Gallo: I was reading in here that the elements that

[10:57:21 AM]

were in section C does not -- this is an accumulative addition, not a repeal and replace. >> I will let >> I will let law answer that question. >> Cindy Tom, city attorney law department. I believe Janet, the city clerk is correct. As posted the revision would entirely repeal and replace section 2-2-26, so the section that you're referring to that's in current code, which I believe is subsection B, it does currently provide an exemption from electronic filing requirements that are already in the code. If a candidate has not raised and does not intend to raise more than \$30,000 in contributions for the campaign period. >> Pool: Then does how does subsection E in the new ordinance conflict with that. This ordinance says this resolution is cumulative and does not supersede another requirement regarding deadline filing, form signing or acknowledgment. >> Right. That would be referring to other provisions in city code and state law. If we proceed as the ordinance was posted, the draft ordinance, we would be repealing the exemption for the 30,000. However, we could leave that in. >> Pool: That was not the intend and we

had some conversations about that in the audit and finance committee that people at the low end would still be able to submit their reports. If at some point we get to a place where we're not comfortable that doesn't have to be in the ordinance anymore we may get there, but we were not there in our conversations. I'll just reiterate that I thought that E was referring back to those sections that were not mentioned in this ordinance. >> Mayor Adler: So perhaps, Ms. Pool, legal can help draft this for you on Thursday. >> We can do that. >> Pool: Thanks.

[10:59:23 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Ms. Troxclair? >> Troxclair: I wanted to ask about the requirement to submit a CD. So where does this put us with needing to bring a physical C.D. With our financial information on it. >> What we need to do is establish some rules on what type of media or format would be permitted. So some people may want to bring in a C.D., depending on their preference, or it could be a flash drive. Might be that you're e-mailing it to us. So we will have more than one option. >> Troxclair: Great. I wanted to make sure that that wasn't going to stay in the code and then this also be there. So if we can replace that with some other kind of option, that would be wonderful. And the last question I had was just about -- I don't know, councilmember pool, maybe you would be better to answer this question. It said the city manager and clerk shall submit a monthly report to the council audit and finance committee on progress. Is a monthly -- I know we've been really overwhelmed in the audit and finance committee and crunched for time, so I didn't know if a monthly check-in was necessary or if there was a better way -- >> That was actually included I believe in the resolution that council passed, which was why we put it in there. But we limited it through the February 1st implementation date even with the understanding that there may be additional projects for enhancements going forward, but we wouldn't do monthly reports after that. We would do as needed. >> Pool: And we also looked at that as a paper report it didn't have to be presented orally. >> Troxclair: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. We had not pulled item number 5, but just by way of notice, I don't know if contract people are here. This might be something to talk about on Thursday, but there's been some question that's been raised about

[11:01:23 AM]

whether when we limit it to five people on the speaker list whether we stop smaller companies from being on the rotation list. It's a question I've heard a couple of times and this has come up again. Do you want to address that now? >> I can, I can. Rosie truelove, director of the city's contract management department. For this particular rotation list we advertised with a notification that we anticipated hiring up to five firms for this particular rotation list and this is for watershed services. We had 18 firms that submitted responses and three of those firms were certified firms. They did -- as we evaluated the contract and all the submittals that we received, those firms did not rise to the top through the evaluation process, but the five firms that did rise to the top through our evaluation process all met the goals of the M.B.E., W.B.E. Ordinance and have representation of all of the different subcontracting areas. >> Mayor Adler: By setting the limit at five, the concern I heard wasn't that the others weren't qualified or that they weren't certified in those areas, but when you limit it to five we get a certain number of large firms that are recurrent on those lists, but if you were to dip to six or to seven we would begin to pick up also qualified, but smaller firms. So why do we stop at five and what would be the advantages or disadvantages? >> Sure. Every time we issue a rotation list solicitation we sit down with folks from my department, the people that manage the actual contracts. We sit down with the folks requesting rotation list so in this case we would have sat down with watershed engineering staff and we make a determination on the

[11:03:24 AM]

number of firms that we're going to hire and the per firm authorization amount. And we base that on our historical use of the rotation list, what projects we think are going to come up? Because when we set a time frame for the contract, we want to be able to expend that contract within the time frame that we set, right, because we're setting up that expectation with the folks that we're contracting with. We also will look at what we think are going to be the anticipated project sizes that are going to be coming to that list to make sure that we are in fact able to make multiple assignments and be able to get the work done. So in some cases we may increase the dollar amount per firm authorization and in some cases we may increase the number of firms we're going to hire and we have that conversation specific to every rotation list before we issue the solicitation so that it can be a fair and equitable process and that we set -- when we go to issue the solicitation we set the expectations for everyone that's going to be competing. In this case we felt like the five firms at the authorization that we list, which is two million dollars each, would be sufficient for the work coming at us. We don't know what the makeup is going to be of the folks that are responding to that solicitation until we receive the proposals and we don't know the outcome as far as if we'll have any certified firms until we actually evaluate them. In this case if you look at the actual matrix, which is included in your backup, the highest ranking firm has a score of 93.27 according to our evaluation matrix, and the lowest of the selected firms is 89.69. So if we looking to to number six that's 88.48. That doesn't bring in a certified firm. The next one would be 87.65,

[11:05:29 AM]

which is CHAN and partners, which they are a certified Asian firm. And the next firm below that is Cass consulting, and they are at 86.76. So when you look at the score break down we would have to jump down a couple of spots to bring in certified firms and then you look at the point differential between maybe number eight and number nine and it's very small and so you start to then dilute the ability by bringing in more firms you start to dilute the ability to make the assignments because you're spreading that authorization more thinly. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. The next item we have on the agenda is item number 7, which was pulled by Mr. Zimmerman about the chapel. >> Thank you, Mr. Mayor. We put in a Q and a request last Wednesday and is that finally answered? It wasn't answered yesterday. We basically asked for the details on the programming opportunities and there was something called heritage tourism. And we were trying to figure out what that was. I think the concerns of the cemetery, it's kind of a solemn place, and we wanted some explanation of this. >> Sarah Hensley, director of parks and recreation. The heritage tourism is actually taking place now at some of our cemeteries with some educational programs, walking tours, bird watching, historic tours, quite frankly that even occur over at the state cemetery, which is to learn the history of the individuals who are buried there, which in many cases it's very significant. But other things take place there in the cemeteries. Bird watching, painting, walking, of course, and genealogy research. Many people go to the cemeteries to do some genealogy research, looking at their heritage. So that in essence is what is currently occurring and

[11:07:29 AM]

we are looking to try to continue that and the chapel work that's on your agenda would be just a part of that as a possibility for some of those groups to use. >> Zimmerman: Okay. So it just begs the question for me, let's say that you had absolutely no programming whatsoever, that this whole thing was abolished, there was no program idea, what would stop somebody from showing up at the cemetery

and doing research on the tomb stones? >> It wouldn't. There are individuals who do it on a daily basis and then there are groups -- the cemetery groups are doing this actively. >> Zimmerman: So why does this have to be here? I don't understand. >> It comes from the public consent that we have through the cemetery master plan and the many meetings. There are individuals and groups who want to have this more formalized so we included that in master plan. I can let Marty or Cora here expand on that, but this is coming directly from our public engagement with citizens and groups who are either actively involved or want to become even more actively involved in their cemetery. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Troxclair? >> Troxclair: My question was just about the fiscal note on this item. The fiscal note for this says there's no unanticipated fiscal impact, a fiscal note is not required. But that doesn't necessarily mean that the project won't have a cost, right? >> This particular item before you today is just to authorize the methodology for the contracting process. So when you come back and see us bring back an item to award the contract then you will see the fiscal note be included in that. >> Troxclair: Okay. So is it possible -- a lot of times -- I guess I have been focused on the fiscal notes recently because a lot of times we only get, well, this is the third stage of a

[11:09:30 AM]

project that ended up being this much, but we're only approving \$100,000, but the total project is a million dollars, but the million dollars we don't see. So just in an effort to try to understand really what it is we're approving before we go down -- or at all times during the approval process. It would be helpful for me if it said a fiscal note is not required, however, if approved the total cost of this project would be around a million dollars or whatever it is, just so that we have a full fiscal picture because sometimes we're going through things and you think no fiscal note, no fiscal note, great. But then when you come back for approval later it's like we're already into the process, that kind of thing. It would be helpful to have the information. >> For this particular rca, if you look this the body of the rca it speaks to a preliminary estimated construction project for these improvements of being 925,000. >> Troxclair: I saw that. Since you have that information it would be helpful for us when going through all these items to put that in the fiscal note part. >> Okay. I'll talk to financial services and he see if we can find a way to standardize that. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Houston: Just one more question, mayor. Thank you. And could we remember to put the district that these occur in on the agenda so we know what areas that we're talking about? I would appreciate it. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Houston, you pulled three items, 21, 22 and 23. Which are neighborhood housing and community development issues. >> Houston: And I recognize that they may not be here because I didn't pull them early enough. So I'll just -- there were some questions in the action plan. The action plan was very long, very thick. And there were some questions in the action plan that I had but I can ask

[11:11:33 AM]

those -- well, there's someone here and some other people here. Can I just ask two questions? I promise I'll be quick. Thank you so much for the work you've been doing on this. The first question I wanted to ask because we weren't able to find it is where is the definition of reasonable criminal history look-back period defined? Whoa use that term but I don't know that it's defined anywhere. Reasonable criminal history look-back period because that's important to people exiting the criminal justice system what that does mean. >> I understand that. David potter, program manager at neighborhood housing. And good morning everyone. I've got with me Jim Padilla who is the staff member who compiles the action plan. And I don't know if you happen to have that answer at your fingertips or not, but we can certainly get that to you. >> Houston: He looks like he might have some part of it. >> Was there a specific section that the reference came up that you would like -- >> Houston: Well, we can get that to you. >> That's

perfectly -- no. So we can do some research. >> Houston: We just noticed that it was not defined so I'm not sure what that means. >> Offhand I'm not sure if it's explicitly defined in the action plan. There is a section of the action plan which deals with barriers to fair housing and so it sounds like that might align with that section. So we can make sure that that is explicitly fleshed out in that section. >> We can also get that answer for you. >> Houston: And because I said I would keep my questions to two, my question is in the development process is the -- is the department

[11:13:33 AM]

proactive, do we look at imagine Austin and look at the program map to determine where development is needed in parts and do a request for people asking for people to come in or do we react to whatever the developers bring to us? >> Typically what we've done is receive proposals from developers and we use the imagine Austin and the Austin plan in terms of when we're speaking with people, telling them where the development would be more desirable, but if they're only bringing in something that is for a specific piece of property, we will take a look at that, but it won't necessarily be rejected out of hand because it's not in one of the imagine Austin preferred areas. >> Houston: Would it ever be rejected out of hand if it brought -- of course as we've been talking about since I've been on the council, more density, but more amenities and more conveniences? Would we ever say I'm sorry because of where this development is being -- where you're looking at, there's absolutely no food, no medical care, no anything. >> Not necessarily. And the reason for that is the development cycle is generally a two-year cycle and when they're bringing us a proposal that's just a proposal at this point that we have it, if it moves forward with our financing, the other financing that they're going to be required to obtain to develop it, there very well could be amenities coming in in the next couple of years while this is being developed. Some developers perform market studies where they see their trends for the

