

# Open Space, Environment, and Sustainability Committee Meeting Transcript – 10/28/2015

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 10/28/2015 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 10/28/2015

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[2:08:16 PM]

>> Pool: Thanks, everybody, for coming. I'll go ahead and convene us. We have three of our four members of the committee here today. My vice-chair is attending some of the sessions on the Na transportation officials conference today -- national city transportation officials conference today. The open space and environmental committee convenes. It is Wednesday, October 28th. It's 2:10. And we're here at city hall on Willie Nelson street. And mayor pro tem tovo is here. I already mentioned that councilmember, my vice-chair Garza is attending the nato sessions. Welcome everybody here is here today. I'm going to take one item out of order at the request of folks from the community who are here today, and it's item 7, which is parkland acquisition, including quarter and one-half mile park gaps, progress made as well as strategic plans for those gaps, using city land for parks and recreation methods for seeking parkland and transit Zones. We'll take that one up right after 10 minutes of education. First item is to approve minutes. Do I have a motion to approve our minutes? >> Zimmerman: Can I have one minute? >> Pool: A minute for the minutes? Sure. While everybody is doing that I have citizens communication. So we'll go ahead and I'll give this information out so we can tee this up.

[2:10:19 PM]

Michael fausom for citizens communication and Zoila Vega is contributing three minutes to Mr. Fausom. And there's no name on this one. President@austinpride.org. If we could get a name on this, I don't know who to call. >> [Inaudible - no mic]. >> Pool: Okay, Paul, if you could put your name on there, that would be great. And Heyden brooks will be after Mr. Hallston. Do I hear a motion to approve the minutes? >> Zimmerman: So move. >> Pool: Councilmember Zimmerman has moved to approve and the mayor pro tem has seconded. All in favor say aye? That is unanimous with councilmember Garza off the dais. So Mr. Fausom, welcome. What do you have for us today? You have six minutes. >> That's fine. Thank you, commission members. My name is Michael fausom. I'm a resident of south Austin. I want to talk about the recommendations for wildlife management plan at the animal advisory commission are sending to council. I've handed out some info to you. Some of you may have received that this morning. I'd like for you to bear with me if you've seen some of these slides before because there is some new information that will put this in the purview of the open space and parks board. The existing policy for coyote management that we have in Austin is humane and based on scientific research. The recommendations from the aac are to audit and cancel the city's participation in the Travis county wildlife management contract, hire an fte, a wildlife specialist, convince Travis county to participate in the funding for the fte and to develop a management plan. Adopting the animal advisory

[2:12:23 PM]

commission chief annual officer point recommendations will increase the danger to citizens by aggressive coyotes, there by limiting access to parks, trails and open spaces, which are urban habitat for coyotes. I ask you to reject these recommendations when they come to council. Adopting the aac recommendations, -- when considering coyote management we have to remember a couple of things. First, that coyotes are predators and that they do carry diseases, the most deadly to human services of which are rabies. There are attacks on both human services, as you can see the examples here, and also attacks on our dogs and cats as well by coyotes. Now, the current coyote management plan includes lethal options. It works and its based on science and research. Here are some of the examples of the studies that our current policy is based on. Now, in contrast a non-lethal hazing policy, the one that's put forward by the aac, has no scientific basis for its effectiveness. The policy for hazing by the aac was rejected by the city council, city staff and county leaders when the current management policy was adopted in November 2014. I've given you copies of letters of opposition from that time from chief Acevedo, Sarah Hensley from pard, Travis county commissioners and the chief animal services officer at that time, Abigail Smith. So we can ask the question then how will does hazing work? We have a real world example that we can look at. Constituents around Denver adopted this type of program as recommended by the aac a couple of years ago. So what are the results we can see. An increase of 237%. The coyotes got so aggressive the park rangers had to be sent to shoot

[2:14:23 PM]

rubber pellets at the coyotes in order to try to meal @that. Also the trails that they have up there can be closed for months when they have accessive coyote activity that's dangerous. Here you can see some examples of trail closings. It can take a few weeks to several months to open those trails up again. And do you have a copy of this slide. So we're currently spending about a million to three million per mile to build multi-use trails in our greenbelts and parks. Parks use is growing proportionally to population growth. Connectivity, alternate transportation, exercising to fight obesity and green space are important goals of imagine Austin and many other cities initiatives. The joint aac chief animal officer recommendation proposes to cancel the current contract for the Texas agrilife wildlife specialist to hire another wildlife specialist. The cost of this proposed fte may be as much as \$85,000 per year with benefits. Our current contract only costs us \$10,000 a year. Coyotes carry rabies, which is epidemic in Texas and may cost 14,000 or \$42,000 per person to treat in the emergency room. Now, you also have -- I'm sorry. I can't see my slide. Yes, you do have a copy of this slide as well. So the question then becomes why would we want to adopt a plan that would discourage or prevent the use of expensive trails and parks and expose the public to an increased risk of rabies infection at the same time? So I ask that you reject the aac recommendations when they come to council. Thank you very much. >> Pool: Thank you so much, Mr. Fausom. Appreciate you being here. So Paul Huddleston, you are

[2:16:24 PM]

next. And after Mr. Huddleston, Heyden brooks. >> Zimmerman: Quick question. Does anybody know when that may be coming before council? Do we have an agenda item on that? >> Pool: We can find out. >> Zimmerman: So don't know yet? >> Pool: Welcome, Mr. Huddleston. How are you? >> Good. [Inaudible]. >> Pool: It's okay. We took care of it. You have three minutes. It has to light up red. There you go. >> Thank you for having me. I really want to talk just for a moment about the parkland, in particular auditorium shores. If you're not aware, Austin pride festival has been held at fiesta gardens since 2011. Prior to that in 2009 it was at auditorium shores and the organizers at that time then moved

it across the street to the long center giving up our grandfathered position at auditorium shores. When I started in 2011 I put us back on that waiting list and we've been there since 2011 waiting for a spot to open up at audit. It's come to -- at auditorium shores. It's come to our attention that there are only 21 events allowed out of 25 and we are at the top of that list. There were no events added until the task force is done with their recommendations, which could be four to six months out. And obviously for us planning pride is a very long process. We're right now picking the date, which obviously doesn't help if we don't know a location. We can reserve space at fiesta gardens but one of the things we've been working for in the past few years is to make the festival free to attend for the entire community, which would be more inclusive of those of a smaller financial means to parents with lots

[2:18:25 PM]

of children, things like that. And for our space needed, fiesta gardens doesn't offer that, the capacity there is 7500 people versus auditorium shores, which is much, much bigger and allows us to actually grow the festival. Part of us making it free is opening it up to more people in community, which we haven't been able to do at fiesta gardens because we're trying to keep it smaller just to fit inside that park. And that's why I come to you today. Pride itself has grown exponentially in the past four years. In 2011 to 2015 the parade has increased 650% in attendance. The festival itself has only increased about 200%. So you can see the disparity there between the two events being our biggest events, one being free to attend, one being not free to attend, which is why I come here today. >> Pool: All right. I see some members of the parks and rec department here. Would it help if they talked with you in the hall? >> Absolutely. Leslie from your office is the one who told me to come in today and talk to you because I've talked to, I think, everybody about this. And this is a good starting point. >> Pool: And I participated in the pride parade this year and last year and I remember how much larger it was this year. What was the attendance this year? >> 200,000. >> Pool: And I had finished walking the parade -- actually, I was lucky to ride in one of those really neat classic cars, but by the time I got back up to the starting point there were still people filing out who hadn't yet walked the course. It was really, really exciting and such a positive experience for the community. >> Yeah. One of the things we're looking at this year is actually barricading the entire route to keep the crowd back a little more so that the parade can continue on track and not run late. >> Pool: Yeah. Everybody is very gracious and just really happy to have this event happening.

[2:20:26 PM]

Let's see. I don't know if Ms. -- Oh, there's director Hensley. That would be super if you guys could talk and then let me know and possibly other members of the -- sure. >> You know -- hi, I'm Sarah. >> Pool: Do you know each other? >> No, but we will. I do understand this and we've actually had a couple of other requests. I'm Sarah Hensley, director of parks and recreation. And we do have a priority list and I do believe they are right up there at the top. The one thing we are trying to do is to hold off. We have this events task force and some things we are concerned about is if we automatically put some events out there and then all of a sudden the recommendations come forth from the task force two things might happen. One is we might have to take back what we did, and second the task force is very focused on trying to come up with good recommendations to bring forward to council, and they are very well aware that there is a waiting list, but I think they would prefer that we not do anything until they come up with their recommendations. And obviously that is the will of the council and we'll do whatever, but from a staff's perspective, we would like nothing else to work even closer with the pride events, whether it be at fiesta gardens or at vic Mathias shores or even another place, we can look at that as well, but the one thing we're trying to do is desperately hold off until we get this report and get this

committee that was appointed by council back with a recommendation because they also want to make sure that there is meaningful recommendations and that they've thought through it all. And I have -- I did touch the waters with some of the members of the committee and they asked that we not recommend putting events out there until they were completed with their work. >> Pool: Let me ask a little bit of information about the timing on when did the task force finally get

[2:22:26 PM]

the necessary number of appointments made to be meeting? >> They've had at least three or four meetings and they're moving right along. They do get a little stuck, but they are having meaningful dialogue and I do think they will have a recommendation sometime in early spring. Obviously with the holidays coming up -- and I know that doesn't help with you, but it also doesn't help the other events that have called and asked the same. So we've had other events -- as a matter of fact, councilmember Garza was asking me about another event and we recommended we not move forward until we have this recommendation. Handy take it upon myself to ask some of the task force members what do you think if we do this? And they thought it would be exacerbating the problems that they're having already trying to address issues. And we're also concerned about the neighborhood looking at that and saying wait a minute, you formed a task force to try to look at this, you've asked us to give feedback and now you're putting back events out there without either listening to what we have to say. So I'll be happy to work -- I'll step out with you and give you my card and see if there are any other options we can look at. Obviously council has the prerogative to say if we would like to see this happen. >> Pool: Sure. Would it be helpful for Mr. Huddleston to come and address the task force just to give a sense of timing? Because it's a timing question. >> I do think that would be -- I can -- I think that's appropriate if he would like to do that. I think Jason, who is the staff liaison, the two chairs are Dave Russell and David King. They co-chair. I think that's something they would like to see and they would probably want to afford the opportunity to the other groups that are on there, the sunshine camp, the keep Austin weird fest. I'm trying to think. There are four or five. So I'll make sure that he gets the opportunity to do that. >> Pool: Yeah, because I don't necessarily want to

[2:24:27 PM]

pluck one recommendation out of the whole because we are trying to get a holistic look at it, but the other side of that coin, timing wise -- I'm making some presumptions about whatever the recommendation would be and I don't really intend to do that, but where I'm driving at is if it takes another six or seven months for the task force to come to some recommendations, then what is the date of the -- is it the spring? Are you looking at April? >> For pride? It's going to be in September. We have to work around UT football. >> Pool: So this is in relation to the parade as well. Okay. >> We have a little time and I do think -- I'll talk to Jason as well and I'll make sure and see if he can come and address the committee. I think it's important that -- this will give them a perfect opportunity to experience exactly the dialogue and hear from an event organizer. >> I've been to their meetings. >> Pool: How does that sound. >> Been there, done that, okay. >> Pool: Any of my colleagues want to weigh in? >> Tovo: I'll weigh in. I would love to see pride down there. I think it would be a great location for it. I want to be sure -- we've asked a task force to come together to look at the use of the park and whether it's exceeding the capacity -- the physical capacities, the natural capacities, the capacity of the surrounding areas. So I understand their interest and our parks staff interest in not adding additional events at this point while we're -- their recommendation may be that we cut back to 10 events a year and then you have to figure out how to determine -- I don't mean to strike fear in the hearts of all the events organizers who are already on that list, but maybe our recommendations coming forward if from that

group will be to really pull back on the number of events. And then we've got a lot of organizations who are maybe anticipating that they'll be holding their events in the next couple of years there or perhaps the recommendation will be that they pick a whole new slate of events and not typically the events that have taken place there and like events like the pride festival to take place in a location

[2:26:28 PM]

where they've been waiting to have access too. So it is a difficult time to start making additions to that list when we've asked our group to really look comprehensively at it. I don't know what the answer is, but I think going and talking to the committee would be great, but again, I understand -- >> I think some of the things that they're looking at is looking at alternative locations too to lessen the impact of this one particular area, spread the wealth to other parks in close proximity, but not right in the heart of downtown and neighborhoods that are impacted as well. So I think the committee is doing a good job. It's very diverse. They have a lot of different feelings, therefore it takes a little longer, but we'll do everything we can to keep communicating and coming up with some other positive options and then we'll encourage that group to continue their good work so they can bring it before this body and the full council. >> Tovo: Great. I think some of the events that have been for many years down on auditorium shores should try new locations to make opportunities for some of the festivals that would really like to use that space for a few years. I hope that that's one of the options that they're thinking through, whether that should be -- >> They are, yes. >> Tovo: -- A consideration to allow some new organizations to take advantage of that space. >> Thank you. >> Thank you. >> Pool: Thank you. Share some contact information. That would be great. Heyden Brooks, children and nature collaborative of Austin. Welcome Mr. Brooks. You have three minutes. >> Good afternoon. Thank you, councilmembers, for the opportunity to be here. My name is Heyden Brooks. I'm a co-founder of the children nature collaborative of Austin, which was founded in 2010. Cincas, as it's come to be known, is 30 different organizations ranging from size from the Earth native school, inside outside

