City Council Work Session Transcript – 08/30/2016

[9:12:56 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: So we don't have a quorum yet so I can't bring us in, but by way of notice, I would anticipate that we'll do the codenext stuff after lunch today rather than first. Probably call up the pid briefing first since that's on the agenda. And then if we have time then do the host. We're going to break at 10:00 to go into executive session on the interim manager question. Hit that, the executive session, then come back right after lunch for the continuation of the briefings. So as soon as we have a quorum we'll start, go from 9:00 to 10:00 on briefings, beginning with pid, and then host if we can. At 10:00 we're going to break, go into executive session through lunch and then back after lunch to brick back up brief -- back up after lunch to pick up briefings.

[9:17:09 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: So I'm going to call and convene the meeting here. Today is Tuesday, August 30th, 2016. The time is 9:15. We're in the boards and commissions room here at city hall. We have a quorum. Again, we're going to start with a briefing on the pid. If there's time we're going to move to the briefing on host. We're going to break at 10:00, basically wherever we are, to go into executive session to discuss interim manager. We'll probably stay in that into lunch, complete the other items on the executive session, come back here after lunch to complete the briefings and do pulled items. So we're going to begin with the first briefing on the pid. Do you want to take us through that? >> Sure. Good morning, mayor and councilmembers. Elaine hart, chief financial officer. I'm here this morning to present the staff's recommendation regarding Travis county's creation of the wild horse ranch public improvement district. We had a briefing for council on August 9th at the same time that the county was in voting session and voted to create that pid. What we hope to cover today is to provide our recommendation for council action that is posted for Thursday of this week and also at the previous work session council expressed some desire to have earlier information about potential future pids, so we'll cover some additional information about pids that the county has received petitions on and then next steps. Just as a refresher and for the public. The wildhorse ranch development about a

[9:19:11 AM]

2200-acre development in eastern Travis county. It is in the city's desired development zone and it is just south of U.S. Highway 290 east. It's at the intersection of sh 130 and 290 east. Of the 2200 acres, 1600 acres are within the pid petition. The city has approved pud unit development zoning for this

development area and has fully purposed annexed the area as well. That happened in 2003. The property was undeveloped at the time of annexation and it still remains undeveloped. The annexation was per the owners request, a regulatory plan that was adopted at the time of their limited purpose annexation. In October of 2015 the owners of the land filed a petition with Travis county to create the pid. As I said on August 9th, Travis county created its first public improvement district, the wildhorse ranch public improvement development, and that is also the first Texas county pid in a city full purpose annexed area to the best of our knowledge. Included in their action, the county approved a term sheet which included key elements of the pid agreement. It also provided that Travis county would approve any of the pid financed improvements. It would also control the timing of the pid formation as well as the timing and the content of the bond issuances. There are several key financial provisions within this term sheet. They specified a maximum authorized pid eligible improvements for the financing of $65 million. That was to include the hard costs, the soft costs, contingencies for the construction as well as the construction management fee. But it did exclude any of the pid formation

[9:21:11 AM]

costs and the issuance costs related to the bond issuance. It also set a maximum equivalent tax rate of 35 cents per 100-dollar assessed valuation for the annual pid assessment. This would be in order to make sure that with the fully loaded taxes and the pid assessment that they still remained competitive in the market that they are adjacent to with the various muds and other developments in the area. And then also one of the final financial terms is that the bond terms would be negotiated at the time that they were being issued and the negotiations would depend on current market conditions. In addition, the term sheet included a partial listing of the public improvements that were to be developed. The county, I spoke with the budget director yesterday, they have a list of 95 million dollars' worth of pid eligible improvement, public improvements that are eligible under the pid statute. They outlined specifically a list of about 42 million that represents this first list. And that included the developer's one-third share of the wildhorse connector road, other improvements, two major trails, work on aunt to major trail and the Gilleland creek trail, which is important in that area of town. In addition monies for public trails, parks and public amenity centers which would include swimming pools and splash pads. Other water and wastewater infrastructure that would not otherwise be reimbursed under reimbursement agreements with the city and then water quality and storm water detention infrastructure. Again, all these are public improvements that would improve the quality of the

[9:23:12 AM]

development. In addition, the developer has agreed to land donations that will assist in providing additional open space for the county, will provide a minimum of five acres for a transportation joint facility -- joint use facility, and additional land for two manor independent school district school sites in that area. Staff's recommendations are specific to the wildhorse pid and cannot be considered as recommendations across the board for any other pid. Each pid will be evaluated by staff on a case-by-case basis. And so we would have to come back if -- regarding any of these additional pid petitions. We do recommend that the council approve the creation. That you not object. We have drafted a resolution that's in backup. It provides for a blank for the council to select "Does much -- fill in the bank with either does or does not. But staff recommends that the council not object to the creation. It is a superior development and it is in the desired development zone, which meets the objectives of the city's pid policy. We also recommend that the council approve several additional draft resolution provisions. One which provides a funding alternative for one-third of the wildhorse connector ranch for the city as well as some other city protections. In the term sheet the Travis county and wildhorse developer agreed to, it

specifically requests for city funding participation on the wildhorse connector. The pid term sheet calls for one-third share, as we mentioned at the previous briefing that the county and the developer would like the city to participate on. That current estimate on