[11:15:33 AM]

area and so it's an area in which they want to build. >> Houston: So then why should we use taxpayer dollars to fund it if it doesn't meet all the kind of criteria that we're asking for in imagine Austin? And have the amenities? Because we can say that they may come in in two years, but history tells us that that hasn't happened and yet we continue to accept applications and apply for tax credits. So I'm just asking us to be more thoughtful about being proactive, about what it is we're looking for and where we want that place rather than reactive. And we'll take what you say and see if we can make it work for the community. >> I understand what you mean, yes. >> Houston: Thank you. >> Casar:, I'd like to thank councilmember Houston for bringing up that issue and please keep my office in the loop as we define that. There's also a balance for setting requirements for some of the developers and we want to maximize the number of units we get, but there are some things that don't necessarily cost folks units or affordability like being reasonable about a look-back period or supporting local tenant organizations and associations in their own building so we can monitor the safety and quality of life in the buildings and make sure that the rents are being -- are as affordable as they were supposed to be based on that funding. And I don't know if it's this action plan or other places as well that we can work with the department to make sure that we're getting the most bang for our buck as far as units goes and the affordability of those units and the location of those units, but then also how do we make sure that we get people into those complexes who need it and that we make sure that the people there are empowered to talk to the city. So that doesn't have to be something that you respond to now, but I think this is a good moment for me to put that out there that very some ways that don't cost us units, but we can improve them. >> And I appreciate that. And it may not necessarily

[11:17:34 AM]

be in the action plan because what the action plan is is the city's application to HUD for federal funds for the next fiscal year. And in our discussions with -- about permanent supportive housing and the housing first model in particular, we're talking to developers and suggesting to them that they may have to relax some of the criteria if they're going to provide permanent supportive housing units. And we and we strongly suggest that they be providing permanent supportive housing units because that's one of the models that we have to put 400 units in place over the next four years. So it may not be in the action plan, but it is definitely elsewhere. >> Houston: And I made an error. Number 30 in your project is choice neighborhoods implementation. Could you tell us what that actually means? We know that there was planning, choice planning, but what does the implementation, has the project been approved? >> It is. I believe that pertains to the rosewood courts. So as part of the development of the action plan our department worked closely with the housing authority and it is our department's understanding that the housing authority is not going to seek additional grant funding, which would be available at the end of this year. However, in the action plan there is reference to, say that new housing would consider allocating CDBG funds if that were to change. If that were to change the council and public would be able to weigh in on that process because this would trigger an amendment to this action plan because it does not allocate funding for that purpose.

[11:19:34 AM]

>> Houston: Please let me be notified about that. And the other question was on 22, I think. And do you ever -- I've gotten several complaints -- not several. Several complaints is probably -- many complaints about the Harris branch apartments, the one that's already developed. Staff looked at the activity level and A.P.D. has been out over 200 interactions on that property since 2013 and now we're about to approve a senior development right there in that area. So do you ever look behind to see what the health and safety issues are for the residents in the first phase and decide if we're going to in fact -- this is going back to 2013. >> I just want to clarify. If you're referring to -- >> Harris branch seniors. >> The development named Harris branch seniors and the development off highway 290 east which is called Harris branch? >> No. >> Thank you. I wanted to clarify that. >> Houston: It's another apartment complex. It's the first phase and Harris branch seniors is the second phase. >> And actually, this one has not been built yet. And -- >> Houston: No, but the question is the same builders, same developers, same management company. They have a lot of issues in the first phase. Do we ever do a look-behind to see whether or not they're maintaining adequate health and safety regulations for the first phase before we award them contracts for the second phase? >> In this case we're not awarding a contract to them. They are requesting -- it's called a TEFRA, TEFRA, my acronym of the day, tax equity and fiscal responsibility act I think of 1986. I could be wrong on the year.

[11:21:35 AM]

And that is required when a project is going to have private activity bonds issued, not by the housing finance corporation, but by some other entity that can issue bonds. In this case this Austin Affordable PFC Inc. which is affiliated with the housing authority. They will be issuing the bonds. The action that will be requested on Thursday would be for the city to approve that issuance. >> Houston: So there are no city, state, federal funds involved in any of this. >> No. It would be the funds that will finance this will come from the sale of the private activity bonds, whatever money is generated from that. And from a few other sources, but there's no city of Austin or Austin housing finance corporation funding in this particular project. >> Houston: Is this the first one we've seen like this? >> This one has actually been

back before you a couple of times if it seems like deja Vu. We will see others like this where they're not requesting our funding, but they're requesting the city's okay, if you will, for them to move forward with the issuance of the bonds for this project. >> Houston: Okay. Thank you. >> You're welcome. >> Tovo: Mayor? I'd like to -- ask a follow-up question. I appreciate you asking that question and that history because I think that's really important. They're in effect asking us for our endorsement and if we don't provide it they can't move forward. So have there been conversations about the existing management and the problems out there and imposing some kind of -- I'm a little concerned about the

[11:23:36 AM]

points that councilmember Houston has raise and whether we're allowing operators who have not set up a safe situation for their current residents to go forward and construct another development for seniors. >> Okay. I personally have not been aware of any of the problems that were brought up. The affiliate of the housing authority will be operating and managing it. And from everything I know that they have a pretty good track record, so I hadn't heard any of those concerns personally. >> Tovo: Who is operating the existing Harris branch apartments? >> There is not one that exists yet. It has not been built. >> Tovo: No, the ones that councilmember Houston was talking about. Are those -- I would expect that they're not operated by the housing authority affiliate because they are -- >> Right. I think there might be some confusion. >> Tovo: -- Very well managed properties. The housing authority affiliate, if it's the same one, has very well managed properties so I would be surprised if they're managing the ones that councilmember Houston's discussing. >> Correct. And I just had not heard those concerns. There is another item similar and it's called Parmer place phase 2, and that received an approval of four percent non-competitive tax credits last year, and they're wanting to build phase two next to it. So there will be some actions being requested among them the same type of action for item 22, it will be a separate item, though. And I personally have not heard about -- >> Tovo: I'm less concerned about approving a phase 2 and the other if the phase 1 has been successful and again is providing for a safe environment for the residents. Could you follow up on that? >> Houston: I'll share with you the information we

[11:25:40 AM]

received. >> Gallo: I've got a question too. I think councilmember Houston brings up a good point that somewhere in the presentation from staff to us that the process should include a history of the owner so we know as we're approving future projects we're approving it for an owner or a management company that is actually providing a benefit and safe housing. And I don't know if that already exists in what you bring us and we just -- it gets buried, we don't see it. >> We do provide a little paragraph. Typically at the end of each request for council action or request for board action about the developer and their holdings, their experience. >> Gallo: So how much detail do you go into with that? So you have a description of the developer, but do you actually do research that shows the criminal history or anything in the previous that shows the type of management and the type of activity that is occurring at their developments? >> Typically not because they are folks that are known to us, management companies that are known to us. And like the one that's doing Parmer place, we had sort of vetted them last year and did not come up with anything negative. We didn't exactly check each property that they owned because they do own hundreds throughout many states, however, ones that are located in Texas we do check on those. >> Gallo: I wonder if we would have had that information had someone brought that to our attention. >> And perhaps that's something that we could provide as a routine on a list of -- whatever we're calling cost benefit analysis, that sort of thing. >> Gallo: Resources are so limited, I think we all want to make sure that we direct them in a manner that we're

[11:27:42 AM]

directed towards good management companies and good owners that really provide good housing. Thank you. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. The next thing we have is item 24, which is a pulled item. >> Zimmerman: Yes, Mr. Mayor, questions on that. We looked this up on the tax rolls and it looked at under tcad the property was I believe \$90,000. And it looks like the purchase price not to exceed \$400,000, so the obvious question is why is the purchase price exceeding the tcad appraisal? >> Junie plumber, office of real estate services. We had the property appraised and it was an independent third-party appraisal, it's 10 acres so came in at two five acre lots, highest best use being residential and the fair market cost is the fair market value as determined by the independent appraiser. >> Zimmerman: Mr. Mayor, where are we on our appraisal challenge? This may be part of why we were challenging the appraisal rolls because it looks like an undervalue of around 400 percent? >> I think it will be covered in the executive session to the details of the litigation, but generally as directed by the council the city filed the challenge with the appraisal district and did it in such a way that would enable us to be able to have this matter heard in district court. And we're waiting now for the opportunity and the right time for us then to take the next step that the -- the planned next step to raise in district court. >> Zimmerman: I'm going to ask my colleagues on Thursday if they would please pull this off and send it to perhaps open space committee or maybe

[11:29:46 AM]

even audit and finance and get this into committee and find out how something like this can happen. That we have a property that appraises for over 400 percent of what it's on the tax rolls for. So I will ask for support from my colleagues to ask for a motion on Thursday to pull this and put it into committee. >> Tovo: Mayor? Could we get some sense from -- perhaps we could ask our real estate staff to just talk a little bit about -- about timing and how that action would impact the timing. But I think I would want to know also what the substance of the questions would be that you would anticipate that a committee would be useful in addressing. >> Zimmerman: So somebody's wrong, either tcad was terribly wrong on their appraisal or else the appraisal that's come in at 400,000, that one is wrong. Somebody is wrong by a factor of 400%. That's what I want to be scrutinized. The other thing that came up was the highest and best use was just that is for residential it's a growth area out there. So if it's the highest and best use is for residential because we have the housing shortage, why would we pull that off the rolls, pay four times more than it's on tcad for and take it out of developable property and add it to a bcp? Why would we do that? It seems like a very poor use of resources. >> Tovo: I'm not sure that our committees, any of them, since none of us are certified appraisers, are really equipped to answer that first question about why the appraisal came in over the tcad valuation, but I think just based on our discussions we have some sense I don't have that happens and that is because the appraisals -- well, I don't know, but that's our process is to hire somebody who is an expert in it to give us an appraisal and they have done that. So that -- that seems to be the information we have. But in terms of why we would purchase the tract and why that would be of value to the city maybe you could ask our staff to address that

[11:31:46 AM]

here today. >> I do want to just add one thing in regards to value. We did buy the adjacent property. It was owned by a gentleman named Roy Gass, in 2011. It was the same two five acre lots, it's the same owned by Mr. Gasa and we paid 405,000 in 2011. >> Mayor Adler: I probably would not join in sending it to a committee because I'm not sure the committee could give us the kind of relief we need. In

this kind of action we cannot use the appraised value, it's precluded by law so we have to get an independent appraisal to be able to assess value because appraised value in courts is not accepted evidence of what market value is, which is one of the reasons I think that we are prosecuting the challenge that we're prosecuting. So in this case I'll support this because this is where the appraised value came in. The more -- the grander question you're asking is the disconnect, and I hope that that gets addressed by virtue of what we're doing otherwise. Any further conversation on this item? All right. >> Tovo: Mayor, I had asked the staff to just address why this tract is -- why you're suggesting that we purchase this tract and not let it be developed by residential developer or whoever else might purchase it. >> Willie Conrad, the division manager for the wildlife conservation division for Austin water utility. Pardon me. We manage the balcones canyon lands preserve. This 10-acre tract is actually an inholding, inside the preserve boundary at this point. It's fronted on three sides by balcones canyon lands preserve property. It's also actually inside the preserve acquisition boundary, which is an area that was designated with our federal permit on habitat conservation plan that targeted areas where we should try to acquire habitat to add to the