[2:28:29 PM]

school, all the way up to Texas parks and wildlife, the Austin parks and rec department and Austin independent school district. I'm here today to briefly share with you some good news. And the mission of the children nature collaborative of Austin is to ignite and fan the flames of the regional movement to reconnect kids to the wonder and joy of the natural world. And the good news that I want to share with you is that Austin was selected for the national league of cities connecting children to nature leadership academy. The national league of cities and the children in nature network, which is an international organization, which was founded by Rich Luvé, author of *Last Child in the Woods*, selected Austin out of some 50 other cities that were competing to participate in the connecting children and nature leadership academy that took place in Salt Lake City about two weeks ago. The leadership academy provided city officials from seven different cities with the skills and knowledge to take up new or expanded leadership roles to help improve access to nature in their own communities. Over the course of a meeting, Marty Stump, who you all know, one of the assistant directors at parks and rec department, and two other city leaders, including myself, represented Austin and we had the opportunity to learn about promising practices and strategies for connecting children to nature. We worked with national experts, attended workshops, conducted field visits and engaged in peer to peer learning with seven other cities selected for the leadership academy. The mayor of Salt Lake City said a hazard part of his speech that kids too often don't have association with the natural world around us and this effort to connect kids to nature means there will be less screen time for kids and more time spent exploring the great outdoors. A few of the benefits -- I passed out two things to leave with you,

which specify some of the benefits of increasing young people's access to nature, include improved health outcomes,

[2:30:29 PM]

specifically lower rates of childhood obesity, as well as stronger academic skills which support early childhood education, increased opportunities for social and emotional learning and last, but not least, social equity by improving access for all of our children to nature. Following the leadership academy Austin has received an invitation to apply for a planning grant. This planning grant will support our city's programs and initiatives that are focused on connecting children to nature. Additionally Austin now has the opportunity to join the national league of city's children nature learning network, which provides ongoing opportunities for city leaders to learn and receive support -- [buzzer sounds] -- For naturally recognized experts in the field and our city peers. Thank you so much for your time and I look forward to sharing more information with you as this exciting initiative unfolds. Thank you very much. >> Pool: Thank you, Mr. Brooks, for bringing this very nice information. Next week the national league of cities is meeting in Nashville and I am not attending that meeting, but I know that a number of my colleagues are. Is there a presentation on the children in nature program happening next week in Nashville? >> I know the national% league of cities has adopted this as one of their premier programs for last year and this year. My guess is that will be part of their program. It should be on the agenda. But thank you very much. >> Pool: I'm family with Mr. Luvé's work and the natural playscapes effort from my work when I worked at the national wildlife federation. They've got a very robust children in nature education project here in Austin too. Are y'all working in collaboration with them as well? >> National wildlife federation in combination with tbg partners, is -- which is another one of the members of the children nature collaborative, have developed with U.S. Fish and wildlife prototype guidelines for designing and implementing natural playscapes. So some of the -- kind of

[2:32:30 PM]

the groundbreaking, no pun intended work in that area is nationally happening here and that hopefully will be replicated not just here in Austin, but also all the way across the country. And that's a big piece of greening school yards and -- >> If you wouldn't mind connecting up with my staff, having a presentation on natural playscapes has been on my mind for this committee to be a forum to air some of that information and educate the Austin community more broadly about what that is. >> That would be great. I welcome that opportunity. >> Pool: Yeah. And why this is a different way of looking at playscapes and playgrounds for children. >> That sounds great. >> Pool: I would love to use this as a platform for that. >> That sounds great. >> Pool: Any other questions? >> Tovo: Chair, I'll just add that it was also a recommendation that was part of the families and children task force that the city explore more -- a broader variety of playscapes and play environments for children and I know that's something our park staff has been working toward in their parks and other facilities. >> I look forward to following up with you on that. >> Pool: That would be great. And we'll schedule maybe like a 10 minutes of education slot for you to come or whomever you designate to come and talk with us in greater detail. >> Great. Thank you very much. >> Pool: Okay. Thanks so much. All right. That is all I have for citizens communication. I have two speakers on different items. Is there anybody else who wanted to speak? All right. We're moving on to the update on national ambient air quality standards for ground-level ozone. This is our 10 minutes of education and I believe this is Andrew is it huxuma? >> Huxuma. Huxuma. >> Pool: All right. You're the air quality program manager at capcog. And we also have [indiscernible] Andrews and carry butto.

[2:34:32 PM]

>> Great. Amfar is not here today. It will be me and Andrew. Good afternoon. As we said, my name is Kerry butto and I'm an air quality program corder with Austin transportation department. And with me today is Andrew huxuma, air quality manager with the capital area council of governments. We're very pleased to be bringing you this presentation today on e.p.a.'s new ozone standard and implications for the city as well as the region. The city of Austin realizes that poor air quality knows no borders and that's why we're a member of the regional clean air coalition. In that organization we partner with counties and municipalities toward the goal of better air quality. Last year the clean air coalition was awarded the E.P.A. Clean air excellence award for community engagement and continues to serve as a model for voluntary air quality programs nationwide. As a member of the clean air coalition the city of Austin has committed to over 30 individual measures towards the improvement of air quality through the regional ozone advanced plan. This is the only committee currently scheduled to receive a presentation on the new ozone standard. At the conclusion of this presentation we would be happy to take recommendations from you as to where we can present this presentation at other forums. And with that I'll turn this presentation over to Andrew. >> Thank you. So again, my name is Andrew huxuma, the air quality program manager at the capital area council of governments. I also serve as one of the two co-chairs of the clean air coalition advisory committee. Pharr Andrews is the other

[2:36:33 PM]

chair and I also have been serving isn't the spring on the clean air advisory committee. As Kerry mentioned, capital area council of governments, we are a regional organization. Many people are not familiar with us. In addition to air quality we do solid waste planning and transportation planning, aging services, emergency communications, homeland security and a variety of other areas. So those of you who are not familiar, this is our -- the area that we serve and we answer to y'all. We answer to city councils and county commissioners and are here to serve you. A brief couple of slides of what we're talking about here as far as national ambient air quality standards. The clean air act sets national standards for air pollution levels that the entire country is supposed to attain. They set two kinds of standards. One is called a primary standard. Those are designed to protect human health and the other is secondary standards. And those are designed to protect any other effects. So vegetation or any other effects that might occur as a result of air pollution. Ground-level ozone is very common air pollutant. It is not emitted directly. It is formed in the atmosphere due to the presence of other types of emissions. Specifically nox emissions, nitrous oxide emissions and volatile compounds. Depending on the area, some areas are more sensitive to voc reductions or voc emissions, whereas others like others are more sensitive to nox emissions. When you get the right meteorological conditions those two compounds will react in the atmosphere and turn into ozone. On October 1st E.P.A. Lowered the first of the primary and secondary standards from 75 parts per billion to 70 parts per

[2:38:34 PM]

billion. This was following a lengthy review process. They last reviewed the standard in 2008, at which point they lowered it from 84 parts per billion to 75 parts per billion, and so this was the result of a regular review that E.P.A. Has to do of these standards. Under the clean air act they're required to review these standards at least once every five years. Along with the update to the standard, they also updated the air quality index. And this is often on a weather forecast you'll sometimes see an air quality forecast. They color code these and different levels are considered good and moderate and unhealthy for sensitive groups, unhealthy for everyone and so forth. So with the update to the standard they also

updated the levels that are considered good and moderate and unhealthy. We have three ozone monitors in the city of Austin. There are actually 10 within the capcog region, tceq, Texas commission on environmental quality, and capcog has the other eight. The two on the left there, Murchison middle school and Austin audubon to society are operated by tceq and they are considered the regulatory record for the region. They meet all the federal regulatory requirements and are used as the basis for determining whether or not our region is in compliance with the standards or not. The monitors that capcog operates are not that full complement of requirements, but are used for research purposes primarily, but they're still good data. So we have these three ozone monitors and you can see based on ozone measurements this year how many days were peak ozone levels reached either the moderate range or the unhealthy for sensitive groups range. So we had more than one, and in fact quite a few at each of these monitoring stations this year. One feature about the

[2:40:34 PM]

standards to know is that you can actually have several days over the level that's considered unhealthy for sensitive groups, but still be in compliance with the standard and that's the situation that we are in right now as of today. The measurement that they use takes a three-year average and they use the fourth highest day, not the highest day. So if that three-year average is at or below 70 parts per billion in areas considered in compliance with the standard. So right now our three-year average is at 68 parts per billion. A lot of that has to do with fact that we had exceptionally low ozone levels last year. If not for last year, our three-year average would be at 71. After E.P.A. sets a standard, they're required to then designate areas as being either non-attainment, attainment or unclassifiable. They're allowed to extend that two-year period by up to one year if necessary. If an area is designated non-attainment, there are some pretty serious consequences. There's very strict requirements for permitting for any new or modified sources. There are some 30-plus years of restrictions on transportation planning and other federal approvals for things like airport [indiscernible] Expansions. And then depending on the classification of the area, there can also be a host of regulations on existing sources. Capcog completed a report earlier this year that estimated that over the 30 to 35 year period that a non-attainment. Designation would have some of these effects it could cost our region somewhere between 24 and \$41 million. So even though we have this three-year average that's in compliance with the standard, as of now it doesn't mean we're out of the woods yet. E.p.a. is likely to be making their designations based on 2014 to 2016 data. We had a very bad ozone season this year.

[2:42:35 PM]

We don't know what it will be next year. We're pretty likely to remain -- to have our own ozone data for that three-year average in compliance, but we just don't know about next year. There's a small chance that we could have a really bad ozone season and have that three-year average over the standard. We are also adjacent to the San Antonio area, which is very much above the standard, and based on the way E.P.A. Designates area, it's not just if you're violating the standard, it's if you're contributing to violations elsewhere. We're also next to temple-killen and they actually have higher ozone levels than us, partly because they are downwind from our area often. So we still have this two-year designation process. There's not a high degree of likelihood that we would face a non-attainment designation, but the other thing to keep in mind is I mentioned we have these non-regulatory ozone monitors, capcog has one monitor in Williamson county that has a three year average above the standard. So we think it's low likelihood, but potentially high consequence. So it's something to still be aware of and track for the next couple of years. This is the time frame for that designation process that I just mentioned. They've got two years from when they issue the standard to actually finalize it. Between there there is a



recommendation process, states make recommendations to the E.P.A. The E.P.A. Will then make a proposal and there's an opportunity for comment at that point and then they'll finalize the designations in October 2015. October 2017. As Kerry mentioned, the city of Austin is one of the main participants in the region's ongoing ozone planning efforts. We're now in the fourth iteration on this that city has been participating in the efforts since 2002 and has won national recognition for this. We have our current plan is called the ozone advanced program action plan that's in place through the end of 2018. And the city of Austin has a

[2:44:35 PM]

number of commitments that have been very important for that. And continued city of Austin participation will continue to be important throughout the designation process. Another thing to keep in mind is as I mentioned E.P.A. Is required to review these standards once every five years. So even though we might be in compliance now, if E.P.A. Sets the standard lower five years from now, it's not clear that we would have ozone levels low enough to be in compliance with that. In summary, low probability, but potentially high impact of a non-attainment designation for the new standard. Existing efforts has been successful. We've had now three revisions to the ozone standard where Austin has barely avoided a non-attainment designation. So that margin of difference there, a significant portion of that can be attributed to our local efforts. There is still more that the city can do to reduce emissions and exposure. There are benefits beyond ozone itself for doing some of those things. And in fact, a lot of the health benefits associated with reductions for ozone come from coal benefits from things like particulate matter. And cooperation will be key to the attainment status of the region and moving forward. >> Pool: I have a question for you. When we have burn bans, does that tend to help with the particulate matter that's in the air or does that get blown away so quickly that it's not measurable? >> It is measurable and estimatable. And in fact, both this year and in 2011, you know, fire emissions have played a pretty significant role later in the ozone season in poor air quality. You know, we haven't done specific -- we haven't done any specific research on burn bans, per Se, but since we've had this situation now

[2:46:35 PM]

twice in a short period of time we're going to start to look more at fire-related emissions and how that impacts both ozone and particulate matter. >> Pool: So I guess you could overlay a map of things that happened like the latest fire? >> Yes. >> Pool: And overlay that over what the particulate matter and the ozone measurements were at each of your different stations and see if it moved the needle at all? >> Yeah. We can get an estimate of what the emissions from those fires were or for the 2011 fires. And then put those in an air quality model. And then, you know, area by area measure how much of an impact that had on any number of pollutants. >> Chair pool, I would just like to say that you all are so good and your presentation was very clear. >> Oh, stop. >> The environmental commission has a committee, an air quality committee, and Mr. Huxuma and Ms. Butto and Ms. Andrews have been involved with our committee. We haven't been able to meet recently because of the changeover into our 10-1 and our committees have not kind of gotten formed again, but we do have a committee and we will continue to meet with them and to get -- have eyes on it from the environmental commission just because we need to be aware of this as a city and there was not a board or commission that was really involved in it before officially. So we are involved in it officially. It was kind of mixed -- it had several boards and commissions. It was confusing, shall we just say? In a word it was confusing. So we got a committee put together on purpose to kind of watch -- kind of be in contact and to have eyes on it. >> Pool: That's good to hear. I think there's a significant benefit to the community in making sure that

the ozone and particulate matter in our area is kept at low levels and I'm not even talking

[2:48:35 PM]

about the financial penalties that can come into play. I'm thinking about the kiddos and the asthma and so forth. Yes, councilmember Zimmerman. >> Zimmerman: Thank you. I need to make a comment here. There's a lot of competition for junk science, but the e.p.a.'s work on ozone is some of the most embarrassing stuff that I've looked at, so I'm just going to make a prediction going forward. There's going to be a lot of push-back when the truth about some of this outrageous poor science comes out. I think the E.P.A. is going to be in trouble. >> Pool: Thank you, councilmember Zimmerman. I will just state that-- >> Zimmerman: I'm not done yet. I've been patiently listening to this, and I've been happy, but I'm not quite done. I'm making a prediction that this junk science is going to come back and bite the E.P.A. There's a lot more to go on this. I'll also ask that you take a closer look at the sensors. You've mentioned how your -- your ozone level depends on where you place the sensor. Okay? There's many, many details like this. The fires that blow in from Mexico, and all these other natural causes, we have absolutely no control over, right, what we call background contributions, are not being accounted for. So there's a lot more to be said about this. I'm just going to end it at that for now. >> Thank you. >> Pool: I would just like to say I don't view the findings of the E.P.A. Or the work that the clean air force have done at all as junk science. I appreciate the work that has been brought to bear on this topic. And I thank you for your good service to the community. Please take up the offer for the presentations at the environmental commission. I think that would be really great. And if there's any way that we can be of additional assistance to you in forwarding the education and the information that you're providing to the rest of the council or the city at large, I'd be very happy to aid in that. >> Great.