[9:25:12 AM]

the roadway -- the one-third piece would be five million to seven million dollars. And so in working with the developer last week, they agreed to an alternative that we had not discussed with council before and I would like to talk you through that. They agreed that the funding could initially be met by increasing the amount of the pid issuance bond issuance. So I said they had 95 million dollars' worth of pid eligible public improvements, roadways were on that list. As long as they stayed within the 65 million maximum on the term sheet they believe that they could -- that this could be -- our portion could be included in the pid bond. Then the city would be asked to reimburse up to the maximum of five million depending on what the cost of the road was, to be paid back over the 10-year period following the issuance of the pid bonds. The city's reimbursement would be in the assessment plan in the next five-year period and it would be used to reduce the future pid special assessments. The city could at its option prepay this amount at any time without penalty. Sources of funds for this reimbursement at this point would be the general fund or any other appropriate source that we might identify in the future. And that funding option in the future might also still include the certificates of obligation. The advantage to this approach is that rather than coming up with five to seven million in total cash or issuing certificates of obligation, this opportunity gives the city the ability to pay out the seven million over a 10 year period if it so chose. So we could set aside,

[9:27:14 AM]

once the pid bonds are issued, we could set aside half a million dollars to $700,000 each year or we could issue the certificates of obligation. And so this allowed the city a longer period of time to repay the one-third of the road. Other provisions in the resolution that were agreed upon last week with the developer, there are two small pieces of property within the pid that are not fully purposed annexed and we will proceed with full purpose annextion of these in the additional year so that the pid is within the city's jurisdiction. We also asked them to put in their bond documents that the city of Austin property inside the pid would not be subject to any pid assessments, and worked with the developer who agreed to provide an additional -- to provide an easement of 12 developable acres for future expansion of the wastewater treatment plant that is located in the subdivision. They have a 250,000-gallon treatment plant currently and the expansion plan can expand up to 750,000 to address service needs in that area. This is -- the words are a little bit small. If you will look at your written copy. Since the beginning of the summer Travis county has received four additional petitions for the creation of new pids. They have begun the process of looking at those. Their procedure calls for developers to provide a notice of intent to petition for a pid and then there is a 45-day waiting period before they can actually file the petition. I believe that of the four the first one, turner's crossing, is

[9:29:14 AM]

the only one that has actually filed the petition. But turner's -- there are four pids. Lago's filing is not complete so it was sent back for additional work by Travis county with the developer. Each of these pids -- each of these pids is a planned unit development that is within the city's etj. There is one one and a half miles east of the intersection of I-35 and sh 130 east. It is in precinct 4 for Travis county in commissioner Gomez's precinct. It's about a 470-acre master planned community with 1500 single

family detached homes, 660 multi-family units planned and over eight acres of office and general commercial lease space planned. Austin water will be providing the water and wastewater service. Entrada, the city actually set public hearings for the annexation of this property in early August for annexation in this year's program. Currently the subdivision is undeveloped. It is also south -- it is north, but it's south of the intersection of wells branch parkway and especially manual road. And Bella Fortuna has annexed property south of the intersection of Brad well road. The property is undeveloped. We do have zoning for a preliminary plan for 415

[9:31:16 AM]

single-family home development. City wastewater service will be made available and we may be able to make water service available if they meet the agreement with their current service provider, which is creedmoor Maha. I would note here that the future extension of pleasant valley road will run through this property from north to south and this is also in Travis county precinct 4, which is represented by commissioner Gomez. Next steps, on your council agenda for Thursday there is a resolution for your approval. Travis county created this pid on August 9th. The council has 30 days to object, which would be the September 8th deadline. So the resolution is your opportunity to express your objection or lack of objection to the creation of the pid. As I said, it is on the consent agenda, but it will have to be pulled so that you can full in the blank in the resolution with the words "Does" or "Does not" which is readily apparent from the draft resolution. And then potential future agenda items that might come before council regarding the wildhorse pid that would be with Travis county on the cost sharing of the wildhorse connector and any other interactions that we need regarding the future bond issuance for the pid in terms of inspections and acceptance of property for the city to manage. We will continue to monitor Travis county pid activity. We're in close communication with the budget director over at Travis county and share information freely. And we'll also provide council periodic status reports so that we give you timely information on these pids. With that I have -- I'm available for questions if you have any questions. >> Mayor Adler: Thank

[9:33:17 AM]

you. Does council have any questions. Yes, councilmember Gallo? >> Gallo: On the last slide we were talking about the potential future agenda items , the interlocal agreement. So if the interlocal agreement is not done what's our financial -- what does that produce for us? I'm just concerned that we're agreeing to do the pid, but it looks like we have an outstanding interlocal that needs to be done also. If we run into a roadblock with the interlocal, what does that mean to the city? >> I think that the resolution that you're passing is a policy statement, but it also represents the agreement between the city and the developer. We did call the county budget representative last week and she was in agreement with the pid bonds being increased. She has been in contact with me as late as yesterday evening saying that they want us to be at the table as they continue to negotiate the pid bonds and process through how those public improvements will be inspected because they will ultimately become city assets, many of them will, and we'll have to maintain them. So there's a lot of work left to do. And so the interlocal is to tie up those loose ends. At this point Travis county commissioners have expressed a clear desire that the city participate in this roadway, even though it was annexed by the city prior to them using their bonds. They do have bonds for half of the roadway and they have a cost participation agreement with the developer that it would be equally shared by the developer and Travis county. However, since the annexation and the proposal of the pid, Travis county commissioners have changed their position and they would like the city on -- they feel firmly that the city may kick in a third of the