[11:33:47 AM]

balance cons canyon lands preserve. As we pointed out it is a developable tract that has entitlements and they would be removing it from the developed -- the area that could contribute to the tax base, but I would also like to point out that part of the premise behind the balance cons canyon lands preserve and the conservation plan is that we would set aside areas in the city and the county that are otherwise developable, but include high quality habitat for the species that we're trying to protect. In order to mitigate for expansive development in the rest of the city and the county. So in this case the balance cons canyon lands preserve is setting aside close to 30,000 acres today. This mitigation that allows more than 75,000 acres in the city and the county to be developed in a way that will contribute directly to the tax base. We did a very brief analysis of the effects of these in 2013 working with tcad, and what we learned is that since the federal permit was issued in the habitat conservation plan began we've allowed private property owners to participate in bccp and use our mitigation. The improvements to the properties that participated in bccp in 2013 were valued at \$4.5 billion. Those improvements pay taxes every year and the value of those improvements continue to go up. So while we are removing these two properties that have a taxable value at one-10th of what our valuation and fair market value is, these properties will serve as mitigation so that other properties in the

[11:35:48 AM]

vicinity can develop and contribute to our tax base. That all sounds well and good, but if you go back more than 20 years when the golden cheek warbler and black capped virio were first listed, what happened is there was a defacto moratorium on development in Austin and take. People could not develop their property and comply with the endangered species act and so the housing market took a slide. And there were some very visionary people that created the bccp and the bcp. They put together this idea that we as a community can contribute to endangered species act compliance so that others in the community can comply with the act and this would apply an economic benefit to the entire community. What we've learned 20 years later is like I said there's \$4.5 billion of improvements on the tax rolls that may not have been there had we not had bccp. They could have been there and developed through other processes, but they were timely, the timeliness was uncertain. The ability to develop them might not have been certain. With bcp as mitigation people can go on their property and do what they wish to by participating in bcp. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Tovo: Thank you. I appreciate that overview and especially those-- that figure. That wasn't information I had before. I appreciate the

context. >> Houston: I want to clarify just a minute. So the idea is to purchase this additional property and then sell it to a developer to develop for -- >> No, ma'am. We would maintain the property and manage it as preserve land that counts towards bcp, but with respect to the enforcement of the endangered species act in Austin what happens is in order to develop a

[11:37:49 AM]

tract of land in a way that complies with the endangered species act you have to provide some mitigation. So if you're going to destroy 10 acres of habitat and a property owner, then you have to contribute 10 acres of habitat in a protected area so that there's habitat that will always remain available for the species. And in the past before bcp, private property owners would have to go to fish and wildlife service for their own permit under the endangered species act. You talked about the code and development process in Austin. The endangered species act process makes that look like child's play. So what pressure predecessors did was create a process whereby a property owner would buy mitigation from us. So we maintain the 31,000 acres with our partners in bccp and that land is basically our mitigation bank so if the city of Austin wanted to go out tomorrow and build something like a water treatment plant, which we just did, we mitigated that project using credits from our mitigation bank. But alternatively a private landowner can come to us and say may we buy mitigation credits from you. And we basically sell those for about \$5,500 an acre. It varies on the type of habitat that's involved. We have that balance of mitigation credits and a private property owner can come to bccp, buy credits from us and we will in turn, turn around and use that money to either buy more land or to manage the land that we have. So the funding for this 10 acres is also coming from this sale of mitigation credits. >> Houston: Okay. Thank you. This sounds like an equity issue there somewhere, but with all the new information that I'm getting it will take me some time to figure that out because I

[11:39:49 AM]

appreciate what you're doing and the balcones canyon land preserve and what we're doing, when we have \$800,000 to spend to buy land so we can have a bank that we generate funds from and I need \$800,000 to build houses, it gets kind of housing. Or buy land to put housing on. I might have you come over and talk to me more so we don't take up more time here about what you do and how you do it and how it impacts the bottom line here in Austin. >> I would be happy to do that. >> Thank you. >> Zimmerman: Just one more question. On the mitigation credits, it's kind of like a bank, right? And a certain amount of credits there, certain amount of credits have been sold, certain amount of credits remain, certain people have bought credits. And where is that? Has that been audited by the audit department so we kind of know where we are in that? >> I don't know that it's been audited. We maintain a ledger on that and we actually report that in our bccp annual report every year. So we'd be happy to provide you with the information from our annual report that talks about our mitigation credits and balances. >> Zimmerman: Okay. If you could send that to my email that would be terrific. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much. Ms. Houston, you wanted to make a comment on number 37? >> Yes. And the comment that I want to make is that this is -- if you all are familiar with the Mueller development, this was designed by engineers, Mr. Zimmerman -- councilmember? This was designed by engineers at the txdot camera and I guess with the city of Austin transportation people. We call it the jug handle.

[11:41:51 AM]

In order to get to Cameron road then exit on 21 >> Before we went on break we had one resolution and

now there's a new resolution so I wanted to so I wanted to provide context for councilmembers and answer any questions. The resolution in June again was not -- was trying to be very directed and targeted towards this one particular week where we had a confluence of three important and major events happening at the same time in the same place. And we were trying to see if we could help our staff and

[11:43:53 AM]

the various stakeholders come to a solution. It wasn't a resolution about how many events we should have at given parks. The place for music festivals that is appropriate in the city. I know we have the parkland events taskforce that is trying to grapple with that broader issue so I was trying to tailor this to the one specific week where we had a lot of interest and a lot of seemingly competing interests. And at first I was pleased to here that the parks department was working with the various stakeholders and webbed we could get a resolution that would work out for everyone. Basically what I've heard back is what I've worked out is optimal that the festival can occur as planned and the opera can occur in the settlement home, very important fund-raiser and sale can have its traffic not be so clogged up was to give staff the additional flexibility to utilize a maximum of one acre of the off-leash dog area of the three and a half acres so that the festival can have additional space to not take up as much of the street and the roundabouts I know ultimately it was a very complicated set of circumstances and I appreciate how in the weeds y'all could get on it, but basically what I was hearing from the conversations is council granting the initial flexibility would hopefully make it all work just for this one year. So some folks asked about why this one year was so important. Last year the council authorized renovation and a map on the shores, formerly auditorium shores, and it's close to being completed right now. So this is the first year that it's going to be open and there were some barriers, including immovable ballards and trees

[11:45:53 AM]

that made it very difficult for the festival, fun, fun, festival to be there this as in the space that was authorized by the last council for them to participate in. So long story short I see this as a transition year and I think that giving staff -- as far as I can tell, giving staff the flexibility to utilize an extra acre of the dog park just for those days, just this one year, will get us through the pickle of how to fit all three events in one weekend. And then there's an additional be it resolved clause that hopefully those stakeholders can come together starting next week to start talking about next year so that we don't have to get tangled up in it again. And I appreciate the staff trying to work this out without council action, but it seems like the best result will be -- in my view will come guard if we give staff that extra space. So I'm happy to answer any questions, but the settlement home has their plans booked and I've had a chance to talk with them. The users of the dog park have questions about if we can get rid of those bollards so we can use the park. There are a lot of unanswered questions for the future, but we have a lot of events that have been planned, artists that are planning to get their exposure vendors that are planning to participate, and I just wanted to help facilitate the process for everyone. >> Mayor Adler: I think this is an important music event to the community and we need to support it and help it go forward. I think long-term we need to take a look at the right site for this associated with the longer, broader study that we're doing with respect to these parks. I do have a question with respect to the conversation that this council is walking into the middle of. There was some area that was designated for the dog walk area by last council that was an area that was designated as flex space that was intended to be land that could be easily moved in to I guess the park either way.

[11:47:54 AM]

Which required specifically for there to be a removable fence. As I look at the land out there it looked like what were permanent bollards presented that would make it less than a removable fence, but I understand the bollard has been planned in such a way that they can be readily removed so there's no impediment with respect to those. And then some -- there was a suggestion that there were some trees that were planted that made that land less of a flex space area. Would you confirm that the bollards are easily removed so that it is used as flex space and could you address the question of the trees and whether or not we should have trees that would limit the use of a flex space? >> Cora Wright, assistant director for the parks department. First of all, let me just say that we appreciate councilmember Casar and council acknowledging the work that we've been doing to work with fun, fun, fun and their 10th anniversary for their event. And to get right to your question, yes. The transitional space, if you recall, your predecessor council really spoke about the need for more access from the public to that entire now called vic Mathias auditorium shores. And there was a need to have a balance that the general public would be able to access the off-leash areas would also be accessible to the public while also supporting our annual events. So the transitional space that you have spoken about, the original design was to have that space be available to open up for the use of events and when events were not occurring, then we would be able to create some fairly easy barriers between the great lawn and the

[11:49:57 AM]

transitional area. So yes, the fencing after more conversations with fun, fun, fun, we have looked at redesigning that fencing so that you can remove it, including the balance. Soul be able to situate in this case fun, fun, fun wants to situate a stage in the area. So now the conversation is just how to situate the stage in such a way that it will accommodate the crowd who will be enjoying the music on that stage. So yes, it is accessible and as a result of our conversations with fun, fun, fun we've made it more flexible and as events are occurring we will be able to put up fencing that is removable so that the off-leash area is contiguous and be able to have a barrier between the people and the pets. >> Mayor Adler: What about the trees? >> And with respect to the trees, there was a plan to add additional trees. And hearing more information from the event organizer we're going to modify that plan so that when the use of the flex space is needed, the tree will not -- the newly -- the trees to be planted will not interfere with the sight line for staging for an example. >> Mayor Adler: And the last comment is in talking with the music folks I know that the resolution says up to one acre, but it looked like they didn't need one acre and the. Theorientation of that I think is important. In talking to the organizer it looked like the fencing around the back of the stage, if you are negotiating this, can be drawn up closer to the stage so that the waterfront remains more publicly open. Still meeting the needs of the event, but -- >> We're hearing as of today that fun, fun, fun is interested in moving that fence line back so there is no interruption to the trail and then access to the water. We're glad to hear about that. The other plan this afternoon, Jason miyer, our events manager, will be meeting with fun, fun, fun on the site.