[2:50:35 PM]

>> We will coordinate with Jessica to get coordinated with the environmental commission to bring a presentation there in the future and we have a draft memo on this topic to be resulted and we'll check where it is in the process. >> Pool: That's great. I really appreciate y'all coming and making a presentation today. >> Thank you. >> Thank you for am coulding. >> Pool: As promised, I'm going to bring up item 7. And this is parkland acquisitions. So we have some folks from the community and I think I'd like to hear from them first and then staff can also bring us some information. So Lynn's good with the urban -- lien Osgood with the urban parks group. Steven zetner, who has done a lot of work on urban core issues. And heather way, who I think did some study of this through one of the law clinics at the city. And I think randy. But I don't have your last name here, I apologize. If y'all would go ahead and -- right, randy Scott. Great. Lynn, are you going to lead off? >> I'm going to lead off. >> Pool: Great. Thanks for being here, everybody. >> Thank you all for having us here this afternoon. We're thrilled that we have the chance to talk about this topic. My role here today is to introduce the history of the report that came out in 2012 called the urban parks working group report and that was co-authored by myself and heather way. The working group report it came from in 2009 when asked the possibility of putting a park within a quarter mile

[2:52:35 PM]

walking distance within the urban core or half mile within the ban core to make sure kids and adults and families could get to parks. And the reason I think it's wonderful that Mr. Brooks was here earlier to talk about nature-based play and the importance of that for children, I think what this is is this is part of a much larger national conversation about how critical parks are as basic infrastructure for cities. That we

know because of the science now that children need parks for their physical, social and cognitive development. It's hard to do a lot of research in the field of cities, but we have a ton of research now in parks because the medical community is really looking at this and doctors are prescribing to children to go out and play in parks. Our goal for the report, we had four main tasks. We are to analyze where the possibility for putting these new parks could be to create strategies for the implementation and to create some basic cost projections. And examine what sort of resources would be needed to bring that to fruition. We knew at that time -- and again, what I'm going to be presenting here is all what we knew in 2012. Randy Scott will talk about other developments since then. Back then in the community survey, 87% of people expressed the strong desire to live next to a park, but at that point we knew that 37% of our residents actually lived within walking distance of a park. When Heather and I were writing the report, what with we understand about the issue is that Austin as a wonderful amount of acreage of parks that we have. We have wonderful reserves, great regional parks. What what we lack at the moment is accessibility. We need more an understanding of suburban parks, things you get into a car and drive to for a game or to walk on a trail to a

[2:54:37 PM]

more urban understanding of parks where it's something that you need to walk to and to get out from your front door. And why is this important. And we bring the example of Los Angeles here. Here's an example, here's -- the city of Los Angeles -- you can see where their parks are. Now you can see where their children are. And how stark the contrast is. In other cities such as New York and San Francisco they're looking very closely at this goal and this need to have accessible parks for children. You know, the alternative of not having any open play space when living in dense urban environments is quite harsh. And they're doing a lot of work to do that. Here is Austin in 2012. We've advanced since then, but you can see we've got a long ways to go. So one of the things that we wrestled with at this time that I think is important to bring up is that the city manager, Mr. Ott, he asked us to look carefully at the issue of schools and school sites because we do -- elementary schools have playgrounds, they're distributed throughout the city. It should be noted that legally schools need to be open to the surrounding public. But in practical matters that's very difficult to implement. Elementary school principals are very careful of the children that are on there and the people who have access to the grounds. Now, that said there is still opportunities and Randy Scott can tell you more about conversations that have been going on between park and aid since then, but one of the ideas is that we could possibly carve out small pocket parks and have it more accessible to the general population around. So what we did is we did a very large mapping exercise and in this mapping exercise we looked at a number of layers because what we wanted to do was get at where -- an understanding are the gaps, but given

[2:56:39 PM]

where are -- but where are the gaps given all the resources at hand. We looked at parkland that we have, parkland that is yet undeveloped. We looked at the existing school park sites where park owns a certain percentage of the land. We looked at potential new school sites where park doesn't have ownership, but potentially we could do one of the carved out pocket parks with an agreement with aid. And then what we called high opportunity sites. So we took a listing of city properties such as fire stations or other properties that might serve as small pocket parks and we -- and as a task force we went around and we looked at them and we had criteria and we picked out ones that we thought yes, this could actually work on a neighborhood park. We looked at the -- what this would all cost if they were to develop this out. And obviously there are tens of millions of dollars in order to do the entire -- to acquire all the land and develop it. And one of the things that I want to mention is that as we look at the

budgetary needs for this kind of initiative is that it's always important to pair both the acquisition of land and the ongoing maintenance. They come hand in hand and it's important that as we approach the issue that we always take those two together. So here's -- just going through the layers here's where we were with the developed parkland, adding the undeveloped parkland, adding again the existing school properties, adding even more school properties. And then finally those high opportunity sites. And what we got then, you will see in this map, and you can see sort of the gray areas behind the colors are where there are population centers. So if you just sort of look at the gaps what you set is this: And this is the map back in 2012 of where if we

[2:58:39 PM]

exhausted all of our resources at a city where we would still be missing opportunities on the ground to develop parks. In other words, these are the areas where we would have to get -- get property in order to make -- in order to meet our goals of having accessible park space for the surrounding families. So in the report we made four basic areas of recommendations in terms of access and acquisition, maintenance, design and development, and implementation, I'll just briefly touch on those. We know that in acquisition that there is just a large number of properties that need to be -- that need to be acquired. Traditionally the best source for that is to leverage the existing city land and then work through other funding mechanisms. And that's where I think the ingenuity can come in terms of getting new parkland to be developed. We are -- we like to consider ourselves as national leaders in terms of the -- in terms of our park space. We've looked at cities such as Denver and Seattle and Minneapolis, they're actually really far ahead of us in terms of their own goals in terms of making accessible park spaces. In terms of maintenance I think this is one of the hardest areas. There have been -- more money has gone towards the parks department since this report was written, which is wonderful. We are still quite far behind in terms of the national average. Back in 2012 we were 67th -- excuse me, 65th in terms of what we were -- how we compared across the nation of what we were spending on our parks. It's just something that's critical that we have to look at. This is a much broader issue than this presentation but as I said earlier it's something we always have to think of

[3:00:40 PM]

together with the acquisition of land. And, again, we're not as high as we -- I think that we we would like to be in terms of our national partners. Design and development, this is a tricky thing and I'm glad Mr. Brooks was here earlier to talk about. A lot of the things we know now through practice, through things that have been developed in the field, is that children have -- and families work in -- like to be in public space in -- in different ways. They like to be with nature. They like to touch things. They like to get their hands dirty. They like to play actively. But our ability to meet that with existing code is difficult. For example, you know, on any playscape, you know, the bars can only be 4 inches apart so that you can't put -- get a head stuck in it. That's very important. How you do move that to a framework where you have kids that are able to trip over logs and pull out grasses when, as a maintenance routine, you have to have things, because of very tight budgets, you have to have things very clearly laid out and things very simplified. So our desire of the spaces we'd like to create and the desire of the spaces we can create, given the code and our budget constraints are actually -- there's a very big gap and something we need to address holistically. Our basically policy, three tomorrow policy recommendations were to increase annual funding business plan business plan. So that we could deal -- so that we could approach the issue of maintenance for fully. Looking at bond referendums, I think this is important. We looked at a number fiscal opportunities for developing parks. Some of the things we looked at were putting something on utility bills when this was happening in 2012. There were -- there was an increase in the

utility bills so that wasn't going to

[3:02:42 PM]

happen. Bond funds are traditional sources. The amount the parks have been getting in bonds have been decreasing since the last few cycles so that has been -- that has been difficult. We also looked at something, a possible taxing district. And when we looked at this, this is the last item there, when we looked at this in 2012, it was not actually possible within the state of Texas to have a taxing district for parks. Since then, because of Terry Mitchell's Onion Creek development he worked with state legislature to enable the ability to tax at joining residents around his development to help increase the maintenance for his park. It is still city-owned land but there are additional funds that are going to keep it at a maintenance level which is going to be comparable to Zilker. So there -- I think we have to get creative. If we're going to solve the -- and I think this has been sort of the difficulty since 2012. It's a very big issue to handle and it's not -- it can't be handled by one small policy or one small initiative. It has to be handled quite systemically and so that -- so, you know, we're thrilled that it's here in front of you all today to talk about. >> Mr. Zetner, are you next? >> I have a deck also, if you can bring that up. I think that's the next person. Randy, is that your deck? >> Yes. >> There's one for Steven Zetner. >> Different order. >> We messed you up here.

[3:04:50 PM]

We'll find it. >> Yeah. >> There we go. Is that it -- >> Pool: No, that's not it either. What's the title of it? >> It is proposed changes to urban parks acquisition policy. While we're looking at that, I can just go ahead and introduce myself, I'm Steven Zetner, president of a small local community organization called Sustainable Neighborhoods. We were founded about eight years ago in 2007 to operate a positive vision for redevelopment along early suburban corridors in north central Austin like Burnet Road and in particular we want to make sure that we can achieve the city's goals, things like, you know, long-term affordable housing but do it in a way that protects the demography, the diversity of our existing populations in north central Austin and in particular retain a place that works for families with children. We also want to make sure that we don't break the transportation function of the corridor. It's going to be very challenging to add so many residents and still allow for all the different modes of transportation. I think one of the things that we recognized -- I don't know if this thing is working here. Ah, got it. I think because north central Austin, being in Austin's early suburbs, I should probably back up and say the white area you see is the early suburbs of Austin, the areas developed after World War II in the '50s, '60s, '70s. It was designed for people to drive. It was very driver friendly area and our whole community is based around being able to drive to places, to have meetings, to do the things we need to do. The challenge is that these areas, because they are designed for driving, have very challenging conditions when you try to retrofit them.

[3:06:51 PM]

to make them walkable urban places. We have big commercial streets that are far apart from each other, large unwalkable block sizes and few pedestrian amenities where they're needed most, in the growth zones along these corridors. So, you know, we tried to think about how you take the city's direction to densify the early suburbs in our area and other parts of the city I think are going to see the same thing, we're like how do you do this? How do you do it in a way that doesn't bankrupt the city because the cost of doing this retrofitting is going to be enormous. And I presented this earlier this year to city council. The solution that we've proposed for an early suburban corridor like Burnet viewed what we call

the village center based historically on a very successful model for development in Victorian London, commuter rail lines in the late 19th century they developed garden villages that extended along the rail line and the village center model we're proposing here is basically the same thing. It optimizes a number of trade offs. You start with where is the best quality transit option look the corridor, in our case the rapid bus stations. You put most of your new housing there, around that transit station. And you invest heavily in the walkability of those districts. You can't do it all up and down the corridor. There's just not enough money to -- or, you know, resources to provide that kind of walkability everywhere, so focus where it's most important. And you see in this example, this is Burnet at North Loop, there's a couple different kinds of functions that you're meeting here and different kinds of open space that perform those functions. The light green space that you see on here is what I call codeNEXT open space, the space we're hoping we'll get as the land development code

[3:08:53 PM]

process works its way out. And that's transit plaza, access to the plazas, walkways through, you know, via new developments and then complimenting that but generally a little further out from the center of the district you have dark green, the parks and creeks open space. And that's a bit more recreational but if used properly it's also contribute to go mobility goals. It's allowing people to walk through to the center of the district to reach the transit destinations there. It's a equal enhance they are makes it more likely for any given trip somebody takes in these districts they will get out of their car do something else. So the first recommendation that I have to the city's existing urban park acquisition policy is to incorporate transit principle and find the places that are on routes to these transit stations and place the pocket parks in a way that enhances their quality, that makes it easier, more fun to reach the transit stations and to do the things that you need to do, the retail arranged there. And, you know, some of these routes may not exist yet. These may be things we have to plan for, during the Burnet corridor plan next year. But whether it's an existing route or future route, this is where we need to put our pocket parks. And then similar to that, this is a difference of -- I call the Goldilocks principle. You don't put your park right up the side of Burnet road where conditions are too loud to linger. It's very hard to have a conversation or meet people or do things when you're right up -- I mean, you can walk to things but you're not going to tend to hang out along the side of Burnet road. That's not a good place for a pocket park. But you don't want it so back