[9:35:17 AM]

cost. What we worked out late last week I believe gives the city a longer period of time to pay out that one-third. And so we felt that was amenable rather than coming up with the total amount of cash right away. And that we would have sufficient time to plan for that. Part of the -- part of the focus there was there is some hesitation to issue certificates of obligation by the council and wanted to find another alternative for you. >> Gallo: So because it's been annexed the city has the responsibility of the roads. Is it my understanding that Travis county has now -- you said originally they had bonds for half of the roadway cost and the developer was going to pay for the other half? >> That's correct. The county bonds are 2011 bonds so they're -- it's a five-year-old election. They had not gun work on the roadway. It's my understanding that the engineering has not been done so it's very preliminary but it is very important regional roadway to get people moving through Travis county in and out of the city. >> Gallo: I'm trying to understand the city's liability on this. So we would be moving from a situation where Travis county had done the bonds for half of the roadway. The developer would have been paying for the other half. And now that the property has been annexed, the city -- is the developer still responsible for half of the roadway costs? >> Their term sheet has reduced it to one-third for each, Travis county, the developer and the city. I have not looked at the cost participation of

[9:37:17 AM]

the county. I assume they're changing it to the one-third. >> Gallo: Is the developer spending any additional money to offset the fact that their obligation for the road has been reduced? I'm trying to understand how this moving target is moving. >> The developer is putting in more public improvements into this development to make it a superior development and so that is how they're -- that is how they're investing their additional monies that they may have saved from the one half to the one-third. >> Gallo: So there is some benefit to the city with developer money being spent in other ways as far as -- okay. So are we looking at the same situation with these other affordable pids where there's been bond funding for participation between the county and the developer and it will change as their annexed? Because a couple of them were scheduled to be annexed, then they would be changed from original agreements with the annexations? >> I don't know that yet. They've just begun to work on them and I have not done the research or -- I have not had the opportunity to meet with Travis county staff yet. They've just begun work on these. And their period of time between the notice of intent and the filing of petition they actually used to meet with the developers, to get a sense of what they're looking at, but I'm not wear of any county bonds in this particular case. There may be some. >> Gallo: I think it would be helpful when we look at the annexations and those come before the council is if there are initial agreements between the developer and the county that would be changing as part of the annexation, I think that would be helpful to know as we talk about the annexation cases too. >> We'll be glad to look at that. >> Gallo: Thank you for the information. >> I wanted to add that the memo that we issued last Friday indicated that the city would be looking at adding these pids to its annexation plan for the current

[9:39:18 AM]

year. So we could extend land use control. >> Houston: Mayor, I wanted to verify something before councilmember Gallo is that the city had annexed this land before the 2011 bond so the agreements that were made about the half and half were made after it was in the city. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem? >> Tovo: I'm glad you referenced that. I saw it referenced in a memo. So there was never any agreement that the city would participate until just this current phase? >> No. The it city has no agreement on -- with the county or the developer on this road other than what we have put in

this resolution and agreed to last week with them to propose to the council. All of the agreements has been with Travis county and the developer prior to today. >> I guess I am struggling to understand the staff's recommendation in terms of how this provides community benefits beyond what we would have anticipated being provided through this development. I would assume to have a marketable product they would have included parks and some of the other amenities that are being listed as community benefits here. The affordable housing certainly could be a community benefit, but looking at the term sheet there doesn't seem to be any real codified amounts of housing at particular levels for particular lengths of time. Just looking at the term sheet that was come up with it talks about a broad range of housing choices for moderate income families, 100 to 200 percent mfi, which is pretty -- it is not what we look for in terms of affordable housing. And then rental

[9:41:19 AM]

housing -- there are no numbers attached. There are no affordability term periods attached. So I guess those are two questions. One, is there going to be any attempt from the developer to really codify some particular terms that we could satisfies whether or not that really represents a community benefit between now and Thursday? And then absent that can you help me understand why the staff believed this is in the city's best interest and the efforts are beyond what would have been contained in the development just as it is without the pid? >> Sure. Our pud zoning did not require any affordable housing and I know that affordable housing has been something that's been discussed at the commissioners' court quite a lot. Where they left it, although it's not in this document, is that the developer had suggested that during the buildout that they would provide 35 lots for affordable housing and that they would identify property that could be ideal for multi-family housing with -- for affordable multi-family housing, specifically for those types of projects that would be eligible for the private activity bonds, but they have not worked through all of those issues prior to creating the pid. They do have a commitment from the developer, but that was a sticky point with the commissioners' court as well. >> Tovo: But it's not -- I mean, given -- I guess for me it's a real commitment if it's in the term sheet or in some other kind of legal document. I appreciate -- I'm certainly not casting aspersions on the word of the developer, but the property has undergone ownership changes and could