[11:51:57 AM]

What we thought we would do is put all of our efforts together to try and figure out exactly how that stage should be aligned there. We don't think that it's going to require an additional acre. It may require a few more, a little more space, but we don't expect that it will require the entire acre. And we're hoping that it doesn't because we do want to maintain a reasonable and comfortable area of space for the off-leash users. >> Sure would be nice if you could meet with them and come to those limits before we vote on Thursday. I think that would be helpful. >> That is why we're planning to meet this afternoon. >> Mayor Adler: Great. Thank you. Further comments? Ms. Gallo and then Ms. Pool. >> Gallo:

I have a couple of questions and then a couple of comments. How many people attended last year? >> The event capacity per the agreement is up to I think 20,000 per day. >> Gallo: And how many do they project to attend this year? >> It's within the same constraint. And one of the things that we were talking about on that end of the park where the off leash area is, the event organizer is trying to plan for up to five to six thousand in that segment. Maybe not all at one time. So by allowing this additional use of the space he will be able to spread, you know, his stage watchers a lot broader. >> Gallo: So I assume as we have our parks events task force and they began to look at different events and festivals that we're doing on our public parks that we will be talking about maximum sizes for festivals? -- Maximum sizes for festivals? >> Absolutely. >> Gallo: My concern is festivals are wonderful and I love our local music and I love living in Austin and don't take anything I'm saying as being negative to that because it's not. And the 700 emails that I've received in my office over the last couple of days which I'm sure y'all have done too. But there does become size constraints. And expand, expand, expand both the amount of land and the time factor that it's closed to the Austin public

[11:53:58 AM]

I think are huge concerns. So social security R. Having said that I do want to see our task force talking about Numbers and where there are opportunities for large festivals to be. The second issue that is to me as much if not more of an issue that we've talked about already is the parking. The settlement home which is in councilmember Casar's district provides a really good service in Austin and they have been using that facility, the coliseum before and now the events center, for probably 30 plus years. They pay for the parking garage during the 30 days that they are there and last year because of the volume of people down there for the fun, fun, fun fest there were people posting on all social media for people not to come because it was impossible to find a parking spot. So my question is as we discuss allowing this festival that is so huge and it's sounding like it's 20,000 people a day, what have we asked the organizers to do about parking and transportation? Because what was happening last year is people got wind of the fact that if they told the parking garage they were going to the garage sale they parked in the garage and they had no intention of going to the garage sale, they were going to the festival. And that shut down the parking that the settlement club paid for to have, and I think if we approve this that the festival needs to come to the city with their plan for transporting people because you cannot park that many cars. And it is not fair to the settlement home that has been there for so many years that pays for that parking garage to have people parking that are going to the festival. So if it is not part of the plan and has not been part of the discussion I think it needs to be before Thursday because I would be very hesitant to vote for something that does not have a transportation plan for 20,000 people. >>

Councilmember, may I have Jason speak to the transportation issue? >> Councilmember, both of those action items first off are going to be some of the first things we take up with the task force and are

[11:55:59 AM]

specific items this council as put as tasks for the task force both in size and location. So message received. We did have two meetings with the settlement home, the long center, palmer events center and the opera over the last few weeks and that was a topic of discussion of how some of the viral media can negatively affect what is perceived or even in reality happening in an area. So we've made some adjustments on our end. We're going to be making some adjustments on the settlement home's end at the garage to kind of take care of some of that. We will need to do a little more work on it as we get closer, but a parking plan and shuttling will be a component that is required of the festival and we'll need to figure out how to attack some of that viral media and see if we can enforce removing those kind of things that go out like that that may or may not be true and anyone can put that out there into the

universe. >> Gallo: They were true. I disagree with you. There were people driving around for two hours trying to find a parking space. It's not people putting wrong information out. People wanted to be there. And also the other issue is they have to park close because obviously the settlement club wants them to buy as much as they can. And it's difficult to carry furniture down blocks. So I guess my question is when you -- when we talk about a festival that's going to produce the number of people you're talking about, I think that the festival needs to have a transportation plan in place and I'm hoping that we will be presented with that by Thursday. >> And it does. Would you please just speak to the main requirements for the transportation? >> Sure. The main requirements are shuttles and designation of off site parking that includes a messaging plan of the festival. And we have received a portion of that of course is not all fleshed out at this point, but as part of those last two meetings, the festival at their expense is going to be deploying additional messaging boards throughout the city as you come in to the festival area that direct the patrons for the festival away from the site. We haven't picked the final locations for those yet because we want to get additional input from both the opera and settlement home on an agreed location on where those may serve the

[11:58:00 AM]

attendees best in terms of messaging, but we've already received that commitment from the festival to add additional message boards in addition to the ones they've already committed to in the area to help with that. Directional information. >> Gallo: Okay. So will we have that specific plan that talks about shuttles and remote parking and contacts and all of that? >> We can have that to you before Thursday. >> Gallo: Okay. And I don't know what arrangements -- the settlement club members will be here on Thursday. They're really concerned about it, and I think they should be. It's a lot of pressure in an area and this is a good function. And I don't know what the city can do with helping to monitor the garage more, but it -- it's a lot of people in a small amount of area with limited parking. Thank you. Thank you for your help with that. Just answer some of the

[12:13:49 PM]

>> Casar: I appreciate us having event. I really did try to hone in on one very specific issue, which is giving staff the flexibility to negotiate using a section of the dog park to relief some of the issues we have to deal with with bigger policy problems. In my conversations, for example, with the settlement home folks, one of the biggest priorities was keeping the roundabout open and in order to do so it seems like the easiest solution just for this year for this one occasion, where we really do have a moving target is to grant that level of flexibility and so I hope that council on Thursday really -- we can hone in on the very specifics of this year because it really is a moving target. You know, and in conversations with our city staff just recently the conversation was that the bollards couldn't be moved and that was communicated to me by city staff and that's changed and that's okay. That just shows you how much of a moving target this particular year is, where we're wrapping up renovations just a few months before a festival that's already been planned and scheduled. We may not like it that three events were all scheduled on one weekend and I'm sure our staff doesn't love it either but this is sort of what we're tasked with dealing with and my hope is that this resolution will get us through the next few months. Will help address those issues and is T does not mandate that the festival occur in any particular way. It's up to staff to negotiate it. If people aren't providing adequate transportation, if it's not safe, not right, it just won't happen. I'm just trying to grant and I think council should grant staff flexibility to get us through this awkward year, and I really look forward to participating in those bigger conversations because very well we may not be able to continue having this festival or events in that newly renovated space. But this year I do have some sympathy, considering our close we how close we are to all these

events happening and the awkward position everyone is in >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Next item is number 44.

[12:15:50 PM]

I pulled this item, as did councilmember Renteria. It seems to me that this is an item that should be considered as part of the budget conversations because at that point we'll be able to understand what the priorities are, the relative priorities, how much money we have or don't have. And a conversation like this isolated from the rest doesn't make sense to me. I was pulling it to say I was going to postpone or pull this for the rest of the conversation >> Zimmerman: Tell me more about that, when the budget amendments come up, do you envision a particular meeting for it? >> Mayor Adler: There's a question councilmember kitchen asked earlier. Manager can you talk to us or someone? How do we -- we have a briefing that comes up next Tuesday and Monday, Wednesday, whatever the days were, there were two days next week. We were keeping potential a few hours open the following week for briefings. At what point do we actually start making budget amendments to be discussed? Ms. Kitchen, do you want to elaborate >> Kitchen: I also would suggest we have a couple of public hearings if would seem to make sense to me that all of us or a lot of us will have things that we bring to consideration -- for consideration for everyone and so it seems to me that we might best do that after the briefings and after the public hearings. Now what I don't understand, if that means that's one meeting that we devote to this or if it's a series of meetings or what. And so I think it would help us all to understand the date, the date to shoot for, I guess. >> Okay. Well, you -- if you'll recall the schedule that the cfo and ed presented, there are a couple of dates scheduled, where you're going to be receiving presentations from the various departments. And certainly, at any point during those presentations and your deliberations regarding

[12:17:51 PM]

what they're saying is an opportunity for you to make decisions or arrive at consensus regarding various issues pertaining to the budget in addition to those two days you talked about an additional two days where you would be deliberating and possibly even hearing from departments that are not part of those that we listed during the initial presentation last week. And as with previous councils, there have been days subsequent to the dates that I'm referring to and public hearings where council has used most of a day to talk about a range of issues and make a range of decisions, including things like there is a -- there are a lot of things that y'all generated over time per, by and large, ifcs, certainly an opportunity to consider all of those in aggregate based upon how y'all might prioritize and what you might choose to seek means -- a means to -- you know, to fund things that currently are not part of the budget recommendation. I am going to be having here soon, in the next day or so, some conversation with my budget team. I see ed standing in the back and our cfo to map out, I think, process and method by which we would suggest that you get at just what you're talking about now. So we'll be prepared to talk about that. Ed, do you want to approaches? Please. We'll be prepared to talk about that soon either by making some sort of verbal presentation or we might provide our suggestion to you in writing of some sort. >> Kitchen: Well, my question is much more specific than that. My question is simply -- I think if I'm remembering correctly, we are slated to adopt the budget on

[12:19:51 PM]

September 10, I think. >> Mayor Adler: Eighth. >> Kitchen: So the question is, does that mean we have a -- do we, as a group, want to take a council meeting prior to September 10 to -- for us to present our

resolutions and make changes? Or are we -- you know, it steams me we may not -- it seems to me we may not want to wait until the drop-dead date. >> I think I was saying yes. My description in how that's occurred in the past, there has been a date prior to the three days set aside in September for adoption of budget so I was saying window that but also acknowledging what's already on the schedule in terms of a couple of days during which department heads will be making their presentation, that nothing precludes you from -- you know, from -- in the course that have making decisions as well. We've also talked about two additional dates in case y'all need them. Those are all prior to budget adoption dates and you certainly can have a date prior to budget adoption that's just focused on what you're talking about. >> Kitchen: , Yeah, I'm talking about a date to vote. I'm not talking about the briefings. >> Mayor Adler: Right. >> Kitchen: That's very helpful, thank you. >> Mayor Adler: We have a public Thursday. Thursday we'll be setting the budget date for the public hearing. Historically, how much time is spent receiving public testimony at that stage? >> I'd say those public hearings typically last from, you know, maybe 30 minutes to as many as three hours. They vary tremendously. >> They vary. >> Mayor Adler: Gnaw would seem. >> Zimmerman: So let me back up. We were presented a forecast budget, April time frame, okay? There were no public hearings that I'm aware of that went into the 3% proposed pay increase. I don't recall any public hearings, no deliberation. It just showed up on the forecasted budget. We came back -- my office came back and we put a resolution

[12:21:52 PM]

in in may, in may. We suggested that, hey, this 3% was produced, I guess, by staff. No public input. So we proposed a conversation on it starting back in may, okay? So here we are in August, and the date for adoption, right, is, as councilmember kitchen points out, that date is rapidly approaching. And what we've had in the interim, in my view, is hours and hours and hours already of 1-sided input from staff. We need this, we need this, we need this. So what I'm concerned is this whole process -- you know, the 3% pay increase, it appears like magic, like that. There it is. And now we've received months of justification and one-sided input. There's no conversation, no deliberation. So I really don't want this problem postponed. I think this conversation -- don't want this to be postponed. I think this conversation should have happened back in may or June. I'd really appreciate it if our council would entertain this on Thursday. Let's at least talk about this one issue. Let's go ahead and start the conversation now. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Tovo? >> Tovo: I was just -- >> Kitchen: I was just going to respond that I agree with councilmember Zimmerman that we need to get to issues sooner rather than later, but my preference would be to do them not in isolation. So this is certainly a proposal that I'm looking forward to discussing, but I want to understand what other proposals people will have also. So I'm trying to find out if there's some way that we can -- that we can have on the table the proposals that people are going to bring so we can look at them in the context of the whole budget. >> Mayor Adler: And I think we do. Talk us to about the schedule and how that lays out. Where is the opportunity for the council to review and discuss proposals and resolutions, suggestions from the council with respect to changes to the budget? >> The short answer to that is on September 1. We have a work session,

[12:23:52 PM]

full-day work session on September 1 that we call a prebudget adoption work session and the intent of that work session would be to gather all the input we've heard from council so far in the process, so whether it be things like this wage discussion or benefits for temporary employees or any other number of council initiatives that you're wanting to discuss as potentially getting addressed in this budget, staff would compile all that information and have a booklet to put together, say these are all the issues that, as we understand, it are on the table and the intent of the September 1 work session is to give council

an opportunity to discuss all those priorities so that on September 8 staff can come back with recommended options, pathways for council to achieve your goals in the budget process. You know, the actual amendments and changes that you would be making to the city manager's budget recommendation occur on September 8 as part of the budget adoption, right? The first part of that process will be to actually make a motion to adopt the city manager's budget recommendation and from there there will be a whole litany of recommended amendments to that proposal. But I think that, you know, the day to really -- as the manager said, any time from today all the way up to September 1, but on September 1 we have a full-day work session, to say here's everything we've heard from council so far, all these different proposals, what they would cost or save, vis-a-vis the budget. And then staff will do our work to try to help you find ways to achieve the changes to the budget that you would like to see made. >> Mayor Adler: Do you know how large the -- how large the agenda is right now on Thursday the 27th? Regular council meeting. >> Do you have any idea, rey? You have to come up. We can't hear you.