[3:10:53 PM]

away from the corridor that people are walking away from transit and destination and into a lightly populated single family neighborhood to reach the pocket park. There's an ideal zone, the transition zone as planners call it, that's wrapped around the center of this district. As I look at examples of recent park acquisitions in North Austin, in the areas that I'm familiar with, I'm seeing a pattern, and it's completely understandable. I have a lot of sympathy for the parks department and making the most with the least, which is sort of been their operating procedure for many years. But what I'm seeing are existing scraps of land, underutilized land, and the parks development is -- development is working with the communities, turning them into pocket parks and that creates a rehabilitational benefit for -- recreational benefit for people nearby, it's meeting these growth issues. They're not near where you're getting connectivity to destinations and transit. In two of the examples up here they're not serving multi-family residents. They're mainly serving people like myself, who live in single family homes, and we have backyards, we like having parks but don't need them. Whereas the growth going in along the corridors is primarily multi-family and those are people who really are going to depend on this open space. So it needs to be in the right place. Another concern I have is the continued outflow of resources

from these growth Zones. An example I'll give you is the farmers market property on burnet road. Until 2007 this was a Travis county facility. It was obviously -- obviously it was a farmers market, a community gathering place. We had community festivals there. And in 2007, when the county decided to liquidate this

[3:12:53 PM]

asset they not make any provision for maintaining the function of that site as a community gathering place so now it's being redeveloped, there's limited space on the site. It's mainly for the restaurant and, you know, we're losing that function in an area along burnet that's going to have a lot of new housing. Also the parkland dedication funds, as best I can tell, that were generated by this project are not going into projects, you know, nearby or, you know, in the growth areas of the urban core. So my third recommendation is really to city council, not the parks department. We need to recognize the long-term risk of trying to retrofit these early suburban areas starting to experience growth and make sure that we find every resource we can to find the open space and put it in the right place so it actually achieves the goals and functions as intended by the planning community. And that's going to be a huge challenge opinion two things I will call out here, bullet points. One is land banking. I think we need a program to start the land -- to land bank the land for parks in the right place well in advance of when the development occurs. That doesn't necessarily mean a huge maintenance cost. You can just continue to use the existing use and depreciate the land and use the revenues from its existing use to cover, you know, if it's bond funding or, however, you're resourcing it. Another thing we have to start doing parkland dedication now for developments in these critical locations. Not everywhere. And then again, we've got to focus our limited resources and get the biggest bang for the buck by recognizing those places along the corridor where they're going to do the most good. I'll conclude by saying that as we go into the burnet

[3:14:53 PM]

corridor process next year, it's probably well known that there are a lot of people in my community who are very skeptical about infill development. And one of the -- when you get past all the rhetoric, one of the legitimate things they raise is the fear that the city is not going to provide the infrastructure to support all the apartments we're putting along the corridor. And that's something the city really needs to tackle. Thank you. >> Pool: Any questions for either Mr. Zetner or Ms. [Indiscernible] Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: Could you make that presentation available to us? >> Mm-hmm, I'll email it. >> Tovo: That would be great. Thank you for those recommendations. Very interesting. >> Mm-hmm. >> Pool: Are you next, Mr. Scott? >> I am. >> Pool: Okay. >> The -- randy Scott. It's under what's called parkland acquisition infill. There it is. >> Good evening, councilmembers, good afternoon, councilmembers, mayor pro tem, chairs. My name is randy Scott, with the parks and recreation department. Being third on the presentation list and lack of coordination we have some overlap and I'll try to skim through those as best I can. In 2009, council pass -- passed a resolution as Lynn mentioned directing the parks and recreation department to come up with an implementation plan on how it was going to meet everybody's goal to live within a quarter and a half mile of a park in the city. In the urban core it would have a quarter mile and outer core a half mile. Park completed this plan in January of 2012.

[3:16:55 PM]

It took the implementation plan to parks board in June of 2012. And in July of 2012, to planning commission. In September of 2012 it gave a memo to council, a copy of the implementation plan in

November 2012 we had a bond election. The implementation plan included \$30 million plus for land acquisition for parks. The November bond election in 2012 included \$4 million for parkland acquisition. \$2 million for acquisition for the head waters of country club creek. To put this in a little perspective, I started working at the parks department in 1996. The first bond package after that was in 1998 and that included \$40 million for land acquisition for the parks department. Every bond package from the '80s up to 1998 included approximately about \$40 million for land acquisition for the parks department. In 2006 the bond package included \$20 million for land acquisition for the parks department and in 2012 it included \$4 million for land acquisition for the parks department. And one more on top of that. The parkland dedication ordinance has not been adopted since 2007, also. That will be going before council in November, November 12. This map was shown on Lynn's presentation. It's kind of the base -- where we are today. The red line depicts the boundary between the inner and outer core and on the inside of that red line parks are buffered at a quarter mile and on the outside buffered at a half mile. Then she went through this. This is undeveloped parks buffered, included the school parks. School parks, Lynn didn't

[3:18:56 PM]

mention this but we have an undivided interest in the ownership of the land in school parks. There's no line drawn. We own a percentage of the land, every square foot and aid owns a percentage of the land, every square foot. The idea behind these are to corner off about a quarter or half acre and develop and have it open to the public during school hours. These are other aid schools. We have met with aid. They are in agreement with the concept of utilizing these schools. They also have provided us with feasibility studies for a lot of their sites. These are the other city of Austin sites. And I think this is the target acquisition areas for parkland. Lynn showed you this map. And this is the acquisitions from 2012 to 2015. They include all acquisitions for the parks and recreation. >> Speaker2: >> Zimmerman: Quick question. It would be helpful to see maybe in yellow or green color what the current acreage is in the context what have you say the acquisition should be. Does that make sense? >> If that's -- is that -- >> Zimmerman: Those are lands that are not parkland right now that you think should be parkland? Did I understand that correctly? >> The Orange represents areas that are unserved by a -- or not within a quarter mile of a park or not within a half mile of a park. So they're -- >> Zimmerman: Okay. I didn't understand that. >> They're [indiscernible], in other words, so they're areas where we would need to go back in and target an acquisition. >> Zimmerman: It's a targeted acquisition areas and there's area in red so I naturally made the leap that that's the acquisition area. But so I'm really confused. >> Not the whole area. Somewhere inside that area where the population density is heavy, which is shown in light gray, would be a target acquisition area.

[3:20:57 PM]

>> Zimmerman: Okay, thanks. >> And that could range from an acre to, you know -- or less too to 5 acres. >> Zimmerman: Okay. >> So this map, and I think this is what council is most interested in, was the acquisition since 2012 bond package. In November 2012 voters approved a \$4 million bond package for parkland acquisition and \$2 million for acquisitions of the head waters of country club creek. The acquisitions made to date with \$4 million include 5 acres off Powell lane, 6 acres -- I did a school at the old show place lanes area, 27 acres off violate farms -- vital farms along brant road. >> Pool: Can you give us a sense what quadrant? >> Okay. Powell lane is just north of 183 and Georgian acres. 6 acres is old show place lanes off I-35. 27-acre vital farms property is a greenbelt connection along brant road on onion creek. 6-acre pony express house, Matthew brown house, stop on the el Camino real trail was an acquisition along slaughter creek, next to a new apartment complex going in over 500 units. >> Pool:



These are the red dots? >> Yes, they're the red dots. And they're red and the parkland dedication also. 1.29 acres off westcreek drive, over by small middle school, off 290 southwest. .25 acres at the entrance of

[3:22:59 PM]

the resident check ball fields that was to improve the entranceway and add some land to the ball fields area for some park amenities. And 1.7 acres in astro place off mlk. These acquisitions represent \$4.9 million. \$2.2 million in 2012 bond dollars and \$2.7 million in parkland dedication funds. For every land acquisition dollar spent from the 2012 bond package we have been able to match it with well over a dollar of parkland dead conversation funds. That's better than a one to one ratio. With the \$2 million approved by the citizens of Austin for the head waters of country club creek we were also able to acquire the red dot just north of highway 77 and at the end -- 71 and at the end of pleasant valley road. There's the -- kind of a list, I believe, of the parkland dedications. And if you have any questions about those acquisitions I'll be happy to try to answer them. >> Pool: I do. I think what would be really helpful to everybody, and you can intend to the entire council. >> Speaker2: I will. >> Pool: Would be to show on the map where each of these items are. Because it's not clear on the map which is which. >> Okay. >> Pool: All right? I also was curious, I received some questions about the 6 million in bond money from -- that was spent recently on parks that I believe were to be neighborhood and urban parks. I don't think they all were -- all the land was in those areas. Can you speak to that a bit? Where the most recent -- >> The 2012 bond package? >> Pool: Yes. >> For was parkland acquisition. There was \$2 million of the \$6 million you just referenced

[3:25:00 PM]

was actually identified for the head waters of country creek. >> Pool: Where is that. >> Country club creek is east, north of 71, east of I-35, south of Riverside drive, old turf, pleasant valley road, those roads. >> Pool: Okay. >> Ring a bell? And \$4 million was for the rest of parkland acquisition. >> Pool: Weren't those funds to be used for parkland purchases that were for urban parks? >> I don't believe the bond language specified that but, yes, we have tried. >> Pool: It would be helpful to, did maybe we can have a meeting and talk a little bit more about -- >> That probably would be a good idea. >> Pool: I think so. I can invite the residents who raised questions about it and we can drill down deeper where those were made and make sure they track with the bond language. I was on that bond committee, which is why I'm asking, and Ms. Way was also on the bond committee. I'm trying to remember what the intentions were and then how that translated through legal and then got onto the ballot and what purchases were made. That's extraneous really to what we're talking about here today, but I would like to have a longer conversation, and I can include some of the folks who are here today. I think they have some interest in where those properties were purchased also. But, yeah, I think with a little bit of additional explanation on where these dots are, that will be really helpful to the rest of the council and maybe if you could more finely describe the targeted acquisition areas as being a general vis assistant where you're looking --visit entity where you're look to go site new parks because these are areas that have a deficit. Not that the city is planning

[3:27:01 PM]

to buy up all of the red. >> Yeah, that's correct. And I can provide those, I can provide individual maps on each acquisition. >> Pool: That will be great. >> That would be more helpful for you. >> Pool: I think everyone would be really interested in seeing where the purchases were made. >> Two quick things that

came to mind, this idea of the low-hanging fruit, the city-owned properties. Thinking through what is it that council can be doing to help us secure those and transform those into the parks that Lynn had showed the map of the survey we did of -- we saw a number of properties, low hanging fruit, city-owned land, one property that comes to mind in my neighborhood is off south Lamar, park deficient area, becoming rapidly one of our most dense areas of the city and a lot of that area doesn't have access to a park, and there's a fire station, pretty vacant track of land, just vacant. It's not used as a park but could be. I get a sense that it's going to take city council support and action to help facilitate those conversations among city departments and to try to get them moving forward on those tracts and that doesn't cost anything to acquire and not much for some of the tracts in terms what have it takes to do at least a basic transmission to park. The second thought I had was just thinking through also going forward what we can do to communicate the things that have been presented today. I think there's a lot of misunderstanding about Austin's parks and the access that we have to parks. We do great in the park acreage category, one of the leaders in the country but this came up a lot in the parkland dedication conversations started. I think people don't really understand that we really are much, much behind our peers when it comes to that access and how that's a public health issue and how it ties into so many of our other goals as a city. I didn't realize until you

[3:29:02 PM]

just mentioned it now, randy, that there had been -- I was on the task force with councilmember pool. I didn't realize there had been that historic high-level funding and had plummeted. I don't remember that ever being communicated to us. Thinking about what we can do to be strategic in our communications moving forward would be most helpful in advancing the goals that we all have. >> Pool: I agree. And one of the things I was hoping to have come from this conversation is a sense of moving forward and trying to probably have to convene a work group to try to finally identify and get the concepts into some resolution language and to move forward. I did have a specific data item for staff per capita and maybe randy can tell us what's the current per capita spending on parks? There was one of the slides that I think Lynn showed that had -- was it 41 cents? >> And it should be noted that was 2012. >> Pool: Right. I was interested in seeing a graph that would show what the per capita spending is. And we can even break it out for the central core, which is where most of the -- >> I do not have that number with me, but I can ask for it and send it with the maps. >> Pool: That would be great. I think that would help to establish a foundation of some data on what the expectations are and how we -- what the gap is between what we're doing and try to make the city size and the population size and if we're going to compare ourselves, like, to Chicago or some of the other cities that are on that list we also need to try to make sure the data is scoped so that we're trying to do apples and apples. >> Yes. While I'm here, I will speak to apples to apples. As heather mentioned we're fine on the acre side. A lot of that does not -- a lot of cities include accessible lands. A lot of our lands that are counted towards that acreage

[3:31:02 PM]

she's talking about per person are not accessible to the public. >> Pool: Deliberately so. Balconies, canyon land preserve there's specific requirements it not be open to the public. If it were, if you think about how much it would cost for us to maintain and police them, it would be a press astronomical number. So while I like having -- I like the idea of having all of our lands being open and accessible at all times, there's also the other side of it because we are liable for what may happen on those lands and have to take that into consideration as well. When the reasons why we purchased the balconies reserve were for water wall and that's a -- quality and that's a different mission. Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: And as I understand your point, that counts toward the total acreage so one of the reasons we look good in

terms of our total acreage is because we're counting lands that are not accessible for public access. >> That's correct. >> Pool: I think we should pull those out so maybe we can talk about the lands that are accessible and that would be part, I think, what you were driving to, to make sure we're talking about accessible lands. >> Yes. >> Tovo: To get back to Ms. Way's point, we need to make sure the public understands because we do have different conversations going on and the public needs to understand why this is a concern even though we have a big park like zilker, there are many areas of the city that don't have access to parks. >> I had a question for -- let me just say thank you, especially to our community members, Ms. Osgood, [ saying names ] For all of your advocacy through the years on this particular issue and your recommendations. Mr. Scott, I wanted to get back to the map that talked about aid and some of the agreements that you're -- I want to be clear on where the -- where that conversation is. As I understood your comments that you've been talking with aid about maybe moving forward with some agreements around additional playgrounds? Playgrounds/park area?