[9:43:19 AM]

certainly again. And if we're considering again just for my own -- I have to judge it on what is going to be codified in the document knowing that ownership can change and other kinds of factors can change. And at this point I don't see those firm commitments in the document, nor am I clear on who would be developing those 35. I guess the idea was to try to get a non-profit to come in and develop those. >> They weren't clear on that and have not worked through that yet. They had their housing folks looking at that. The term sheet and the creation of the pid creates the boundaries within the -- that defines the geographic area. The county's intent is to continue to do many more negotiations before they do the pid financing. And so some of these items will be addressed at a later date. All this action does is create the pid. And those were some of the discussions that were -- that took place over at the Travis county commissioners' court. This sets in motion a much more detailed months long negotiation process before you could actually issue the pid bonds. The vote was three in favor and two abstentions and the abstentions were relative to the affordable housing components. And so I do think that they are intent on fleshing those out more, but in terms of Travis county they felt very comfortable creating the pid now and creating the boundaries and continuing to pursue those additional negotiations with the developer. >> Tovo: But those would be negotiations through the developer. Our decision is Thursday. We would not be involved in those negotiations in a formal way. And it does, as I understand it, require at this

juncture a financial commitment. I understand the reimbursement, but it is also the decision on Thursday -- the decision is

[9:45:20 AM]

Thursday is asking us for a financial commitment that we didn't have currently for this developer. So that's another reason that -- the terms that we're voting on or being asked to consider important. So could you address that bigger question that I had asked about why the staff believes that this is -- that this particular financing mechanism offers community benefits that the developer wouldn't be providing just in the course of creating a market, a product that's appealable to the market, attractive to the market? >> You can step in and help any time you want to. >> Mayor pro tem, council, Greg Guernsey, planning and zoning. I did want to point out that there are some differences from the original pud which they're required to meet all the standards of. In the original pud there was a facility that capital metro had an option up until 2012 and that option has lapsed. But I see in the developer donations that they have agreed to provide a five-acre multimodal transportation site. So that would bring back a transportation piece that had expired in the original pud. I think in the original pud too there was only one school site and this actually offers a second school site to the manor independent school district. And I understand as well, although I don't know the actual amount and the developer is now sitting to my right. He might be able to tell me, but I think there's some additional parkland that would address in this pid document that they've arranged with the county that would be beyond what the original pud ordinance would have required by the city. >> >> Tovo: I didn't understand, I'm sorry, the cap metro piece about it expiring. If it's in the term sheet could you point me to it? >> The original pud ordinance said that the capital metropolitan

[9:47:20 AM]

transportation authority, there was a site along the existing longhorn rail line that passes adjacent to the pud on or about January the 12th. The site may be developed for different permitted uses. If a transit center is developed there are certain uses that are prohibited, but this actually dedicates a multimodal transportation joint use facility. So I think that is in addition to what the pud originally called out for back when it was created. >> Tovo: Is the pud -- are those documents online? >> They are. And I can send a link to all the council offices. >> Tovo: Great. >> Mayor Adler: Is there a way to make part of the financial commitment that the city enters into the agreements with affordable housing. Is there a way to -- I don't understand the mechanism of the financial commitment. I mean, is it a financial commitment subject to execution and us signing off on the joint agreement. Is there a place or a way to make those understandings part and parcel of our financial commitment? >> Wait to make that formal is in the interlocal agreement with Travis county. And therein lies the problem, where if the county creates a pid the city has 30 days to react. So by September 8th you have to object or not object. If you object it's terminated. If you don't object it's created. So you have this very small window of time to negotiate any interlocal that could

[9:49:22 AM]

document what we've got as a proposal in the resolution and get with the developer and make any changes that the city would want to make. The legislation really doesn't give the city much time to react, frankly. With a 30-day window. >> Mayor Adler: Is there some action -- this might be a legal question. Is there some action that the developer could unilaterally take prior to September 8th that would bind the developer to again make it -- the agreement or the city's financial commitment conditioned on being

able to reach an agreement in the interlocal? >> Gregory Miller may have an answer to that, but I'm not sure that the developer can unilaterally bind himself without us being involved. There may be something in state law that Gregory can address. >> Gregory Miller, law department. There's nothing particular in state law that addresses this. Anything between the developer and Travis county, they can work out any agreements that they want to between now and our deadline. With or without our participation. >> Mayor Adler: And I understand that part. What I'm trying to figure out is if there is a vehicle that we could create or something that we could do that would enable us to only have the financial commitment if -- the county creates -- the pud is created. And eventually there will be an agreement between the county and the developer. What if the county and the developer can't agree on an affordable housing parameter? What happens then? >> The county would have a chance to not go forward