[12:25:55 PM]

>> [Off mic] >> So for the 27th, what we have is starting at 9:00 is going to be an Austin energy public utility oversight committee meeting starting at 9:00 and then at 11:00 we'll have the tax rate hearing starting at 11:00. That's pretty much what we had for that day. As for the agenda, I believe that is pretty much the only item. I don't know of any other items on that agenda. >> Mayor Adler: Is it possible to earmark that afternoon for budget conversations? Not briefings but discussions about priorities and hearing resolutions? I'm just trying to back us up a little bit and give us more time to be able to have things maybe to -- >> Absolutely, if that's what the council wishes to do, we can certainly do that. >> Mayor Adler: Can you come back to us on Thursday and lay out for us between now and the budget time, ed, where there would be opportunities for us to be able to engage in conversation and when we have the question of the setting the public hearing to receive public comment on that budget, which is item 59, will you be able to put that date into context? In other words, on Thursday you would lay out for us what our options are in terms of where there are additional time periods? >> In relation to item 59, setting a public hearing? >> Mayor Adler: I'm using that as the vehicle on the agenda for us to be able to discuss that. >> Mayor Adler: Because that gives me a context to decide whether or not I want to set that hearing on the 20th or some other day. So I want to know whether I'm setting it on 20 or another day. In order for me to do that I need to know when my available budget periods are going to be able to be for the council. >> So I think, certainly, that ed can provide some written guidance between now and Thursday. I think the notices have gone out publicly about setting public hearing. So, I mean, is that correct?

[12:27:57 PM]

About setting the public hearing, have the notices gone out? There may not be quite as much flexibility, but we can check that. We'll be careful about the context and the posting we've got for setting the public hearing. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. I think that would be helpful. >> We can get something out today in writing to council about the dates as you discussed. >> Mayor Adler: And available opportunities. So take a look at the calendar between now and September 3 and tell us what the available opportunities are. >> And I do think that the 27th council meeting is just a regular council meeting. And we don't have the agenda set yet, but we can look at that also and provide that information. >> Mayor Adler: That would be helpful. Because that's an opportunity people haven't blocked on the calendar and if there's not, otherwise -- if there's not an otherwise big agenda that week that doesn't have things would need to go that week, that would provide us an opportunity to be able to do that. >> We'll do that. >> Renteria: Yes. I also want to know the difference between the savings to the general fund, what

department -- you know, because we've got revenue and comprise -- enterprise type but I want to see what kind of savings really applies to the general fund also. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ms. Tovo. >> Tovo: I would say, too,, I appreciate -- I think that's a really good question. I would say, too,, doing it in the context of the budget proper allows us to submit those questions through the budget q&a process and get those answers back and which them in the context of any other proposals that -- pardon me that, there might be with regard to wages. I was interested, too, and will submit it, I guess through this week' q&a process, in the event that there is an interest in considering it on Thursday, but I'm interested, too, in looking at some of those -- some of those salary levels and asking staff to do calculations of what -- what those employees are going to experience in terms of increased costs related to their health plans. I know we had some discussion about that at our meeting last

[12:29:57 PM]

week, that employees will all be facing increased health costs for dependents who are on their health insurance. And so for those employees who are at -- you know, they're not making \$100,000 or more but they are also -- with this proposal would not be experiencing 3% increase, their costs from the health insurance plan are going to be considerable. And so I just want to get a sense of what those -- what those individuals' financial picture is going to look like if this proposal went through, in addition to the anticipated increase in healthcare. >> Mayor Adler: Good question. >> Tovo: I hope that means it was presence comprehensible. If I can put that in words I'm going to try to figure it out to do it through the q&a. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Kitchen. >> Kitchen: Just going back to the time line, thanks for providing that. I just want to make sure that we're clear. I'm interested in understanding the date on which we can review actual resolution language. So I appreciate councilmember Zimmerman and the cosponsors bringing forward language for us to consider now. So I think we need time to do that, as well as the briefings that we've had. Because when it comes right down to it, that's what we're going to be voting on. So I don't know that I want to have one day to see -- you know, one council day to see and vote on those. So I'd like to build in some time so that what we're talking about the proposals that people are bringing forward, we're talking about specific language. So. . . >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool? >> Pool: I guess I got lot of a little bit in the conversation. Are you saying, councilmember kitchen, that there will be other proposals for wage increases other than the 3%? The resolution that was offered by Mr. Zimmerman?

[12:31:58 PM]

>> Kitchen: No. I'm talking about -- to me, what I'm -- from my perspective, when I'm voting on the budget, I'm look agent all the pluses and minuses. So, in other words, I'm -- because at the end of the day, we're talking about what we're charging people from a -- you know, what people will be paying from a tax rate perspective. And that's -- from my perspective, that's important to me. So I'm going to want to understand the proposals that are going forward, that will end up with some savings, and those that are going forward that may end up costing more. Because it's a -- you know, a balancing, to me. So I don't want to talk about things in isolation. That's what I mean. >> Pool: I get you. And I agree with that entirely. And I also will be asking for staff to bring a number along the lines of what the mayor pro tem is saying. If indeed we will be raising, by \$600 a year, I think it is, right? >> Tovo: I think so. >> Pool: Give or take? The cost of insurance, I want to make sure that the raise that we do grant takes into consideration that, so that if it's a 3% or if it's a 5% for it's a .0801%, that that doesn't get eaten up by the \$600. Because that%, that number is a percentage in the salary, which is a smaller percent for peopling who earn more and larger for people who earn less. >> Mayor Adler: Then the other question -- >> Pool: In other words, so for me the raise should be a hold harmless over what additional costs are coming out of

the salary. I don't want it simply to offset what additional increases staff -- because -- and I will take this additional step, because my colleague to my right is sighing and evidencing extreme exasperation. >> Zimmerman: Correct.

[12:33:58 PM]

[Laughter] >> Pool: Because, on my left -- [laughter] >> Pool: Because -- at a 90-degree angle. Because these folks are subject to extreme affordability concerns, and we've -- you know, we've said this and I've said it multiple times in the last few months. Had we talk about affordability, we got to be thinking about our staff. We got to be making sure that they can afford to continue to live in Austin. >> Mayor Adler: As you're looking at the calendar -- and I -- having not gone through the process yet I'm not sure I clearly understand. But if the design is to have us talking about things that we would want to do on the first and then you're going 2002 figure out what the financial implications of those things are, and then we learn about those things on the eighth, that's not enough time, I think, for me to be able to get those things and then to be able to set relative priorities. So I'm trying to move it up a little bit so that you hear all of the things that people might want to do so that you can put Numbers on those. >> Mm-hmm. >> Mayor Adler: And so we can have that information well before we're actually picking things. So a week before or several days before. I don't know how that process works. >> Right. Well, we understand. I'll be meeting with ed and the other financial team today. He'll see if we can get that figured out and get back to you in the next day or two. >> Mayor Adler: That sounds good. Ms. Kitchen. >> Kitchen: One last thing. Since we're talking about some of our questions about the resolution that councilmember Zimmerman brought forward -- and, again, I appreciate you bringing it forward at this point so we can consider it. I'm also interested in the trade-offs that we've made. I'd like to understand. I know we still have some blow -market-rate employees, and so I'll be submitting questions to ask about that. I'm also concerned about pay equity. To me I wouldn't want to be

[12:35:59 PM]

giving across the board 3% pay raises at the expense of folks that should be raised either because of pay equity issues or because of market rate-rate -- historical market-rate issues. So I'm also balancing that. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Next item that we have on the agenda is 45. Membership on the task force. Ms. Troxclair, you pulled that. >> Troxclair: Yeah, thank you. I was just going to ask. I've seen a couple of e-mails from people who were asking why east Austin wasn't represented on the low income consumer advisory decisive thought it was worth having a discussion about as a council. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Gallo. >> Gallo: When we looked at this -- I'm a cosponsor and glad to be. We've been doing important work and we need to certainly give them the time to finish. One of the things that became readily apparent as we were looking at the membership and how the committee was made up, the task force was made up, is there was no representation from any of the districts east of I-35. My thought would be at this point, even if there is a termination date when the project is complete in October, that I would really like to give the districts that don't have representation on that task force the ability to appoint someone, even if it's for a very short period of time, so that we do get that representation. Because I think it's really important, and we've tried to do that with all the other committees and boards and commissions and task forces. So I would kind of turn that over to those districts, but would be happy to support any amendment to the resolution

[12:38:00 PM]

that might address adding to, not substituting, but adding to the low-income task force representation

from the districts that are currently not represented. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Tovo. >> Tovo: I just -- as the -
- so I -- sponsored the original task force that created the loan consumer advisory task force and I have
those resolutions I'll distribute in a examine sponsor on this. I wanted to provide context. This is a group
that's been meeting. It's been meeting -- it was created last August, and it's been meeting since
November, and they've already complete aid draft report. They're actually more or less finished with
their work. But because of the -- because of the various transitions and the way in which we set up the
boards and commissions resolution, it's my understanding that staff are of the belief that this task force
should be appointed -- reappointed to be in accordance with our rules. So that would mean that every
one of us would then appoint a member to this task force, the rmc and the -- I've done it twice in two
days, councilmember Houston. The resource commission and the electric utility commission would then
make new appointments. So I think in the interest of efficiency, in the interest of recognizing the original
mission and the original intent of this group, we need to allow the group that was appointed that's been
working on this to just wrap up their work. I understand the concerns inspect was a group that was --
constituted -- was described as needing to represent a broad cross-section of the community, including
nonprofit organizations, utility consumer advocates, members of the faith community and contractors
and we've got two people who work in the field. We've got somebody who is a legal representative of
low-income folks. We've got Dan Pruitt. So it is a diverse group I think in terms of expertise.