[3:33:04 PM]

>> Early on we had met with aid, talked about the concept of looking outside of just school parks and looking at their other schools throughout neighborhoods and high dense population areas that we could utilize and carve out a quarter or half acre on aid-owned property, where we have no ownership in that. Aid was open to that. >> Tovo: Great. >> And actually provided us with feasibility studies for their school sites where we could incorporate that, fund to go develop those is -- is currently not -- doesn't exist. >> Tovo: Okay. And so those were -- those conversations that you're referring to were the ones that happened during the infill, the urban parks task force? Has there been any additional work since then in terms of talking with aid? >> We try to meet with aid on a regular basis, but -- and it's always a topic that, you know, we make sure that everybody is aware of, of our goal, and the need in the future. >> Tovo: So what do you see as the next step? It sounds like those conversations have progressed behind just identifying possibilities. You've actually talked about -- as you said there are feasibility studies for how many of them? >> I would say over 20. >> Tovo: That's a good number. >> Yes. >> Tovo: So what would be the next steps, if we wanted to move forward and -- doing them? Is there additional ground work that the staff would have to do with aid? Or is -- are they -- are those agreements really ready to go pending fund. >> No. We would have to enter into an agreement on each site and then it would also include a maintenance agreement, whether we go out there and maintain that. It might not be wise for both aid to go out and maintain the school and us send a crew out and maintain the one little half acre site on that school site. Maybe it's -- enter into some type of maintenance agreement for the entire site, to have it -- maybe aid maintain the entire site for us.

[3:35:05 PM]

Then it's also -- to be able to expend dollars there. Currently can't expend bond dollars, from my knowledge, on aid property. So there is that hurdle to get over as well. >> Tovo: So we'd have to use general fund money or parkland dedication money. >> My understanding. >> Tovo: So I guess I still want to get back. This is an issue that's come up a couple times and it would appear to be, you know, not as low-hanging fruit as city-owned land but still low-hanging fruit in terms of parkland acquisition. Have you prioritized those 20 or so sites so that if we had a council action item to direct the city manager to move forward in really negotiating agreements on, say, five of those tracts, do you have a sense of which five those would be? Or would a first step be asking staff to prioritize among those 20? >> I was just looking back on the implementation plan, where they were prioritized. >> Tovo: Great, so there is a ranking of sorts. >> It's 28 aid sites on the inner core, 33 aid sites on the outer core. >> Tovo: Well, that's interesting. I'd like to see us move forward with something on that issue and so maybe I'll talk with Mr.

Scott and figure out what -- where you are in your discussions and then bring something back 40 committee to consider at the -- for the committee to considerate next month's meeting. >> That would be great. >> Tovo: For for all your work on that. >> Thank you. >> Pool: Director Hensley, did you have something to offer? >> Zimmerman: I have a question to ask, I'm one of the councilmembers on the committee. Thank you very much for coming, you guys. There's a brochure that does a very good job of explaining benefits of parks. It may be going overboard here by benefits, benefits, benefits. I want to talk about the affordability aspect quickly and draw attention to page 5 that I have here, this bottom slide that talked about the

[3:37:07 PM]

4 million, right, that's I guess recently spent. There's a note down here that says there's approximately \$1.5 million of that \$4 million that hasn't been spent. That's the way I read this. What I want to ask you to do, for the \$2.5 million that's already been spent, I'd like for you to put some Numbers on here as to how much tax revenue is being lost by the fact that those properties, which could have been, if they were sold or noosed some other way besides park, they could be put back on the tax rolls and contribute to the tax base. Secondly, once they become parks, now they incur maintenance liability, right? So there's two aspects. One of them is when property comes off the tax rolls or it's not on the tax rolls, we're losing tax revenue. That's one hit that we take. Then we take an additional financial hit because there has to be at least some maintenance done, right, on the area? So that information is very, very important. Because people need to understand benefit along with cost, right? Cost benefit analysis. So people can make an informed decision. Because the way we got to be the most unaffordable city in Texas is we say benefit, benefit, benefit, benefit, benefit, and we never talk about the cost. So I would appreciate it if you would add that bullet item on here and say for those parks already acquired, the 2.5 million, how much are we losing in tax revenue and how much are we spending in addition on maintenance for those areas. Could you include that information? >> Pool: I think mayor pro tem tovo is interested in responding. >> Tovo: Yeah. Just -- I understand the -- >> Zimmerman: Well, the question was for them. >> Tovo: Right. But I want to share something that happened at planning and neighborhoods and that is that we had a resolution asking staff to provide some information back to us and actually we learned through the process -- and this was with regard to the density bonus resolution I brought forward. We learned through that process if we are doing staff to compile a fair amount of data and information analysis, it really requires a vote of

[3:39:08 PM]

the full council. So I would say I think it's one thing to ask our park staff to come forward -- to provide us with the digital copies of the maps that they've presented here and other information that already exists but I think you're asking for a level of information and analysis that sort of goes beyond what they've already done and I would -- [indiscernible] If you're interested in that, council, for a vote. >> Zimmerman: So if parks wants to bring information citing benefits -- this is not really very scientific either, they don't need a vote of council to bring us to proposed benefits but costs we need a vote of council? >> Pool: Mr. Zimmerman, I'm going to have -- >> Tovo: To provide analysis about the tax benefits of tracts that we've already purchased and turned into park use, then that's asking them to do a fair a work on -- frankly, decisions that have already been made but they're going to have to potentially get some information from economists or, you know, real estate experts and I would -- that falls for me into the category of -- it actually goes beyond the kind of information we were asking of staff that we were asked to get a vote from the full council to obtain. >> Pool: If you would like to make some kind of a motion, I would also point out that the documentation that you're actually gesturing with was

presented not by our park staff but by a gentleman who came during citizens communication and he offered that. He brought that. That's not a city of Austin document. >> I haven't seen that document. >> Pool: Anyway, that was from Hayden brooks. So director Hensley? You were going to offer some -- >> No. I just -- I think one of the things, you know, that we need to do that's important, I think, is work with the school district like randy talked about. I think there needs to be a closer coordinated relationship because if we're looking at jointly shared land we also need to talk about the issues related to who

[3:41:09 PM]

maintains, how do they do it, and it takes us a while to get through the legal documents to do that. So we're moving -- we're moving, but we're moving slow. And we have had some positive work, not only in that area, but looking at how we accomplish joint facility development, not being able to do the bond -- I mean, spending the bond dollars because of the state law, but how we do that through other mechanisms of funding, which is parkland dedication and other means. So if -- as we work with the school district, I just wanted to mention that we do need to identify the factors involved with -- they're struggling with their playground maintenance as it is, and as a matter of fact we have met with them on several occasions to talk about making sure that our playgrounds, whether they're on school property or city property, are addressed and evaluated and reviewed on a regular basis so that the citizens doesn't see the difference between the school playground and city playground we want to make sure they're safe for everybody. It's that same thing we want to do when looking at the parks and how we're able to open up more land for park use is to make sure that it is safe and that it is accessible and that one of us or both of us are doing the good job of maintaining it well. So that's just to keep that in mind as we move forward. But we have a good relationship. We just need to keep working on it. >> Pool: Mr. Zetner. >> Yeah, I respect the idea of approaching this as a cost benefit analysis. I think that makes all kinds of sense. One thing I will say is that can get very complicated if you start taking in a lot of different kinds of trade-offs but one thing, again to the point I was trying to make in my presentation that I think would be helpful as a city is to start, again, thinking about the opportunity to use

[3:43:11 PM]

open space for transportation function and improve the quality of transportation because transportation, no matter how you do it, is expensive and if we can use open space in the right places to start to achieve some of those transportation goals, it may be very cost effective compared to the cost of putting new lanes down burnet road. >> Pool: Right. And it would -- possibly even increase the number of people who would take the bus. >> Yes. >> Pool: It would be a more welcoming location to catch the transit. There's some history, back to the school districts, there's history with the city partnering with the school districts back in the '50s and maybe even earlier, where there was shared space that was kind of the standard model. So really what -- it sounds like -- I don't know how it was that time passed and that dissolved, but I know that that has been on the front burner for me and some of my colleagues and also some of the new trustees with the school district, to try to bring that to the fore. And in those instances additionally with the transit stops, I think it makes a whole lot of sense to pear the open space where it exists with the transit stops. Like you say it could be very much the case where - - we already own the land so it's a matter of even having those stops adopted by the people who live in the vicinity. Austin really loves its parks and I think we can count on that and expand on that capacity. I did want to say that there's other school districts other than aid that we might work with on this. So pflugerville, del valle and I think manor and possibly some of the school districts on the west side, if they're not in the county, might also be interested in working with us on this. So I think what we'll do, I think mayor pro tem and I may

[3:45:14 PM]

take -- join together and work with y'all to maybe convene additional work groups to kind of move through the recommendations that you have here and see if we can't build on that and make some of this reality. There's a lot of intersecting issues, mobility committee would be a good one for you to make some presentations to with regard to the transit stops. And we're looking at our quarter cent funding and that is all targeted to safe routes to school and bikeways by the nature of the program. And so we'll be making some decisions on that. The mobility committee is looking at that in November, and I think council will make some decisions on where those funds will be spent in December. And it could be that there's some intersection there with the projects that come out of that effort. That can forward the issues that you've got here. Any other comments? >> Tovo: It looked like Ms. Osgood had something to say. >> About cost benefit, I think one of the opportunities we have here is the capacity to foster public-private relationships to help us meet our goal. It's a very systemic issue so we have to think of it broadly, in terms of broad partnerships with the health community who have an enormous amount of knowledge to contribute but also down to the fine grain and I think that's one area of practice, as we develop our parks, that we can really throw our energies behind and to help support us in the larger equation. So. . . >> Pool: Anything else y'all would like to offer? Staff, are there any other staff comments? Thank you all very much. Thanks for all the time you've put into the topic and the report, and I think I see some ways forward, moving some of

[3:47:15 PM]

these to implementation, some of your recommendations. >> Thank you. >> Pool: Thanks a lot. Let's see. Item 4, appointments to the joint sustainability committee per resolution number 20150604-048. That's item 4. I wanted to talk just a little bit about what the joint sustainability committee is. We have some applicants who are interested in appointment but I don't think we are ready -- I don't think staff is ready. We're trying to sync up the different committees and they haven't all been -- they haven't all had their appointments made yet and not all of them have staff liaisons yet appointed. So what I thought I would do on this was give kind of a high overview of what the joint sustainability committee is and then recognize that we are taking in applications. And, yes, you are. >> I'm Lewis from the office of sustainability so I have the latest information from the city clerk and would be glad to provide you any information you need. >> Pool: That would be great. So the joint sustainability committee is a committee that will advise council on matters related to conservation, sustainability, and other environmental issues. It will also oversee

[3:49:15 PM]

implementation of the Austin community climate plan. Who is on the joint sustainability committee, it's composed of 11 members of existing boards and commissions, and we lined out which board of directors and commissions those were and three community stakeholders, which will be appointed by this committee. And we will not make appointments today because not all of the commissions have had a chance to make their appointments to that committee, and I just wanted to urge all of the boards and commissions that are listed and maybe Lewis can run down the list of those commissions. Those who have not yet made their appointment to please look at doing that soonest. And interested individuals who wish to apply for the committee can apply online by way of the boards and commissions portal. This is the standard approach for taking interested applications from those interested -- applications from those interested. You can also email me at my office to let the committee know that you're

interested and we'll keep an eye out for those applications. Thanks for coming, Mr. Lef. >> Sure. So the ordinance laid out 11 different commissions and boards that we're going to make appointments and nominate individuals from those respective boards and committees and commissions to the joint sustainability committee. So to date eight have nominated somebody from their own board or commission. They've also been approved by council through your process, at the council agendas. So there are three current vacancies from the commissions that were listed in the ordinance. Economic prosperity commission, which I believe has not actually formally met yet. >> Pool: Right, I don't think they have a staff liaison appointed yet. >> Correct. Plantation and zero waste advisory commission. They actually had it on their agenda for the last meeting but got behind on their items so I think it's on their next agenda. >> Pool: Okay. So can you run through the commissions that have appointed? >> Sure. Sustainable food policy board,

[3:51:16 PM]

community development commission, the resource management commission, electric utility commission, parks and recreation board, urban transportation commission, water and wastewater commission, and the environmental commission. >> Pool: Great. All right. Thanks. Any other -- any questions or anything? All right. We will put this off and if you could signal my office when you know that those three commissions have made their appointments and will continue to take in applications and hopefully make an appointment at our next meeting in November. >> Will do. >> Pool: Okay. And just FYI, the November meeting for this committee I announced last month because the fourth Wednesday is right up against Thanksgiving, we moved our meeting for November to, I believe, it's the 16th, it's a week ahead of time -- the 18th? Okay. Yeah, the third Wednesday for November. All right? Thanks, and we'll see you here then. Thanks. Item 5, process for waiving admission fees at Barton springs pool for Austin residents 80 years of age or older. This came from action council took earlier this year and I think it was councilmember Houston who asked if we might look at this and just make a blanket open -- for all residents who are 80 years and older to have free access to our pools. Thank you for being here, staff. >> Kimberly, Mcneely, assistant director for the parks and recreation department, here with me is Sharon, division manager that oversees our nature and adventure programming, as well as our swimming pools. Just a little a. >> Speaker4: We call it -- just a little aside, we call it wet and wild. Just a little history. The reason we're here today is because exactly the way that