[9:51:24 AM]

with the pid if they so chose. You know, there's a lot of steps between now and the issuance of the bonds, so I think if the county were to somehow disagree with the direction of the pid then they would have the discretion to issue or not issue. Does that help at all? >> Mayor Adler: No, that's true. So the county still has the ability to be able to say the deal that is being reached isn't the one we want so we're not going forward. >> Right. >> Mayor Adler: Can we create that same opportunity for the city? >> In terms of -- I think if you refer to the resolution the way it is now we have a couple of key bullet points in terms of agreements that we've reached with the developer. And I think the second one talks about our funding over a 10-year period or up to 10 years. So I think somewhere related to that it would say that our decision to fund is contingent on xy and Z. >> Mayor Adler: Can we do that? >> Certainly. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. So can't we then create by the same condition that says we're allowing this to move forward, but we're not financially obligated until we sign off as the county signs off? >> Correct, yes. >> Mayor Adler: So we could do that. >> Yes. And I guess then just to make clear, what we're looking at right now is objector, not object to the creation of the pid. That's the action that we can do on the first with regards to the statutory framework. So with regards to an Ila or any kind of agreement with the developer about conditions for funding, it's a separate, but related piece, if that makes sense. >> Mayor Adler: Let me ask the question differently because now I'm confused again. I thought I understood. If the city wanted to be -- we wanted to, say, go ahead with the pid, let's do this, we have the same issues that

[9:53:25 AM]

the county potentially has on afforble housing or those other agreements. So we're going to allow the pid to go ahead and be created. But we are not financially obligating ourselves to do anything subject to a later agreement with the developer and the county with respect to how this should move forward. >> Yes. That's exactly what the action would look like. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. So by the action of approving it, we're not agreeing to any kind of financial commitment necessarily if we put in the right language. >> That's correct, yeah. So I think the right language would refer to our desired goals for affordable housing and so forth. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Or the signoff of the agreement. >> Yeah. >> Mayor Adler: We don't have to necessarily have negotiated out those elements. We could just make it subject to reaching agreement on the interlocal. >> Exactly, yeah. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ms. Houston? >> Houston: Mayor, I need to be really clear because I understand the action that we take on Thursday is separate and apart from the suggestion that you're making. If we -- if this does go forward, then that's it. And then they negotiate afterwards. >> Mayor Adler: Right. My only concern was going back to some earlier questions. I wanted to make sure that what I wanted to understand was if we don't object are we financially bound? And my answer to that is if we put in language that says that we're not financially committed, then even if we don't object, we're not financially committed because we've put into our approval

language that preserved for us that out should we not be able to agree to the terms. >> Houston: And my question for legal is that can we add that information to the resolution of do not object? Does or does not. And can we add that to that? >> So I think you can add conditions to the resolution to say that we're only going to fund this if certain requirements are met. So again, the decision you have on Thursday is to

[9:55:25 AM]

object or not. And if you don't object you can also say we want to make sure that there are certain commitments that are going to be made by the developer as this goes along. >> Houston: And Travis county. >> And Travis county. >> Houston: Because they are in fact the masters of this public improvement district. The city has nothing except asking for money and not giving out disapproval. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Garza? >> Garza: Just to understand what was just said, so if we approve this -- if we don't object, the pid gets approved with a condition that they have to meet certain whatever for us to meet our financial part of it, does that mean that, okay, regardless of what happens they breach an agreement or not, there's a pid. There's a pid and that's it. But the part that changes if they don't -- if there's an agreement about affordable housing and that is not fulfilled, the city, for example, does not have to pay the one-third for the road. That's what we're saying, correct? >> Mayor Adler: We could put in that kind of provision. >> Garza: Okay. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Anything else on this briefing? Mayor pro tem? >> Houston: I just had some general concerns. Go ahead. >> Mayor Adler: No. We'll let you go next. >> Houston: First of all, I want to thank staff for really do a lot of work on this in a short period of time. And trying to address all the concerns that I have. It still is -- feels to me like we're trying to serve two masters when it's a county issue. And that we really are just the subordinates up under that. And that puts us in a very difficult decision of -- like the road, for example, that wasn't in the original agreement and so now we've got a financial obligation

[9:57:26 AM]

for that unless we put the language in that says we don't. But how much additional money will we cost? I see we need to hire some staff to be able to monitor. Is there a monitoring component that the city needs to do to make sure that all the due diligence is done in the public improvement district that was created by the county? >> I don't think there's any -- well, there would be some ongoing monitoring, but most of that would be on the county side. As the improvements are put inspectors that would go out and inspect the improvements to make sure that they were built to city specifications, especially if we're going to be the owner of the asset. So -- but my understanding is those would be standard practices and they would have to pay certain permit fees and those kind of things. >> Houston: So we would not incur any additional funding in our day-to-day business to make sure that this public improvement district does what in fact the county says it's going to do? >> I have staff on hand and myself would be involved, but it wouldn't be extra money. It would be extra workload. Because you do have to keep up with what they're doing. >> Houston: Because this is a big deal. And so I need to be assured that the city staff, not the county, whose baby this is, but the city staff is going to be monitoring it so that we don't fall into a position like we have in other situations where we're asked to come up with some additional funds for something that the county didn't plan for. And we need to have updates on a regular basis about this. >> Right. We would do that, but it would be within the existing resources that we have. As of today. >> Houston: Okay. And then the other thing I wanted to share with everybody is that this project was never meant to be an affordable project. It was built to be market rate.