[12:40:00 PM]

It's not a diverse group in terms of geographic representation. We do not have somebody from each
district. I would propose that -- I'm going to do a little thinking in talking with my sponsors between here
and Thursday. Given they already have a draft report, perhaps instead of bringing forward a resolution
that says the existing membership can stay the membership and we'll let them finish their work, we'll
just ask them to finish their draft report or submit it as-is. I think it would be disruptive to their work to
start reconstituting that group with new membership when they've basically completed it. They just
haven't finalized those recommendations but I've got a draft report in my office so they've gotten to
that stage and I believe should be allowed to complete their report. I know there may be some concerns
about whether -- whether all of the recommendations are going to make it into that report, and it's my
understanding that every task force in our -- has the ability to submit a minority report so I know we did
hear a presentation from one of the members who felt his recommendation -- well, I don't want to
speak for him. But if there's a concern that his recommendations will not have made it into the draft
report, I would welcome that member or anybody else to submit a minority report in addition to that
draft report, if they feel like the draft report doesn't capture their -- their ideas. >> Mayor Adler: Okay.
>> Tovo: So I guess I would submit that to y'all for your consideration. We can contemplate this
resolution on Thursday or we can just ask that group take another week or two, wrap up your report,
finalize it, but I don't think it makes good sense to do what the alternative is, which is to have each one
of us then reappoint -- you know, make new appointments to a group that's finished, basically, nearly
finished. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Renter. >> Renteria: Yes, mayor. And I agree with you also. You know, it's -
- I was discussion this with my staff, and they basically informed me

[12:42:01 PM]

that, you know, the whole report, it's just about finished up. And I felt like, you know, it wasn't worth
the effort to go out and get someone and have them just sit there one meeting or the max two and try
to catch up to what has been discussed for a whole year. So I -- if we do, in the future, expand or -- you
know, continue their time -- expand their time, you know, I would want to have one of my
representatives on there. But I think that it's only fair that we should just allow them to go ahead and

finish and submit that report to us without us having to go out and appoint someone. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston and Ms. Garza? >> Houston: First of all, I want to thank the sponsors of the resolution for at least acknowledging that the low-income consumer advisory task force was fairly exclusive and not inclusive of people. And so I'm -- I just -- once they complete their report, is there no further need for a low-income consumer advisory task force? Because what I heard was that there were providers of services. Didn't hear a whole lot of consumers of services on there. So if we think that this is it and we'll never in the next four years have to have a low-income consumer advisory task force, then I guess I'm fine with it ending a natural kind of end and not reappointing it. But if we think that we're going to have to do this again, then I think maybe -- you know, if this is something that's going to guide our decisions on -- something is going on out there. [Sirens] If this is going to guide our decisions on how people are

[12:44:01 PM]

able to live in this community, then I think maybe we need to rethink maybe ending this process and then providing an opportunity for that to continue. But I'm not here -- I mean, I don't know. I wasn't here when it was developed. So I'm fine with it ending, but if we're going to need their work again, then maybe that's something we should considerate a later time. >> Mayor Adler: And you said, Ms. Tovo there, was thoughts about continuing the committee and having reappointments made after the report is in? >> Tovo: What happened was, because of the timing situation, it's my understanding that's what city legal felt needed to happen since the boards and commission ordinance says that the new council is going to make appointments to our existing boards. So it just got caught up in a -- it got caught up in this shift. Because that boards and commissions didn't really make exceptions for short-term task forces that might be going on and might not have concluded their work. So the only option is to fall back on the boards and commissions transition resolution, which said every new councilmember gets to appoint a new person by July. You know, what I'm saying? But this was a -- and I'm passing out the original resolution. Councilmember Houston, you raise a really good point and I think that this group really was tasked with looking at the generation plan and looking in particular at our energy efficiency goals and looking at how well our energy-efficiency programs work for low-income individuals. And how we could better -- better shift those programs to really make sure that we are offering energy-efficiency programs that ratepayers can use, even if they are not property owners, if they are low-income, what are some options for them making use of those energy-efficiency

[12:46:01 PM]

programs. So it was a pretty specific, pretty narrowly focused task and I don't believe we need that group on an ongoing basis. They were really looking at our document, looking at our energy-efficiency goals and making recommendation to us for program changes for potentially increasing our energy-efficiency goals and I think once we have those recommendations we'll be in a position to act on them or not. Austin nearing does have at least one group, maybe two, that advise it's on an informal basis about issues related to low-income ratepayers, but we don't make appointments. Those are social service providers -- providers and others who get together with Austin energy people and I think they are sort of serving in the function that it's -- in a more advisory function but this was a pretty focused, look at our energy efficiency goals, look at our programs, based on your experience working with low-income individuals or your experience in the industry doing energy efficiency improvements, make some recommendations about changes we might want to look at. >> Houston: Thank you for that additional information. I remember when they mas a presentation, and my question to them then was, where are your low-income consumers? Where are they? They're not represented on this task force. And when you talk about the advisory committees for Austin energy, we still name nonprofits or for-profit entities

and we still don't have a consumers -- the consumers' input. So that's critical to me, the end user. We can speak for people, but it's more helpful to have people on those committees to speak for themselves. And so that's what I'm getting at. >> Tovo: I agree. And it was in the resolution to have consumers, but we did end up with membership of individuals who are speaking for consumers. You're absolutely right.

[12:48:02 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Ms. Garza? >> Garza: Yeah. I just want -- I appreciate the concern for the geographic representation, but I hope, mayor pro tem, that you don't change it. I support it as-is, and I don't want them to rush. My -- if the report is indeed almost done, I wouldn't want them to rush it. I don't think that's the alternative, to just say just turn in what you have now. Because I do believe that the people appointed to this task force are advocates for the -- the chair and vice chair are people who have spoken to my office several times, speaking for the consumers. So I'm going to support it as-is. I hope this doesn't cause you to change the language of it as it's written. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else on this? We'll go to the next item, then, item 51. The bull hook issue with the elephants. >> [Off mic] They're coming. They were in the bullpen. So -- >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> No pun intended, that's right. >> Zimmerman: You don't need a [indiscernible] To get them out, do you? >> No no. I might, though. >> Good afternoon, mayor, council, Aaron called, Caldwell, acting dispute chief, animal services. >> Mayor Adler: What? >> [Off mic] >> Mayor Adler: Zimmerman, I did, and you did as well. >> Houston: So I'll let you guys go first is. >> Mayor Adler: I'm looking at this issue. Putting aside for a second whether I believe in animals at circuses at all and putting aside the debate on this particular instrument and how it's used, I think there are some cities that have stepped out and moved forward on

[12:50:03 PM]

banning this tool. I think most principally of Los Angeles and Oakland that have done that, they've both done it in a way that it happens after two years, so that the current contracts that they have, I think, are resolved? My understanding is at that point in time the circus that's going to be in town, in Austin in two weeks is voluntarily moving past the practice of having elephants in circuses, which I think is a good thing. So I was just looking at the Oakland and the Los Angeles as the -- how that's been resolved in other cities and just wanted to point that out and it's something that I'm considering. Mr. Zimmerman. >> Zimmerman: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I concur on those remarks. We also looked at the situation. It looks like the circuses are going to be ending the practice of bringing elephants, which I guess is too bad, but if those tools are not allowed to be used, the elephants become, you know, a danger to try to control. Elephants are very, very powerful animals and so maybe in terms of safety, I agree with you. The circuses are saying, well, let's just stop the practice, but I definitely don't want to see the elephants canceled this year because of -- if they can't bring this instrument, they're concerned about, you know, the training of the elephants that have been used to this tool. If they can't use it, they probably can't bring the elephants. I don't know where they would park them no not allow them to come into Austin. So definitely I can't support this resolution as written, but I could support a date that's consistent with what's being done in California, the schedule of not having the elephants in the future. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston? >> Houston: Thank you. I've been really clear about this, that the members of my

[12:52:05 PM]

community will be able -- will not be able to see a pack pacaderm live, if this is instituted and the effective date is before the Kirk cuss gets here in August. I have no problems with moving it two years out because ring willing ringling brothers is in fact going to remox all elephants from the traveling Kirk

cuss. But it's, again, for me an equity issue. My kids with see things in books but are not allowed to see them up close and personal. And so the paciderms are the largest creator except maybe the whale that they will ever be able to see and by saying they can't use this instrument to help guide and move them around our city, I'm not going to be able to support that. I can support it, but I -- I will be offering an amendment on Thursday to change some of the language, specifically in the area of 3.27. I've asked the animal services department to check to see if any of these things outline have ever been done in Austin. They're all over our e-mails today. They're all over everything. And I'd like to talk about more humane approaches to caring for animals. It will include not using the bull hook at some point in the future, but Austin is more about values than about this negative stuff that rouses people's emotions. It's never happened in our city. So I'll be offering some more humane language too talk about what our values are as a city and how we want to treat animals rather than delineating these things that I don't know where they came from, there's no documentation to say where it came from, it's not anything that we've found here in Austin. So I'll support an amendment, and I will -- I'll be offering an amendment and then I will also support moving it a couple years out.

[12:54:05 PM]

So my kids get a chance to see them this time. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ms. Gallo and then Ms. Pool. >> Gallo: Thank you for your comments there. I grew up riding and training 1200-pound horses, and what I find it's not the tools tools necessarily the problem in training the animals it's the people using the tools and using them inappropriately and in wrong ways. I think what was interesting in researching this was that the American veterinarian association, medical association, did not oppose this. And, once again, I think, as you pointed out, we need to be very careful about banning things that it's really not the tool or the instrument. It's how the train ser using it and -- train ser using it and the -- trainer is using it and the penalties should be substantial enough to keep that from happening. So. . . >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else? Ms. Pool. >> Pool: I'd like to recognize -- is that Ms. Hammond? Our new animal services director. Would you like to take a moment just to speak to this? I would note while it's true the American veterinarian association has said it's how the tools are used, not so much the tools, but there's a long list of other credible organizations who are asking us to do the ban. I haven't decided yet how I'm going to vote on this, but I am truly and fundamentally concerned over the fact that we bring wild animals from their natural environment over to put them in a Kirk cuss or zoo -- circus. There's aspects that feel wrong to me. As a kid I went to zoos and circuses circuses and I took my departure she came to me as a 7-year-old and said it felt wrong to her. So welcome, Ms. Hammond. >> Thank you.