[3:53:17 PM]

councilmember pool has described it. You had asked us for -- previously to look into the history of the Barton springs lifetime compass if there was any options for something other than the way we currently distribute those lifetime passes. And so right now it's a method to honor -- originally it was a method to honor individuals 85 years and older. We recently found documentation that the first -- we believe one of the first fee waivers happened in 1960, and then in 1990s we changed it through council action from 85 to 80 and that up to this point, I believe there are approximately -- although it says 30, there's actually 34 lifetime passes that have been award so we just need to make that correction. I lied -- 32. And we have seven individuals that have since this subject matter came to the forefront we have seven individuals who have requested lifetime passes. So we've had over the last 55 years, we've had 32 and then seven in the last few months. We have not awarded those passes. We have no intention of not awarding the passes. We just wanted to finish this process so that we were giving the appropriate pass to those individuals and didn't cause any kind of inconvenience. So the current process is that individuals would submit a written request for a lifetime pass to the aquatics division. Requirements is that individuals had to be 80 years of age, that they contributed to Barton springs pool in some way, and

they would articulate that in their request. And also that they were a regular pool swimmer. The next part of the process is because it would be a fee waiver, meaning that these slides would no longer have to pay to enter Barton springs, that it would have to -- we'd have to create an rca to request a fee waiver from council and then we usually

[3:55:18 PM]

would present that to our land and facilities programs subcommittee, the parks board, open space committee, and then it would go to council for final approval. And it would explain what the fee waiver entailed and what our proximate revenue -- approximate revenue of forgiveness would be. And so based upon what it is that councilmember Houston had asked us, we could do a few things. The first option is to retain the five-step process that we have, where people would actually have to apply. And we could do it for Barton springs pool only or we could do it for Barton springs pool and all of the other swimming pools that require a fee during our charging season, which is normally from the time that spring break starts through to November 1. Another option is to replace that, this idea of having to apply for and instead have an amendment to our fee schedule that basically says that if you are of a certain age, you don't have to pay, 80 years or older, there is no fee. The fee for that is zero amount. Which would mean that we would no longer have to come back with an rca and go through this entire process. There would be no application process. Basically, you would show that you are of 80 years of age and then you would receive an opportunity to enter the swimming pool at no cost to you. And it could be for Barton springs pool or it could be for all of our pools. You're going to see later on in the presentation, our recommendation from a staff perspective is that it be for all of the swimming pools. The fiscal impact at the back of your presentation, I provided a -- what we believe could be -- it's on just a word document, what we believe could be the fiscal impact. Unfortunately, there's a lot of assumptions that we had to

[3:57:18 PM]

make based upon not exactly knowing the number of times that individuals who are 80 years and older actually enter our pool. Those sorts of things. So you can see that I just gave you some basic information, that the total Austin population who is -- right now -- I guess it depends on exactly what you look at but we're saying that it's 885,415, that the population in the census tells us that individuals who are 65 and older, there's 67,000 of those individuals, 67,500 of those individuals. We know that the average life expectancy is 79 years of age so just right before the 80 years of age that we're proposing you would be able to have a lifetime pass. So we made some assumptions. If 25% of the population is 65 years and older, we believe that 80 -- 80 years and older would be approximately -- if 25% of the population is 80 years and older, we believe that that's about 16,884 people, and then we're going to say that 10% of those individuals that are 80 years and older may be interested in a lifetime pass. Obviously, these are assumptions because we have no way of knowing exactly how many. So we have an eight-month charging season. Sorry, we have eight months of non-charging and then three months charging -- I'm sorry, ooh. We have eight months of charging at Barton springs and three months of charging at municipal pools. And so what we're saying is that it's \$1 to enter any of our pools, \$1 for a senior citizen. If they went for the eight months annually, 240 days, and they -- every day they went -- I'm sorry, if they went for five days during that charging season -- and it could go to any, they could go to Barton springs or any of the charging pools. The revenue would be \$171 per senior citizen over 80 years of age. And so the total foregone revenue if every individual of

[3:59:23 PM]



the 16088 individuals over the age 80 decided to use the swimming pool five times during the charging season every year, then it would be \$289,444. That's the minimum. But of course we're saying that up to this point only 32 individuals have taken advantage of this, and even with the word getting out -- and we expect there to be a larger number but even with word starting to get out we only have approximately seven more requests so we can't give you a real fiscal impact right now, but what we can do is monitor this and come back. We think it will be negligible and we think that the benefits that are associated with being able to honor individuals who are 80 and over who are still active far out weighs the costs that we would have to forego in revenue. So our recommendation is for the city council to approve an amendment to the 2016 fee schedule by adding a fee of zero dollars for city of Austin residents 80 and over and allowing access to all city of Austin managed and operated aquatic facilities. I think that we are prepared for any questions that you might have. >> Pool: Mayor pro tem? >> Tovo: Thank you for looking at this issue. So I think I understood from your recommendation, are you still recommending that in the backup presentation it looked to me like you were recommending keeping the five-step process. Has that changed? >> No, ma'am, I apologize. What we recommend is we amend the fee schedule to say that once you turn 80 years old the fee is zero. And there's no process.

[4:01:25 PM]

>> Tovo: That makes all the sense in the world. >> Other than proving that you're 80 plus. >> Tovo: Thank you. In looking over the materials earlier it looked like that the recommendation was to keep the process and I was going to recommend that we not. So it sounds like -- I'm in full agreement with your recommendations. That sounds great. Thank you. >> Pool: So question. If I'm 80 and I come to deep eddy would I show a driver's license or is the city going to issue like a library card for pools? >> It's interesting. We've had that conversation back and forth. And frankly we have not come to a decision because we believe that there may be some individuals who will feel honored by us actually putting together the pass and we feel like there might be some individuals feeling like really, you're making me go through this? Can't I just show my driver's license. So we're trying to figure out with some hybrid way of trying to honor folks the way they would like to be honored, either with the least impactful or the one that is the most honoring, but we haven't come to a conclusion, but certainly we're sensitive to both of those. The first step would be to have the zero fee so we could then begin to offer this to the folks who are interested. >> Pool: Yeah. >> Tovo: I'll just say I like the idea of people being able to show up to the pool and show their driver alone or other id that shows their age and they can get in free without another level of bureaucracy, but it did -- I meant formal process, not bureaucracy. But I did wonder about that. I think for some of these individuals we have recognized for one thing their contribution and their use of Barton springs, and so I like that you're considering whether there's some other way to honor that with some kind of card that if they want to take the time to get it they can. >> Pool: Yeah, maybe make it an optional honoring kind of a process. You could ask people if they would like to do that. >> Yeah. >> Pool: I guess I

[4:03:26 PM]

would -- if there are no other questions, I think I'd listen for a motion. >> Tovo: I move that we accept the recommendation and recommend to the full council that we implement the changes that the staff have described. >> Pool: And a second? I will be happy to second that. >> Zimmerman: I'd like to speak against. >> Pool: All right. >> Zimmerman: We'll take speakers for and against the motion or what do you want to do? >> Pool: Feel free. >> Zimmerman: Well, I'm word about this issue did make it to some of my district 6 constituents and I've heard very little but the little I did hear kind of surprised me. Some of

my 80-year-old constituents said I don't think I need a swimming pass just because I've swum a whole bunch of years. I mean, I could see both sides of this. Frankly, I don't see anything wrong with what we've been doing. I think I like the current policy of saying that people that have been involved with the pool, they have some personal interest in it and they've contributed to it over the years and they swim there routinely. I like what you're doing right now and I just -- I can't support opening this up. I think what it does is it once again segregates our city. I want to say thanks for putting together and estimate and I understand, like you're saying, it's impossible to know really what's going to happen with this. And what the revenue impact will be. But it's another step towards, you know, economically or -- I guess this would be gentrifying by age, segregating by age that we're going to have the population under 80 years old is now picking up the tab for all the swimmers over 80 years old. It's just another one of these divisions in our city.

[4:05:28 PM]

So I understand the sentiment, but I just can't support the motion. >> Pool: Okay. All right. Any other comments? All in favor of the motion? And those against? So that's two for and one against, so the recommendation succeeds and it will move forward to council. And the recommendation is as is written at the back of this document here. And thank you. All right. Let's see. I think there was -- okay, item 6 and we have a speaker on item 6, which is ordinance proposing amendments to city code title 25 requiring recycling and reuse of materials generated by certain construction demolition projects. Mr. Wrath gabeer, would you like to speak first? >> [Inaudible - no mic]. >> Pool: I also wanted to mention before we get started, this item came to the agenda late and I think that there are some other commissions and additional information that needs to be assembled so I don't know that we'll be taking any action on this today, but we'll go ahead and hear from the people who are in attendance. Thank you. Mr. Gebber, how are you? You are a sky diving accident? >> That's the story. Bob gedert, city of Austin. I brought staff to present the powerpoint, woody rains and Gina Mckinley. This issue was brought forward to our staff by a council resolution and we are following through with a lot of stakeholder meetings

[4:07:29 PM]

and discussion among those that are affected by this ordinance. And so I'd like staff to present the ordinance. I remain available for any questions. >> Pool: Thank you. >> Good afternoon. My name is woody rain. I'm a zero waste planner with Austin resource recovery and I'm here to lay out this ordinance and where it came from and where we're going with it. But I'm going to start off with a little bit of background on C and D or construction and demolition materials and then talk about some of the other policies and programs within the city of Austin that have supported those over the years which have really set the stage for this ordinance. And as director gedert mentioned, the resolution last December then called for this ordinance and we described that a little bit. And talk about the contents of it and the impact on the city in various ways. So first just a little bit of a definition so to speak. Construction and demolition or C and D materials are generally the materials that come out of building and demolishing structures in town. And I'll point out some of the constituents there. The first of several bullets there on the top left are some of the larger materials that have a fairly steady demand. The materials on the right side that are included -- are not included are ones that are generally excluded from green building definitions of C and D materials and K initiatives because those are materials that are either largely recovered or diverted through one means or another and they're controlled like asbestos containing or lead containing materials by other regulations and we wouldn't want to interfere with how those materials are managed. Beneficial use something that materials managers hold dear to

their hearts and the definition and use of that term in this ordinance holds true to the zero waste principles that the city has adopted. Some other communities have slightly different

[4:09:30 PM]

definitions, but these are the use of that application here. And I'll be using the term diversion a lot because it embraces not only recycling and materials, but also the [indiscernible]. This is nothing new to Austin, diverse of materials from construction, demolition projects, it's been going on for a long time. In the early years it was done through methods of source separation where there would be on-site separate containers for the various materials to make it easy to keep the materials clean and keep market demands, but a lot of the construction projects around town, particularly downtown, don't allow for separate collection of those materials and so the industry has evolved to where those materials have been commingled and that is dependent upon the haulers and the processors and the industry setting up systems to be able to sort that material out at a separate facility off site. And that's really what's made C and D recycling cost effective in Austin in a way that does not affect the building process, the operation there at the job site. Essentially all the material goes into a container like that, no different than if it were going to the landfill. Instead it goes to a processing facility where they sort out the goods from the rest. This is a larger facility that was in place in Austin for awhile that gives you an idea about how the demingling process can go on in processing of commingled C and D materials. There's a variety of types of operations in the Austin area right now. Most of the landfills -- in fact, all of the landfills in town have some method of diverting materials and there's some other independent operations that process the materials for the markets in the area. Where did this come from? Well, green building actually has been a laboratory or you might say an incubator of ideas on a

[4:11:30 PM]

lot of fronts in terms of energy and water conservation, saving people money on their utility bills in many ways. But this is an idea that they've championed for a long time and the infrastructure that exists in town owes a lot of its existence to the green building initiatives that they have proven out in terms of construction material, management. As you can see, they're rating system started off 20 years ago requiring that as a basic requirement on commercial and it's grown to involve other forms of construction as well, including multi-family. The Leed program also has -- provides credits for diversion so folks that are getting those green building recognitions also have an inclination to build on the infrastructure that's available in Austin to divert materials. So it's a basic requirement for commercial ratings and those green building is an integral part of a lot of the construction that goes on in Austin right now. So that's how it is. And in part why there's a lot of construction material diversion is through that existing infrastructure. Some of the material processors in town, some of these -- there are many more businesses that handle these materials than what I'm enumerating right here, but I tried to whittle it down to just those turning it into their final product or dealing directly with the scrap metal mill, paper mill or metal mini mill. So we've got a lot of destinations for the materials to go here locally. Five years ago council directed staff through the city manager to look into this idea. A year later as council adopted our master plan, which laid forth our path to 90% diversion it had a section in it that described how we would address -- how the city could address construction material management largely because it's 20% of what's generated in the Austin area and that's an opportunity for

[4:13:31 PM]

local businesses to handle more material and use that local material -- use that material locally to build

on -- no pun intended, help support our local businesses. Over the last couple of years the zero waste advisory commission formed a C and D recycling commission that then in turn worked with the Ar staff to develop what we called -- the arr staff for what we called a recycling concept or an intent, an ordinance intent. A lot of folks were involved in that. We researched what other communities had in place. We looked at the experience through Austin energy green building. As I mentioned before, because it's a basic requirement, they collect a lot of data on the programs, their buildings that have gone through the building -- the material diversion program. The city of Austin, because it meets Leed standards, has a lot of its own experience on diversion of materials so we're able to tap into that data banks. And then the local stakeholders have weighed in. We've looked at the existing markets and looked at what the potential is for additional market development within the community and also within our own remanufacturing hub that's under development south of town. Some of the folks that have weighed in on this, as you can see it's a pretty diverse set of folks that have a vested super in what that - vested interest in what this initiative might look like. Other stakeholders if you want to call it that, internal stakeholders, involve a lot of city departments and I highlighted a couple at the top because of their leadership and how they've helped us develop the concepts. As I mentioned earlier, some of the contributions from Austin energy green building and the data that they provided, but also help us understand what the opportunities are. Development services also is somebody of course that would be affected to some extent and they've provided