[9:59:28 AM]

Because when the county did their surveys they decided that in the manor ISD, which is what this is in, they had a lot of low income housing. And it's truly in that area of low income to moderate income housing. So they determined, am I correct, that this was not going to be an affordable project. It's going to be a market rate project. And so when you talk about the housing cost, Elaine, can you tell us what the price points are for some of those units that we're talking about? >> My recollection is there are 200,000 and they may go all the way up to 830,000. But primarily they're looking for workforce housing. I do recall that the real estate report said that there were no multi-family projects within five mile radius of this development. So I think multi-family will help on the project. >> Houston: And I challenge the folks at the commissioners' court because, of course, there are many that overlaps district 1 and there are many multi-family units near eagle lake and eagles landing but they didn't calculate that and that's within the five-mile radius. So anyway, there were some issues at the county's being able to look at that a. So the affordable housing is a piece. The land is a piece. The precedent is a piece for the county being able to super impose financing inside the city of Austin and us having very little to say about that. Have those as concerns. You all have done a good job trying to alleviate some of those concerns with all of those questions that I asked, but I don't see any

[10:01:28 AM]

extraordinary or superior benefits as someone else has said. Those things were going to have to be done anyway. Except for the addition of the school for manor ISD and the capital metro land for multi-modal transportation. So ... I just want to thank you all because you did an amazing job in a short period of time. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you, mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: Something that councilmember Garza's question raised for me. The affordable housing component is really contingent on -- if we went along the path that the mayor was suggesting, the affordable housing piece would be contingent on -- on the city's financial commitment for the road would be contingent on the affordable housing piece because it's not part of the term sheet for the pid. >> Right. >> Tovo: It could have been part of the term sheet for the pid for that to have been part of the terms that were laid out. But we -- I assume at this point we don't have the ability to add new terms to that term sheet because that's really a term sheet between the developer and the county. >> Correct. >> Tovo: So there aren't any contingencies we can place on the decision we're making Thursday with regard to the pid. Other than -- other than what we talked about in the resolution, which would really be about our financial commitment. And so -- so were there to be a change in that commitment, it could just simply reverse to the -- to the county and the developer paying that road. >> It could. >> Tovo: Okay, thank you. >> Houston: Again, there was a lot of conversation at the commissioners court about affordable housing and the need to continue to have affordable units, not only

[10:03:28 AM]

multi-family but home ownership because that's one of the thing that we're missing. We keep thinking that low to moderate income family people can only live in multi-family units, but in fact people want to own a home, that's an American dream. That was never that consideration and they have had that conversation for months, but did not get that through. So I'm not sure how much leverage we have to build that into the development except by saying we're committing to pay for a third of the road, which seems [indiscernible] To me, so -- >> Mayor Adler: Some people -- >> [Bribery] Some people call them incentives because it doesn't give us many tools other than to hold out what we can discretionarily give in exchange for the social programs. >> Houston: What I'm hearing is that the negotiation is not between us and the developer, it's between the county and the developer and so the county has tried to

do -- put in affordable housing into this project already, and so -- so I don't know how we're going to be more successful. >> Mayor Adler: I think as the mayor pro tem points out, the leverage that we have is whether we are contributing financially and we could say we're though the going to contribute financially as a city unless the things that the city want are also represented in what happens. Yes, councilmember Garza? >> Garza: I'm assuming that the developer is here? I'm -- can we ask if there would be a -- if there would be inclusion of -- of affordable housing or is that not something that we can -- okay. It sounds like there have been attempted negotiations by the county to ask for more affordable housing or affordable housing in the development and -- what I'm

[10:05:29 AM]

hearing is this couple is interested in -- in there being affordable housing. >> Yes, councilmember Garza. My name is Pete Dwyer. I'm the wildhorse developer. I would like to clarify. That Travis county housing finance group, and they have a pretty sophisticated group over there. They looked at our feasibility study, they looked at our demographic study. They hired their own independent economist, analytics to come in and take a look at it and the conclusion was that there's already a concentration of low and that the best thing that we could do is go be a market rate project and run successfully for four or five years, then come in and take a look at the affordable housing component. We went and met with foundation communities. And they looked at it and said, you know, we would not score very high on a tax credit project over there right now because we would be concentrating additional low into low. So I don't want to be perceived that the county asked us and we refused to negotiate. We are really kind of follow the lead of what I think they issued a pretty sophisticated report and came to that conclusion. We simply agreed with that conclusion. >> Garza: But foundation communities, I believe, is more like a multi-family -- >> Correct. >> Garza: There seems to be -- I like that -- I like that this council is trying to use newer tools like land trusts. So I heard that there was some lots -- there were some lots proposed. >> Yes. >> Garza: Is that still an option? >> We also went and met with the folks at Mueller, listened to how they do thing. We do plan to build that in. But, again, everybody's conclusion was let's get some momentum going in the market rate product and then work that in as we're going