[12:56:06 PM]

Good to be with you all. As you know I started June 15 and had personal boys take care of but it's very good to be -- I was actually home sick from Austin when I was back trying to get my house back on the market. Good sign. Thank you. I cannot speak extensively about the subject. I'm not totally familiar with it. I haven't been immersed in it. Mr. Aaron Caldwell, the acting deputy has a better background and also I believe Kerry in legal, forgive me, I don't have your last name, Ker where I hry, on terry. I know it's an issue of legality, if it's. Some interesting points have been made, I think, something you bring up an excellent point about the humane treatment of animals. I think it's very emotional for people. Animals get us right in the heart and our backgrounds, in our memories, talking about children and family members having close proximity to magnificent creators. Then there's the debate about zoo versus circus and confinement and natural habitat and how to enjoy and learn about animals. So it's complex. The only thing I would offer -- and I would defer to the city legal department on this and Mr. Caldwell, who has been following this much more closely in my absence as I transition from Virginia to Austin, is

it's the -- the concern I think here is the use of the tool. They are magnificent, large creators. Just like with equestrian, how these tools are used has been controversial because not all animal caretakers and companies and jurisdictions are the same. And I think insisting on humane treatment of animals while they're in city limits is certainly reasonable, that they're not maltreated beaten our hurt. There's ways to train animals, no matter what we're talking about. There are examples from other places that have come to light recently on how animals are

[12:58:07 PM]

treated and in confinement or captivity. That's all I have to offer. Aaron might be able to be more specific, as well as Kerry. Thank you. It's good to be here. >> Mayor Adler: It's good to have you here. >> Thank you. >> Pool: Aaron, if you might be able to help us. >> Yes. The issue with this onus will be for us is one of enforcement. Meaning if the circus is held on UT property, the UT department would be responsible for enforcing that. We wouldn't have jurisdiction to do so. If it does pass, we have to make an agreement making sure they know they're responsible for making sure the tools are being used properly in our venue and I don't think that's one we discussed or vetted. That would be one of the main concerns I'd like to put forward to the council. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Tovo. >> Tovo: I'd like to ask if we want to discuss that if we can talk about that in executive session on Thursday faction there's an interest in talking about what our legal ability is to enforce this vis-a-vis UT. I'd like to also tell my colleagues, I'm not going to talk long about it, I think we've had a conversation going on in our community for many years, actually, and there's been several resolutions coming forward from our animal advisory committee asking us to take this action, as the mayor said. Other communities across the country have banned the use of bull hooks within their limits. The one mentioned, la's ban takes effect in 2017, so about a year in advance of the one main circus, one of the major circuses incident to phase out their elephants I think is in 2018. L.a.'s ordinance takes effect in 2017. I believe their -- I understand the interest in not having this take effect immediately, when the circus is coming to town in two weeks. But I would urge my colleagues to think about a date that is not -- is not years out. I believe this has been a community interest. I think we have exhibited in

[1:00:09 PM]

many ways, many policies we've adopted an interest in -- a community value, a real community value of protecting animals within our limits and there's a lot of evidence, and I know we're all getting lots of e-mails and videos and other information. So I don't need to recap it but there's a great deal of discussion out there about the fact that elephants, there are many ways of interacting with elephants, and the use of the bull hook is one that people feel is necessary to do training, but there are a lot of examples out there of ways in which that has been use inhumanely, and I believe there's a very valid argument that many make and I agree with them, that wild animals such as elephants should not be -- or do not exist for the pleasure of entertaining people. And that there are other methods out there of interacting with animals the use of positive reinforcement, paired with food, treats and protective element within the trainers, but there again I think we may have philosophical differences, I don't need to go on and on about it, because we're getting a lot of literature. I do believe this is an action that we should take, reflective of the values of the values that we hold, I will be meeting or my staff will be meeting from representatives of U.T. About what existing contracts they have with the circus, with the construction going on. At the Erwin center. I'm not sure that it would -- that they have a contract extending beyond this year with the circus. But we'll get details for you for Thursday. Again, I would urge my colleagues if you are interested in putting a date in there, not to push it out to 2017 or 2018, but perhaps we could all agree on 2016 at least. This is a long time coming. The circuses themselves know this change is coming

and I think that gives everyone appropriate notice.

[1:02:09 PM]

>> Houston: Thank you all for your comments. This -- this afternoon now. You've got two things to share. One is that the community values that you speak of were -- were perhaps community values that a certain group of people decided were the community values for the city. Nobody likes animals to be harmed. Cats, dogs, rats, hamsters, snakes, people have snakes and stuff. I would like them to be harmed, but -- [laughter]. But again we're a compassionate community, so in general we don't want people to be harmed. Some of the policies that have been put in place did not include everybody. And so now that we have a larger representation. It behooves us to consider what -- what impacts the decisions that we make have on people that were not a part of that original conversation. Second thing is that I have many people from India who live in my district and when they get married they use elephants. That's part of their tradition, that's part of their culture. I'm now getting emails from people saying no animals come into Austin. First it was just circus elephants, now I'm getting emails, massive amounts of emails about no elephant. I can't do that because that deprives a culture of -- of the use of an elephant in ceremonial activities, especially weddings. And so, you know, I'm willing to give some on circus elephants but I'm not willing to give up on that cultural significance of elephants to a different community than we are representing here. >> Tovo: I appreciate those points, councilmember Houston. It's my understanding that the ordinance as written does not -- applies strictly to elephants in circuses. There have been calls to

[1:04:09 PM]

expand that. I think the original recommendation that came from from the animal advisory committee was broader, traveling shows and exhibitions and circuses, I may have that language a little wrong. But even if we expanded it to traveling shows, I don't believe it would capture elephants that are used within wedding ceremonies, though I'm not certain about that. We have made inquiries and will continue to do so to get a sense of how many elephants, how often it is that elephants are used within wedding ceremonies within the city of Austin. But again the ordinance before us does not, would not prohibit the use of elephants in wedding ceremonies within the city limits. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Further on this? Last item is item no. 58 pulled by Ms. Gallo. >> Casar: There was 52 as well. >> Mayor Adler: But that was the same item as item -- I'm sorry, 52. I apologize, 52. Mr. Casar. >> Casar: I will be brief, I wanted to alert my colleagues that I'm going to be considering some amendment language to this. I appreciate the transparency in what it is that we're doing, especially the public hearings, but I do think that it's important that we pair what it is that -- that cost of government is and especially the increasing cost of government with what those cost drivers are and what people are getting. You know, when the city manager presents the tax rate to the city council, it comes not just as a tax rate, but what - what the reason is for that specific tax rate and I would want to have, if we're going to do truth in taxation, have truth in transparency so people can have an informed opinion when they come to a public hearing, they can come and bring us as informed of an opinion as

[1:06:10 PM]

possible. Working on some amendment language. I'm not sure what just how prescriptive I would be. I know on the -- this resolution it's pretty prescriptive about exactly what charts and graphs would be there, but I'd want there to be most likely equal space to give some context to those Numbers. You know, the analogy that my staff used for me was, you know, if somebody said you can have dinner for

\$7 or you could have dinner for \$5, most of us would say I will have dinner for \$5, but it would be helpful to understand the difference between the \$7 dinner and the \$5 dinner and why and I think providing that would be helpful. That's the amendment, the gist of the amendment that I will bring, I will try to get it on the message board if I have. Second I think having Numbers to adjust it for inflation. I'm still considering sort of whether that makes sense or not, that's something else that I would want the council to think about between now and Thursday. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Ms. Troxclair. >> Troxclair: I just wants to respond. I appreciate your comments, councilmember Casar. I wanted to make it really clear that the purpose in putting this taxpayer impact statement forward is to give the average austinite a very simple idea of what the actual dollar amount is that they're looking at next year. I mean, it's really not the -- you know, doesn't really have any kind of editorial statements about what should or shouldn't be. It just when we have conversation, it's all -- these are all Numbers, you know that our financial stuff has access to, but it's difficult. I mean I've seen so many different Numbers and figures, even in our discussion this year. I've seen, you know, the states man published that it's -- that the average austinite is going to see -- home owner is going to see a \$40 increase, that doesn't include drainage fees, utility bills. Also the Numbers that are included in our budget, a

[1:08:11 PM]

lot of times -- well, they don't include appreciation, which you know when we're in an economic climate that we are right now in Austin, that is a -- is a significant number that people need to take into account, too. So -- so, you know, I want to credit bill oakie who has been talking about this taxpayer impact statement for a long time and I just thought it was a very simple and easy thing for us to provide to the public. Because I do -- it is confusing. Especially when we talk about the tax rate is going down, not this year, but the tax rate has gone down, but the amount that you owe is going up, but this year there have been statements made that the tax rate is going up, but it's the dollar amount is going to be lower than what you would have owed for a typical homeowner if the tax rate had been lower and we hadn't had the homestead exemption. It just really confusing. So the bottom line is I wanted something very simple for someone to say I'm an average person in Austin, I can look up quickly what my home value is. I can see what I can expect in dollar Numbers when it comes to other fees and city-related utilities, okay, great, I'm looking at about \$250 next year, I need to budget appropriately for that. That was really kind of the main. So I would be happy to talk to you more and I certainly want to work with your office on your idea. But my concern would be then you get into, well, what cost drivers do you include, what don't you include. I mean, obviously the budget is an immense amount of information that it's difficult for all of us to understand. Especially then when we get into support services, general fund versus enterprise fund, all of these other things. I just the purpose of this was to provide something really clear and simple. So I really want to make sure that we don't convolute that too much with any changes. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Kitchen? >> Kitchen: I would echo that. The purpose is just so people can understand. Because it's very confusing

[1:10:12 PM]

what a tax rate is and how it relates to the rise in property values. You know, maybe you could think in terms of a simple statement or two on it that can then refer people to other documents, maybe something like that. I wouldn't have any issues with it as long as it was simple enough, you know, because I think, again, that the purpose of this, it's something that's been proposed for a while now is just to -- to simply bring that information together in one place so someone can go, oh, that's what effective tax rate means. That's what -- I mean, it has definitions on it, too. So anyway that's the purpose. >> Casar: I think that I appreciate the simplicity of it. I think that if the goal is to have -- help

people budget for their taxes, then perhaps it should be really after we -- after we determine the tax rate and set a budget. So if it seems to me from reading the resolution that it's really about public engagement and the budget process because it's to be published before we determine a budget. If it's to be about public engagement, I want to give both sides or all different sides of the story, because I think that when you have just the year over year of how much the cost of government is, people would want to -- would want the other side of that information to say well what is the reason for the change. Seems like the chart that was attached really what it depicts is the change in the growth in the city budget and in the amount that people pay. That tells the story. If it was just to be one single number it tells the story. But what you editorialize it does seem to tell a particular story, I want the story to be as complete as possible. That's not to editorialize too much on whether services are good or bad. But once again back to the dinner point, I would want to know well is it going up to \$7 because the cooks have

[1:12:13 PM]

health care and they are not sneezing in your food or you are getting dessert, too. We can argue about whether or not we want dessert or number. Because it's scheduled before the public hearings on the budget, I would want us to have simple information to help people contextualize the Numbers so we don't just put the number out there in front of people. The cost of government is rising, that's all that we are pushing to you. I would want folks to come in and argue about whether they want it to rise more or less and I think our city staff has done a pretty good job of simplifying what the costs are. I wouldn't want to be too prescriptive about that, but just to give two sides of the story. >> Houston: And what I would like to see happen, it's not only to have it simplified, but have it tiered because we've been using the typical family, typical home, some 200 some thousand dollars, the typical home in my district is 183,000, the median income is 41. So that skews how they will be able to plug into the simplicity of the impact statement. So I would like it to be tiered at least three levels so that people who make, whose houses are valued at below this, this is how they plug in. People between this and this, this is where they plug in. Because my folks won't be able to plug it the 228,000. >> Troxclair: Can I respond to that really quickly. I wanted to let you know that we did include an example graph of how a taxpayer impact statement could look. I'm a very visual person and that's probably why some of my resolutions come out being prescriptive because I have an idea of what it should look like. So we did include a backup sample taxpayer impact statement so you could kind of see what we're talking about here. It does have, I agree with you, I have the same problem in my district. You know the average home is not anything close to what we talk about the median home being. When we talk about valuations and property taxes. So -- so I have it starting