[4:15:31 PM]

a lot of information to help us understand how many permitted building projects could be affected on this. By the way, we'll talk about it later about the impact, the fiscal impact to the city. They also advised us in how they could minimize the impact on their permitting applications. We want to be sensitive to that. We talked earlier about the initiating resolution from a year ago. That directed staff to use that intent development that was developed through the stakeholder process during last calendar year. And was approved by the zero waste advisory commission. We then spent the first part of this year sort of fine tuning that and turning that into an ordinance that we then have shopped around or visited with the other commissions on. We briefed the environmental commission last month. We worked with the planning commission through several meetings to help fine tune the draft ordinance. And then just a couple of weeks ago we got feedback from the zero waste advisory commission. As they come through the contents I'll discuss some of the recommendations. They basically approved the ordinance with revisions in some cases here. And what you see in your backup ordinance is the result of that input. So what's in the code or this draft ordinance? It amends two parts of the city code, the land development code 25-11 and also the solid waste services code 15-6. And that's how it is that we're working close we with these other departments. The 25-11 defines what sort of building projects would be affected and demolition projects. And in 15-6 it describes what would be required of those affected projects in terms of what their diversion requirements would be, the reporting requirements and then the penalties for not reporting

[4:17:32 PM]

or not meeting diversion requirements. It also adds some elements -- some requirements, builds on some reporting requirements that exist right now for private haulers and establishes a new program we're calling qualified processors. Then the other element before council are the administrative rules that support these amendments to the solid waste services code. So stepping through this starting sort of with at the end of the draft ordinance, but I think a good place to start is whose affected. And this summarizes a little bit about the discussion among the three bodies here, the two commissions and arr

staff. The ordinances drafted would affect new construction -- construction projects that are over 5,000 square feet beginning next October, October 1 of 2016, but it would delay until 2019 affecting commercial demolition projects. The planning commission didn't weigh in one way or the other on the commercial demolition, but the zero waste advisory commission advised staff and council on delaying commercial demolition. The other element that was up for discussion is what would be required, what are the diversion requirements for these projects that are affected. And you'll see there on the second and third columns the diversion percentages and these are diversion choices because a project could choose between either a percent diversion or reducing the amount that they dispose. And I should spend a little time explaining. That. That's built on another green building concept where a project that's built well and designed well may not generate a lot of material as discards. They want to save money upfront. They don't want to pay for it upfront and then pay to dispose of it as well. And this pounds per square foot disposal rate is designed to reward that or recognize that initiative

[4:19:32 PM]

within green building or any kind of building. So the affected project could choose between the two diversion rates. As you can see all three bodies, planning commissions, zero waste advisory commission and staff agreed that the diversion rate should start off there at that 2016 level. The swabbings championed higher -- zero waste advisory commission championed higher rates in future years and I'll later mention a couple of studies, but they introduced those higher rates so that the industry could plan for aspirational and help to reach our zero waste goals at future rates -- future dates. The draft ordinance before you did not include that because we believe that the industry will be working towards expanding those diversion opportunities on its own. But the other reason why is because that ordinance calls for staff providing council with a couple of studies. One is to track and report to council on the household affordability, the impact on the household affordability of not only the existing program but any increased diversion requirements. Similarly it would be looking at a market study of the materials to ensure that the materials do have viable destinations. And then with that information council could act in later years on expanding the program or increasing the diversion rates. So that's a general requirements of it. The remainder of the ordinance you might say are some of the administrative aspects of it. An affected project would report to the city how much they're diverting, how much they're disposing so that the city could do the math and they could do the math to see if they're in compliance with the 50% diversion or two and a half pounds per square foot disposal. To keep this ordinance from being a one size fits all, it has an element, a feature

[4:21:33 PM]

in it that's a waiver request so that a project just by the nature of the materials that are affected can show that the city that it can't meet a 50% diversion, this provides an opportunity for them to request a waiver from that diversion requirement. So as part of the reporting mechanism they would say -- they would provide evidence and show how the material wouldn't -- the project would not be able to meet that diversion requirement. On the enforcement side of it all for either not reporting or not meeting the diversion requirements and granted a waiver, the penalty would be a class C misdemeanor. The qualified processor feature is something that grows out of the green building initiative, something that Leed has piloted recently in order to reduce processing costs and administrative costs. Currently under a green building project they report box by box how much material has been diverted, but on a qualified processor system the city would through a third party validate that that processor is diverting at least the 50% requirement. Meeting the city's requirement. So that all the material that they receive from an affected project would be basically shown to be in compliance with this ordinance. So it means less

processing, having to keep track of -- or administrative work on the part of the processor, keeping track of every load and the cool fronts of every -- and the contents of every load, but the reporting for that project. The licensed haulers currently on this 15-6-44 currently report to the city three Numbers, the quantities of material that they deliver to either a landfill or are, a recycling facility or an organic processing facility, and this ordinance would expand on that to have them split

[4:23:34 PM]

out the quantities of material that are C and D materials that they deliver. That helps them track the benefits and impact of this ordinance, but it also helps us understand the benefits of some of the other initiatives that the city has in place that affect the remainder of the materials that they haul. So how does this affect the city? It does in a variety of ways. I've alluded a little bit to the household impact through future studies. You have in your backup some -- a lot of details that illustrate the effect on household affordability, but I wanted to introduce a little bit -- another bit of Numbers here. To illustrate the number of projects based on fy '13 building permits, the number of projects that would not be affected versus the Numbers that would be. And you can see it primarily affecting by putting at the threshold at 5,000 square feet is primarily not affecting residential projects. But it is affecting multi-family projects, the larger ones. So it doesn't affect the average size household or average size single-family home, 2500 square feet. So based on that, on the household -- the affordability impact statement ruled that they would have a neutral impact on household affordability and aspects in Austin. A neutral impact on the land use for affordable housing development. And because these other items down there listed below are already covered by green building initiatives, either required or they have development incentives to meet green building requirements, they're already diverting construction materials. So those kinds of projects are already diverting that sort of thing. So it would have a neutral impact on those production of affordable housing

[4:25:35 PM]

impacts. Now, it would have a negative impact on development in general and that's because it does cost more to process a box of commingled C and D materials than disposing of it in a landfill, but these bullets are designed to illustrate what that level of impact might be. And I think the folks at Austin energy green building and all the data that they've collected be able to give us some idea of what the generation rates are on a per square footage basis of households or housing construction in Austin. They average about eight pounds per square foot disposed or generated -- that either had to be somewhere, either be disposed or go into a landfill. And if you look at just the gate rates, if you call up a recycler and say how much are you charging? And you call up a disposal facility and take the difference between that, it's about \$20 a ton. For some people they might get a good deal on disposal and the \$20 a ton it might be more than that because they can dispose of it for less. On average it might cost about a penny a pound and that could work out to about less than 10 cents per square foot, compare that to \$100 per square foot for a building cost, which is affordable. And it's pretty small. Just to put that in terms of real square footage is a 5,000 square foot structure it would add about \$400 to the cost of that structure or 15,000 square foot structure about 1200. So how many projects would be affect and how would that impact the city's cost? So what is the cost to arr is what this table is intended to convey. And you can see the several fiscal years there with the new construction kicking in in fy 17 and the commercial demolition kicking in in fy 20. That next row there shows the Numbers of projects that would be completed in that year and it's -- although they might be impacted --

[4:27:38 PM]

they might be issued a permit in fy 17, they might not be through until time in fy 18 so that number of projects grows. And that's why it is the number of ftes for arr would grow a little bit. The first year ramping up there's some expense. We can absorb that within our own budget, but you can see it's a modest increase over the next few years for arr. One thing that's an unknown is what the compliance rate would be. And that's another cost that may develop later on. So the other impact to the city is our impact to our zero waste goals. How much less are we going to dispose of? How much more material will be pumped back into the economy? The two main rows there estimate the tonnages of materials that would come from either construction projects or commercial demolition projects. And over time 208,000 tons. That's a big number. What does that mean? And it is just an estimate, but to compare it to a number that we hold dear is the number that we collect from our -- throughout the course of the year from our curb side customers, that blue and green areas being the 2016 and ultimately 2019 quantities of material, you can see that it's in the ballpark of what we're collecting curb side. So it's a pretty good amount. Pretty large amount. So staff comes before you today to recommend -- or ask for your approval of this ordinance to the full council. And we're available to answer whatever questions you've got. >> Pool: Thank you, Mr. Rains -- >> I did forget this. It will come before you -- it's scheduled for a public hearing on November 19th. >> Pool: All right. Very good. Thank you. Questions? >> Zimmerman: One

[4:29:39 PM]

question. >> Pool: Councilmember Zimmerman. >> Zimmerman: Back on page 29, could you help me understand where the 5,000 square feet, 15,000 square feet, 400, \$1,200, where the one cent per square foot, where did those Numbers come from? >> We -- Austin energy green building and their project -- projects that meet Austin energy green building standards report to them the quantities of material that they dispose or divert. And we were able to look at those and compare it to the square footage of the project. >> Zimmerman: I'm sorry, green building. So what percentage of green building is -- I guess what I would call the real world. The constructions and cranes going on around here, is that all green building? >> I couldn't tell you how much of it is green building. I can say that everything in the downtown area must meet the minimum requirements for green building. And we've got folks from green building program here if you want to ask some more questions about that. >> Zimmerman: I need to hear from the people who actually build things. When I was a teenager, I didn't play sports or go to camp and all that stuff Normal kids did. I spent my teenaged years at construction sites, picking up trash and debris and building things, doing foundations, roofs, commercial framing and construction. That's what I did. >> Yes. >> Zimmerman: And I just get the feeling when I talk about this subject that nobody knows what really goes on at a construction site because they haven't been there and they haven't done the work. But it's just my opinion. But I'm really skeptical that these costs are anywhere close to reality. I think this is going to be very, very expensive and you're going to get a lot of push back on this. >> Thankfully we had a lot of Numbers from around the country because we're not the first. And so we're able to compare the Numbers that we collected here in Austin to Numbers that other communities have reported.

[4:31:45 PM]

Due buick, Ohio. >> Zimmerman: Do you have Numbers from Detroit too, the city of Detroit? I mean -- the construction is just going to move outside of Austin and it's already doing that today. This will just accelerate the move of construction outside of Austin. >> Pool: I think the city that Mr. Rains mentioned was Dubuque, Iowa, it wasn't Detroit. Any other comments or questions for this panel? Appreciate the time you've taken -- >> Tovo: I do have one. >> Pool: Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: I probably have more

questions than I'm going to ask right now, but I think I just want to ask one right now. That is, we've gotten some concerns lately and I know we've communicated these on to your staff, but the concerns have come from the demolition of historic properties where none of the materials have been salvaged. And I should say historic in terms of their age, not designated as landmarks, which would have been protected. But this ordinance -- these ordinance amendments, as I understand it, won't address that situation at all as it's currently been crafted. >> It does not interfere with what's going on right now. We want to make sure that because there's a lot of deconstruction and salvage that goes on that all of that would count towards the diversion rates. That's why we've included not just recycling, but also reuse. It's written in a way to sort of let the market determine where those materials go, whether they go into recycling or into the salvage uses. Some of the by-products you might say out of establishing this ordinance is having a program that will foster a lot of the other opportunities out there. Our department has a partnership with the economic development to support the reuse of materials, something called the Austin materials marketplace. Habitat for humanity posts a lot of materials on that. And I think one of the

[4:33:46 PM]

by-products of this will be helping the generators find the users. That's kind of the missing element a lot of times when materials are salvaged. And we're doing a lot of salvage down there on the onion creek buyouts and those folks are finding places and partners for those materials to go. And I think this program will help support that sort of initiative. >> Tovo: I want to say I'm extremely supportive of your efforts and the direction this is going, I think my concern is really wondering whether you're-- whether the changes are going to be capturing the situation I'm describing and I don't believe it would be because it's really aimed at larger scale projects. >> I see. It's over 5,000 square feet and above. And commercial demolition. Yes. >> Tovo: So I think in the time between now and when it comes to council I'd like to just explore whether you've considered options. Because as I recall the council resolution was fairly broad in terms of looking at construction diversion. It didn't specify just for the largest projects, just commercial. But we do have, you know, an increasing number of demolitions. I've forgotten what the number was just last year alone of residential demolitions. There's Mr. Sadowsky who provided us with that information so he may remember how many. Did you say 2500? 1200. And so especially when those projects are older homes where we know there likely is a market for those materials, but also we're losing what I would regard as some pretty valuable architectural elements that could be used on other older properties, I think we should have -- at least explore having requirements for those properties as well. >> I'd like to address that. In our stakeholder meetings and our discussions on demolition, we were primarily focused in a different arena than what you're speaking of there. And I think what you're speaking to is a niche that we can certainly address and

[4:35:46 PM]