[10:07:31 AM]

along. So I think the single family comment on of it, as we get into our second or third village, that's when we can start looking at some of those what do they call it? Conditioned equity. >> Garza: That is a written part of your agreement, that those lots will be donated at some point? >> At this point in time, it's written there's going to be 35 of them. >> Garza: All right. Thanks. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any further discussion? Casar? >> Casar: I imagine actually this may be a brainstorming thing for you on the affordable housing component. There may be some way for us to think about -- there are other places in district 1, district 3 and 2 and 4 where we are losing affordable housing, so maybe as we think about newer tools, maybe there's some way we can leverage the negotiations, talk about the negotiations with wildhorse that can help us get affordable housing in the eastern crescent where it's being lost as well. That's also something that I think we should start thinking about. We spent a lot of time here on council debating infill projects, but larger, more suburban developments, I don't think that we have given them some of the due and time they deserve. I appreciate our chance to learn about how we work on these to provide all of the amenities that we need and want. And if there are -- if there is a higher concentration of low income housing out there, maybe there's some way we can start thinking about how that development brings us lower income housing into the core. And I'm not sure that I have a solid idea on that, yet, but consider this a call to my colleagues and to you all and to the community to see if we can start generating ideas on that as well. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Zimmerman? >> Zimmerman: Thank

you, Mr. Mayor, now that I'm seated on the extreme far right of you, I thought I would be easier to find. I appreciate that. Let me say something, Mr.

[10:09:32 AM]

Dwyer, I appreciate your patience on this project and perseverance, I support you 100% with trying to move forward on market affordable housing. I haven't kept my little clicker here for bingo, but I think that I have heard affordable, you know, dozens and dozens of times. I have to point out again that subsidized housing is not affordable, it's not affordable and it's unsustainable. The only kind of of affordable housing there is is market affordable, where people can afford to purchase or rent properties without government subsidies. I appreciate your effort to do that. I concur with your comments on the tdhca applications. They are trying to avoid concentrations, subsidized housing projects. So I agree with you on that, too. I also want to point out quickly, this has been in the works for many years. I think that back in -- back in a decade ago, didn't you try to get a mud approved. Municipal utility district? >> Yes. The original pud application came with a request for four muds, it was denied. >> Zimmerman: I appreciate that. I'm going to go back to the city's presentation on page 3. There's a bullet point down here that says in the -- in the third bullet point, it says property undeveloped at time of full purpose annexation and then annexed per owner's request. Okay. Now, the way that should really read is that it should say after the city denied owner's request for mud consent, the property was annexed. Because that's the -- that's a truthful statement. In other words, this could have been done without any of this delay and the -- all of the drama about, you know, county versus city and it could have been done more than a decade ago as a mud outside of the city and we would have had this housing supply already in place. So I apologize for all of the delays and hassles.

[10:11:32 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Anything further, Ms. Gallo? >> Gallo: I'm trying to understand the process of the whole picture here. We did a full purpose annexation on this property in November of 2013, is that correct? So at that point the city would have been responsible for what? For providing what services? I mean, I'm assuming that this list -- so -- so the city a would have been responsible for streets, the city would be responsible for public safety, the city would be responsible for libraries, for parks. >> Water and wastewater. >> Gallo: Water and wastewater, et cetera, et cetera. So it looks like that this -- that the pid is being set up to tax the development and future owners of properties in that development to pay for these services that the city would normally be paying for. Am I -- I'm kind of -- okay so far? >> Okay. >> Okay. So the pid is a benefit -- is definitely a benefit to the city because out of our general fund, we're not having to do streets and sidewalks, public safety, libraries, parks, et cetera, et cetera. That's listed as potential pid expenses. Right? So there is an advantage to the city to do the pid. Because those tax dollars that are being raised by the taxing entity of that pid will help pay for these services that normally the city would have to pay for out of our property taxes that we charge, the city charges. >> Councilmember, the developer is responsible to certainly dedicate parkland, make improvements, build those roads, put in the water lines. The city would then maintain those and I think this pid

[10:13:32 AM]

is helping to -- to defray some of the costs of actually building an infrastructure that the city would ultimately maintain. The pid may actually speed up, you know, some of those improvements because the developer has another tool in their toolkit to help pay for those improvements all at once. But the city, whether we have the pid or not, the city would maintain the roads, ultimately the developer would

build and the utility would take over those lines that he would ultimately construct. >> Gallo: So I guess what I'm trying to understand is why is the pid not something the city is setting up instead of the county, if the benefit is to the city and to a property that is fully annexed into the city? This -- just for future reference because it looks like we've got several additional pid applications before Travis county. >> Correct. >> Gallo: That is all new for all of us and I appreciate the answers to the questions. >> Right. >> We had worked with the developer for over a year through August of last year on creation of the pid. And kind of got stalled because we were midst of budget review and working on the budget. As well as the issues that came up with the whisper valley pid and trying to find a workable solution to prevent the default on the bonds. And so -- so the county was very anxious to get working on a commitment to use its 2011 bond funds for the wildhorse connector, which is a major thoroughfare through the county and the developer decided that they had worked with us, they asked us if we minded if they went to the county. The law allows the county or the city to create a pid inside or outside of the city's jurisdiction. And so in October of last year, they went over to the