[1:14:15 PM]

at 150,000 going up in \$100,000 tiers from there. But obviously I would leave the details to the city staff of how this would actually look. >> Houston: I found it, thank you. >> Troxclair: Perfect. >> Councilmember kitchen? >> Kitchen: Just to clarify, I'm confident that you can come up with something simple that would make that point. That's fine, I don't have any problem with that. But in terms of your analogy, this is really about people don't know if they are paying \$5 or \$7. They don't know what they're paying. That's part of the reason behind the taxpayer impact statement is to provide from transparency to that. To give you another idea behind what we're trying to do here. So ... >> Tovo: Councilmember and then I have a question. >> This is not the only cost driver, there's also changes in people's insurance coverage. Okay? So I mean if we're going to be educating the community we need to remind them that - that while the tax on your home is one of I think five taxing entities and you know we did the pie charts that show the school district is about half of the tax bill, et cetera, then there's also changes, so if it's

going up by \$7, it might actually be going up by 10 because maybe now your insurance is more because your home is valued higher. So the minutes we pull one item out to try to explicate and explain it, we need to expand to say but this isn't the only thing that is going to change what your ultimate payment is next year. Does that make sense, councilmember kitchen? >> Kitchen: Yes, it has fees on it. The taxpayer impact is not just the property taxes. It includes fees. >> I was also talking about the insurance that you personally pay on your home, your homeowners insurance or renters insurance which also fluctuates from year to year depending on your appraisal

[1:16:16 PM]

value. Your insurance number changes every year. >> Kitchen: Yeah, I understand that. I just think at some point we can't, I mean, you can't put everything on this page and it's just really -- really from my perspective it's just transparency on what we're doing. >> Gallo: That's my point as well. If we're going to talk about it to try to be as transparent as possible. We also need to remember if we tell people your taxes are going up by \$7 or down by \$10, that may be what the city's portion is and we can be really open and transparent about where all of that money is coming from and how it will affect you. But when you said that they'll go into and what they're actually paying at the end of the year, there's a whole lot of other items that also affect the dollar that is spent. And one of them is what you pay for renters insurance, if you have it. And what you pay for homeowners insurance. Which is also coming out from that same pot of money. [Multiple voices] >> I'm speaking from the perspective of someone who has a mortgage and their mortgage company pays their taxes and they see a change in their mortgage payment from one year to the next. It's an accumulation of a number of things. Not only your taxes, but also your insurance. >> Kitchen: I understand. At? Point you can't put everything on the page. >> I agree. >> Tovo: If I could ask my question then, councilmember Zimmerman, I'm call on you. This talks about doing this two weeks prior to any public hearing. I'm assuming this year you know that that won't work because two weeks before would be August 6th and we will vote on this on August 6th. I'm not sure how quickly staff were this to pass could actually get it. You have made a provision for us as close as possible. But I guess that I would like to hear, I mean, I assume that's what you were envisioning that it would not happen, then I had a question for staff about that. >> Sure. I was thinking about that exact question when we were talking about our -- about

[1:18:17 PM]

our budget schedule and how that was going to work. So I don't know if the -- if the publication as it's written in the resolution right now is -- is practical this year. I would love to see -- I mean, I think it would -- again, I think the financial stuff has easy access to all of this. Inch, so I don't think it would be difficult for you to put together if the newspaper publication doesn't happen this year, I would still like to -- to have the impact statement so that I can at least send it to my constituents and we can -- have it posted on the city's website, you know, with the budget documents and whatever. Whatever in any other place that's the city is publicizing the hearings. I just I think that -- that part of the resolution is to just make this information accessible and easy to find. So if -- if again the newspaper publication isn't the way to do that this year, then we can talk about it. But -- >> I would think that we could -- we also have a time constraint in terms of getting it to the news publications, sufficient days in advance. So I would certainly think we might have a chance of getting it in on August 13th, a week in advance this year. We will be publishing on August 13th our annual budget and a brief which already contains a lot of this information, the information about the tax bill, the information about the things adding to our budget, the information about the utility bills, something that we do every year. Already try to do it in advance of the public hearings. We do what we call a budget and a brief. It's about three pages long. It will be in

the Austin chronicle, in la prensa, 20,000 brochures, put at the rec centers, libraries, your councilmembers will be getting them on your front desk to provide that to your constituents. It contains a lot of it. Not everything that would be in this quick impact statement, I think we are already planning on that putting on, August 13th, I would think we could include that as well. We are working on a fiscal note just from our past experience, working with the

[1:20:17 PM]

states man and L.A. Prensa, we think it would be about \$5,000 to do an advertisement in the newspaper. So -- >> Tovo: Thank you, that answered my next question, too, about the fiscal impact. But what -- how will you approach this? In terms of the overlap with the information that you already provide, will you -- will you provide that -- in two places or what -- what would you envision, how would you envision -- >> In looking at the backup information, councilmember troxclair, the second item is very, very similar to that utility bill and tax bill impact statement that we currently do. I think the parts of this that are -- that we don't do it we do it on a monthly basis, say let's look at it on an annual basis, the Numbers would be monthly versus annual. Also this idea of tiering it. No such thing as a typical person in Austin. The range of home values varies dramatically. We have not done that historically, either. But we could easily do that. There is a nuance when you try to get to a typical person, even two people that own \$150,000 home, they are not typical. Some people get a senior exemption, some people don't. Some people get historical exemptions, some people don't. So what an individual pays is truly an individual item. Two people with \$150,000 home, one person might have a huge lawn one person might have a small lawn, so their typical water bill will be very, very different. So it is a challenge, to really get at what's a typical person paying. >> Troxclair: I just got a note from my staff to read or to point out the last sentence, because the legal department didn't make an accommodation for this year as far as publishing and making sure we can publish as close to the date as reasonably possible. >> Tovo: I was just trying to clarify whether that was the intent that we are -- if

[1:22:18 PM]

this year. >> I just wanted to say my comments may have been misconstrued as not supporting this. I do support it. My goal is to make sure when we talk about items where we are trying not to be confusing and to bring clarity and transparency that we don't also change, mold expectations so that people think that the city says my taxes are only going to go up \$7, but they went up 17. City, how did that happen. It turns out it wasn't really the city fee or increase that caused it. So I'm just trying to -- to create the larger context in which we offer the information to the -- to be explicative, we are only talking about the city, that's all that we have the authority to do is affect what the city's comments are. I think the comments at the end there about a person who owns a \$150,000 home may in fact have a very different result on their tax bill based on the specific circumstances of the home they own and the insurance levels and that sort of a thing, which is exactly what I was trying to say. And I do like the idea, I've met with Mr. Oakie, I think it's a great idea. I was surprised we didn't actually offer this information already. So I -- I think that I had asked what about this that Mr. Oakie is looking for that we don't do. It sounds like there are a few things. I would certainly support providing as much information to folks as possible. >> Tovo: Other questions or comments? I think that's our last. Wishful thinking. Okay. 58. And who pulled it, councilmember Gallo, you pulled it. This was an item to set a public hearing on the park lands dedication, parkland fees. We just the thought was that we've been receiving some -- some comments and information and I know this

[1:24:18 PM]

is -- this dialogue and discussion has been going on for years, several years at least. It just appeared to us that -- that the -- because this would be a fee that would be increasing the cost the development, construction, building, we all keep talking about affordability and trying to -- to hold costs down as best we can, we did get some information and some comments back from -- from some of the development community, reca, the board of realtors, home builders, that really would like to have more conversation about this before the public conversation is out there. So I think the thought was that we would suggest it being postponed for at least a month to allow that conversation to happen. Not to stop it from happening, but just to -- to step back and allow more communication with some questions they still have. There's some other dedication ordinances that we have that are in place already and the fees for this as we talk about adding more parkland and not having budgets to maintain the existing parkland we have. I think that we need to be concerned about that conversation, too. So just pulled it just to kind of plant an idea of the possibility of when we talk about -- about setting a -- a public hearing for this, that we at least give us a couple of months to allow the stakeholders to come into the communication and talk a little bit and give us a little bit more time to think about adding more fees when we keep talking about affordability in Austin. So -- that's it. >> Tovo: Councilmember pool. >> Pool: I would be interested to hear staff's response to that question. That (indiscernible) Question. I would also be interested to know, there are a number of projects that are, depending on the fees revenue in order to continue their process through the city, the waller creek -- the waller creek

[1:26:19 PM]

conservancy, I think the project along waller creek is in fact one of the projects that's most interested in -- in ensuring that the city is receiving adequate compensation for the use of the parkland through the fee structure and that the fees are in fact at the level that they need to be at. When was the last time the fees were reviewed. >> Councilmember, (indiscernible) With the parks department. It was in 2007. >> Okay. So it was about eight years ago. And there's been considerable change to the profile of the city in that time. So I certainly don't think that the review of the fees is -- is undue. I think we definitely need to look at it. So I will be interested to see how staff responds to that question later this week. And I just want to -- all of us to bear in mind that there are a number of other initiatives the city is supporting that look for revenues that are based on the income that come from parkland events fees. >>

Councilmembers, core a Wright, assistant director. The first thing that I wanted to share with the council, I'm sure that you are quite aware, the item before council is to set the public hearing and -- and in looking at that, I was trying to anticipate the need for additional input from our development community and what comes to mind is -- is between now and September, we have at least six weeks and we want to make sure that council is aware that each time that we've been invited to go out and speak to a group, we've availed ourselves. In fact we have attended meetings and there have been representatives of the groups that -- that councilmember Gallo mentioned: However, we wanted to be very clear, we're happy to go out and share additional information, but we have six weeks working for us and we would be happy to respond to

[1:28:22 PM]

any questions. August 6th is just to set the hearing. When I look at the big picture of all of this, you're right, we've been having this conversation for quite some time. We've taken it through all of the required boards and commissions. I only mention that to say this. That is each time we go before a public body, those are additional opportunities for input and feedback and so when I think about the big picture, we've been out there at least nine formal times and then that's -- included this that are three

round table discussions that we've had with -- with as many people who would show up. So -- so I just want you to know between now and the way we're currently posted to come to council in September 17th, we've got six weeks to work at it. We're totally available to have additional conversation. >> Thank you for that. I did pass out copies of some of the emails and letters that we had received. I think a lot of you were copied on those, also, so thank you. >> Tovo: I would like to say just looking at that calendar, I see very clearly, not only has there been a call from -- from some members of the community to re-evaluate our parkland dedication fee and make sure that we are, you know, that it really is keeping up with our tremendous need for parks, but the formal process has been going on for more than a year. And so I think that it's certainly true that there may be some out there who don't like what's been proposed. But there has been a lot of public process and I'm -- I'm -- with all due respect going to support moving forward and setting a public hearing. I think it's critical that we do it now so that we can adopt that change in the budget in a timely way in pushing it back -- and pushing it back would mean that we would have to come back and do a budget amendment. So ... Other comments or questions about this item? Any other topics anybody wanted to talk about from this week's agenda?

[1:30:23 PM]

All right. We stand adjourned. 1:31 p.m.