I'd like to work with staff and Austin green building and see if we can find a way to address the issue you're bringing forward. Our recommendations on eliminating the demolition recovery efforts in the initial years were based on stakeholder feedback on large commercial projects where demolition material has no markets or very limited markets. And we're hoping by 2019 that those markets rebuild. That's in a demolition world of commercial buildings. What you're speaking to is recovery of high value material, and in smaller buildings. And I think we can capture that. >> Tovo: Okay. Thank you. And I do see Mr. Sadowsky here. I don't know if he wants to comment on what he's hearing from preservation in Austin and others who have been involved in this. >> I'm really just here to answer any questions. >> Tovo: Thank you. >> Pool: We have one person here to make some statements. Empty rathgabbler. You



have three minutes, sir. Welcome. Red means you're on. >> Okay. My name is Ross Rathgaber. My family has been in the demolition business in Austin for over 50 years. The ordinance as now proposed is a whole lot better than it started out being. I want to -- I'm going to kind of take a wait and see attitude as far as how it works with the construction part of it. You need to understand the difference in the construction and demolition. It may sound real obvious, but from a waste recycling standpoint it's a whole lot easier on a construction job after you've done the framing, you go pick up all the little scraps of lumber and they go in a container. After you've done the sheetrock the drywall portion of your project and you haven't painted yet, you go segregate that material and so on. And it's a whole lot easier to segregate materials doing that versus what you do on a demolition project. And considering the way most

[4:37:48 PM]

demolition is done mechanically, it's you've got a commingled waste stream. We do recycle as best practices and I segregate materials to the maximum extent that I can. If I can pull metal out I did. If I can pull masonry out I do. We don't start on a slab until all the other debris is gone, but there is a big, big difference in how you approach a construction project versus a demolition project. Councilmember Tovo, as to your question about saving things out of old houses? I'd love to. A lot of times they have asbestos or lead on them. One of the big incentives if you want to increase markets, and I want to commend Woody and Gina, they've really been working with me and I think they think I'm from the dark side at times. But one of the ways you increase it, for instance, salvaged lumber in Austin, Texas cannot be used to build a house. You can only use banded lumber to build a house. You can use it for decorative things or maybe form things. Let's maybe change the building code. You've got a board that's 50 years old that may have some nail holes in it, but it's probably a whole lot better than the two by four that you go down to Home Depot and buy that was cut two weeks before. But it boils down to markets. And I think that by delaying the demolition component of this to three years it gives the markets for the construction materials time to develop. You know, one of the things I do have a big concern about is the achievability of these goals. And they were originally *Fait accompli*, we were going to go to 75%, which I've done on certain demolition projects, but it takes a special kind of demolition project to do that on. On 95% it's virtually

[4:39:50 PM]

unachievable. Unless you have an all metal or all concrete structure you're just not going to get there. [Buzzer sounds] My time's up, my time is up. But painted sheetrock there is no use for painted sheetrock anywhere. >> Pool: I appreciate your work with the staff and I hope you will continue to give your assistance and opinions on -- >> I wish there were more of my come patriots down here. I've tried to understand. And councilmember Zimmerman, this is a big deal. And the biggest component is its impact on affordability and that's one of the reasons why I think this three year period before, particularly for demolition, because it may just kill my business. I may just have to move out of Austin. I've lived here my whole life. >> Pool: Thank you, Mr. Rathgaber. >> But I don't think \$20 a ton is going to be enough to -- for the process. >> Pool: Thank you. >> Zimmerman: Before you go I have a question for you. I appreciate you coming up and I want to say I think the reason more of your colleagues are not here is because as you said, *Fait accompli*. They're not going to get anywhere. There's no sense of reality with a lot of the bureaucracies and bureaucrats here because they haven't done the work. They don't understand what it is they're regulating. So yes, you are probably going to be kicked out of the city along with a lot of other people. People are just going to leave. That's what's going to happen. >> I hope not. >> Tovo: I have a quick question. >> Pool: Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: When you were talking about the

salvaged lumber and the code restriction against using salvaged lumber to construct buildings, are you aware of any cities that allow for that? >> I don't know. I mean, Austin could change it. I think that's something that really ought to be considered. If you want -- that's the greenest thing to do is not go to foxsanantonio.com and click on beat the traffic out and cut down another tree. A lot of the lumber that's

[4:41:50 PM]

used now, you can make mulch out of it, but you're prohibited from counting for it from use as fuel. I seem to remember a number of years ago we invested in a bio mass facility in east Texas that I guess has been mothballed, but if it was a good idea to burn wood over there from trees that had just been cut down and were green versus, you know, cured lumber that's a whole lot more efficient fuel, why isn't that a good idea? And I understand that it's not counted in the Leed guidelines. They don't allowed it as use of fuel. I question that. >> Tovo: Okay, thank you. >> Pool: I thank everybody for being here. Mr. Gedert, was there anything else you wanted to offer? We have one more agenda item and I promised we would end at 5:00. Go ahead. >> Just simply asking for a recommendation as we move to city council. I recognize there's a bump in the road with the deconstruction and recovery of material. We can work on that issue. >> Tovo: I'll move that we recommend this to the full council. I'll just add the caveat that I will have to really think through the lag in time for demolition as well. I think that is -- I understand the reasons that have been offered for why that's in place, but I will have to think about that a lot before we take our final vote. >> Pool: Is there a second? I'll be happy to offer the second. Any other discussion? All in favor? Of the mayor pro tem's motion? Any against? Two for, one opposed. That motion passes. Thank you all for coming today. We have one last item and this one, item 8, is the renovations work that is happening or will be happening on the northwest municipal pool. And this was an item that came directly out of your deliberations and budget, one of thing -- specifically that I was looking for.

[4:43:50 PM]

This pool is in district 7 and it's one of the major pools. I think it's like the third most used throughout the city. And I guess you guys are going to talk about that. Hi, Marty, hi, Kimberly. Thanks for hanging out with us so late in the afternoon. I appreciate you being here. The floor is yours. >> All right. So the basic objectives of the briefing today are to provide you an operational overview, give you a very brief summary on the conditional assessment and then to provide you information regarding the improvement considerations and the estimated timeline. >> Tovo: Can I ask a quick question since we're about to lose our quorum here. >> Zimmerman: You don't need a quorum for this, do you? >> Tovo: That was my question. Are we discussing and potentially taking action on this today? Because it's headed to council for an expenditure? Or is this just an informational? >> Just a briefing. >> Pool: And then the only other thing that was going to happen is I was going to announce the committee schedule for 2016, but that also doesn't take -- >> Okay. So just real briefly, and my apologies. I didn't realize how small this would end up on your page but hopefully you can see that in your packet. This particular pool was built in 1956, which makes it 59 years old. The operating budget is \$195,593. And that's a five-year average. This particular pool is open from may through September. It's one of four aquatic facilities in district 7. It uses approximately 7.3 million gallons of water, approximately 56,847 patrons participate -- use this pool or participate in some kind of programming at this pool annually. It requires 13 lifeguards, two cashiers and two

[4:45:51 PM]

managers to run. It's open 8:00 A.M. To 8:00 P.M. On weekdays and -- that should say A.M. 11:00 A.M. To 8:00 P.M. On weekends. And some of the special programming that happens there includes water polo, special olympics, swim lessons, et cetera. This pool includes -- and district 7 just for comparison purposes, just so you know, it also includes balcones neighborhood pool and brentwood neighborhood pool. And walnut creek. And those pools I was supposed to have notes in my notes it says I was supposed to have comparison notes, but I failed to do that, so I apologize. I can tell you that this pool is the second in attendance compared to municipal pools only behind Bartholomew pool. Northwest was included in the department's aquatic assessment and before we specifically speak about northwest pool, let me just provide you a real quick overview of the aquatic assessment. It was a structural -- the first part of the aquatics assessment was a structural and engineering evaluation and that has been complete and that assessment can be found online. We are currently in phase 2, which is a community input process, and it has been named women 512 and it includes focus group and survey development and community contacts. We're working with a consultant by the name of Cortez consulting. Cortez consulting. And she and her team of individuals will be putting together information that will be transitioned over to the third phase, which is a third phase assessment, which will take the engineering information and the community input information and put it into a package that will help bring forward a master plan. And we're calling that phase 3 of the aquatics

[4:47:52 PM]

assessment. And again online it gives you some information about all the three phases. We have selected brand-setter-carol as the contractor for the third phase. Has it gone to council? It's gone to council and been approved and we've already started work. Of course it has because we've already been having meetings with. This the aquatic assessment is to determine high priority objectives. The ones that is online from 2014, its purpose was to help us understand what are some of the high priority objectives that need to be addressed. And then it also provided some general recommendations. Please know that this assessment had eight public meetings, two open houses, 3003 surveys, one interactive town hall meeting that included approximately 5600 individuals who participated, and the basic feedback said that we'd like to extend the use. 75% of the folks said they would like to extend the use of existing pools. 56% of the people said we'd prefer to build a new pool. And 63% supported seeking alternative funding for being able to support those pools. That's just a general -- there's lots of detail online if you wanted to read that. Northwest is considered one of the seven critical pools, which means that within the next five years, five to 10 years, there were seven pools in this assessment that are predicted to fail because structurally or the engineering aspects of the pool have been -- have deteriorated such that it could possibly not be around for us in the next five to 10 years unless we take action. The other pools that are included in that are givens, montopolis, northwest, Gillis, govalle and Shipe. It's a recommended cost to replace northwest pool. In 2013 it was \$8.1 million. And just so that you know,

[4:49:52 PM]

Shipe and govalle, because of the previous council's generosity, there was money that was dedicated to rebuild those pools. Northwest, while there will be some improvements, it won't be considered to be taken off of the critical list, but there will now be five pools on the critical list instead of seven. Here's some of the deficiencies that were identified at northwest pool. I won't read all of them to you, but the one that was of specific importance, I believe, to the individuals who use this pool is the uneven deck because the uneven deck did not -- it's provided a safety issue. It also provided or impeded access to the pool for individuals who were disabled. And so based upon that information I'm turning this over to

Marty so that he can tell you a little bit more about where we are in the actual improvement process. >> Marty stamp also with parks and recreation assistant director. I would like to acknowledge Sheryl Bolin and Wayne Simmons from the broader aquatics team here to answer questions as well. Of course we all know where the pool exists in northwest district park. It's part of a larger park facility, certainly with other amenities surrounding it. As it relates to pool deck renovation project, you know, we've begun our analysis of the pool and as Kimberly suggested, the current realm of the pool, the pavement heaved and cracked, inconsistent texture to the deck, some prior applications of non-slip pool deck surfaces has failed. Some trip and fall hazards related to those changes in grade and ultimately some drainage impairments as well due to the changes of grade, but then certainly A.D.A. Accessibility there are barriers in place and we will quantify those further with on-site surveying.

[4:51:53 PM]

Just a few photos here from the earlier analysis illustrating some of the on-site issues that I'm sure we're all very, very familiar with. It's just deteriorated condition that's characteristic of our older pools. When we look at now the opportunities, and certainly the department is very appreciative of council's appropriation of \$50,000 now to address the pedestrian space about the pool. We're developing a work plan at this time. In fact, we started the day this morning on-site with one of what has been a series of on-site meetings with aquatic staff and our in-house construction team. In general right now the steps underway are the topographic survey and the beginning of the scoping of the design and the additional permitting analysis that we're looking at. We will begin with some select demolition of some areas of the pool deck now to ascertain what's happening beneath that surface in order to correct the condition. In terms of a project schedule it is our aspiration to complete this work during this off-season, get it up and running by next swim season. We will know more about that within the next week or two as we delve a little deeper into the existing condition. With the money allowed we're fairly confident that we'll be able to address the paving around the pool itself as we transition closer to the gate house and the restroom facility. We'll have to draw a line somewhere to stop. We can't take the paving work all the way to the parking lot and the street. That would be cost prohibitive. But one of the other things we're looking at is while we have that pavement surface up, either all or in part, there are some plumbing return lines that are part of the pool filling system. We'll be looking at those. There's sort of a secondary system up in place and functional now. This may be an opportunity if it's cost allowing, we will be able to create some of those repairs while we

[4:53:54 PM]

have the paving up, but we're really focused on the pedestrian space itself to correct that slip-fall condition. And again, we're looking at a combination of in-house construction forces as well as some contractors that are available to us through some service agreements to get the work done as quickly as possible. But that is certainly our intent. We will know more as I say during the next week or two as we finalize a work plan and a schedule. Should we find that it would not be possible to complete this work during the off-season we'll certainly let you know as soon as possible, but I think we have a medium to high level of confidence that we can get it done this winter. So with that, any questions that you have? Happy to help. >> Pool: Keep me posted. I'd like to go out when the work is underway and have a look at it and then maybe when it's complete. And one of my constituents I think is involved in swim 512 who has an interest in northwest pool, especially, and she has been working on increasing the public engagement for swim 512 to kind of get the word out more broadly in the community. So thank you all for your efforts. >> We would be certainly happy to provide a preconstruction or a mid construction walkabout so you can see the work while it's in process. We'll certainly keep you in the loop. >> Pool:

Any other comments? All right. Thank you both. The last item I just wanted to announce for 2016 our committee schedule. And I think we may be -- this will be on our agenda for future adoption. So this will be more for staff to communicate forward. Fourth Wednesday I plan to have meetings January, February, April -- and these are the dates that are on here. January 27, 2016, February 24, April 26, which is not a fourth Wednesday because of conflicts with

[4:55:57 PM]

any other date like holidays and budget work sessions. May 26, May 24, June 22. We're going to skip August and we already skipped July for budget. So we skip August. September 28, October 26 and then November 16, which is the third Wednesday, which is similar to what we're doing this year moving up to the third week. And then cancelling December, which I also plan to do this year. So we'll be cancelling in 2016 the March meeting, the July one again is already canceled, August and December in 2016. So that would be eight meetings. And we'll try to put all the work into the eight meetings left on the schedule and I think that will work, but if it doesn't we can always revisit the schedule. We'll give a try at giving some time back to people. I appreciate all the efforts that is expended to get these meetings going and everyone's attendance late in the day. I think we may be done. Is there anything else? All right. We are adjourned at 4:58. Thank you all very much.