[10:15:33 AM]

county, who was very anxious to get something going, get a funding mechanism in place for their portion of the roadway. So they started working with the county, the county developed their own pid policy because they didn't have one. And then -- the county did the due diligence that they felt was necessary for the preliminary creation of a pid. And so that's why they were at the county. Because they had worked with us and really gave convenient some of the issues we were dealing with, with whisper valley at the time, didn't believe that the council would be favorable to creation of a pid. >> Gallo: Okay. That's very helpful because what it says to me is that in this particular case, because of the 2012 bonds for the road construction, that there would be an advantage for the county stepping in and doing this because the county then would pay a portion of the road costs that normally the city or the developer would pay for. But can we look at the other, as we're looking at the other applications moving forward, can we make sure that there is a reason like that that would be a benefit for the county to do it versus the city to being -- seems like we have more control as a city if the city is doing the pid and instead of the county. But sounds like in this particular situation, because of the -- of the history on the road, that that makes it a little different. So ... >> That and the fact that they already had about nine million in approved bonds for that roadway, another nine million for another roadway in Travis county. >> Gallo: That makes sense, thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else? I think we're set. Thank you very much. All right. So what we're going to do here is we're going to now break, go back into executive session. We're going to go into executive session to consider two items. >> Mayor, sorry. Mayor? Do we need to give direction to staff about the language

[10:17:34 AM]

we're interested in for this pid? Or do they already have that direction? >> Mayor Adler: I think that would be helpful. I was going to do it after this. I think there's some desire to keep the financial obligation of the city dependent on our joining in on whatever the -- the cross-party agreement is. >> My understanding is that legal can add, we can draft some additional lack to the second be it resolved that adds that contingency. But I'll work with legal on it, on the language. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. >> We will propose some options for council, backup -- >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. So what we're going to do, we're going to go into executive session here in just a second, I'll do that call. We'll come out of that -- actually, we're going to be in executive session until at least 12:30, 12:45. So -- so I would think that we'll come back, as -- as I look at it now, probably be 12:30, or 12:45. 12:30 we can try for, to continue with the briefings. We will do the host briefing and then the codenext briefing then we have the items

that have been pulled by people. >> Tovo: Mayor, I think we have individuals here who are from outside organizations. You expect the host briefing to come up at around 12:45? >> Mayor Adler: I think so. We have folks from the community for both of those two briefings that we have. Realistically I don't think we will be back any sooner than 12:30, that's possible, might be more likely 12:45.

[10:19:37 AM]

In that time frame we will do those two briefings and then after all of the community folks are gone, we will do the items that have been pulled on the agenda when it's just us again. >> Gallo: We're going to be pulling an agenda, are the champions tract discussion. Agenda item no. 37. Only as we try to do on Tuesday, indicate to the community that items are going to be postponed on Thursday. It's my understanding that staff is going to recommend a postponement of that item on Thursday. We may want to do that early so that staff is not -- >> Mayor Adler: As long as we're not going to discuss -- what you are saying is 37 is going to be -- staff is going to recommend postponing it. You want to give the community notice that 37 is going to be postponed on Thursday. >> Gallo: On Thursday and also not have to keep staff around for the full afternoon. >> Mayor Adler: I would say staff doesn't have to come back at all if we're just going to announce that 37 is going to be postponed. >> Gallo: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. I understand that also number 29 and number 50, expedited permits and tenant relocation may also be discussed this afternoon, pulled and discussed. That being said we are going to go into closed session to take up two items, pursuant to 555.071, EP related to development fees and pursuant to 551.074 of the government code, E 4 the interim center manager. E 1 and E 2 have been withdrawn. Without objection, we will now go into executive session. [Executive session session].

[10:53:12 AM]

. [Executive session]. >>

[1:32:11 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: All right. We are back from executive session where we discussed personnel matters related to the interim city manager. That was the only issue we discussed in executive session. We are now back to our main meeting and we're going to go right into the host briefing. So if y'all want to come forward and take us through that. Good afternoon, mayor and councilmembers. Today we're going to go over the homeless outreach street team pilot. We understand that you're looking at some budget considerations related to homelessness and we hope that the learnings from this pilot since June first will be useful. We're going to go over what the pilot is, why the community has come together around this initiative, the results since the start of the pilot on June 1st, what makes the homeless outreach street team or host effective. And how it fits into the broader system of solving for homelessness and what's needed for the future. So the homeless outreach street team is a new initiative to address proactively the needs of people living on the streets. The core team members include the Austin police department, Austin Travis county integral care, Austin Travis county emergency medical services and the downtown Austin alliance. It's more than just that team, however. There's a lot of supporting partners, including the ending community homelessness coalition, health and human services, downtown Austin community court, the Austin resource center for the homeless, and front steps among many other service providers like salvation Army, Trinity center, community care and caritas of Austin.

[1:34:11 PM]

The homeless outreach street team is inspired by homeless outreach teams in other parts of the country, including Houston. Our initiative is a little bit unique in that we have this multidisciplinary team with many different types of professions, and we're also taking an iterative approach as we go through. So Austin's team is multisector and cross-agency. There's two police officers, there's four mental behavioral health specialists. There's one to two rotating community health paramedics and there's an outreach specialist. And you can see that the downtown Austin alliance is helping us fund an outreach specialist going forward. Host began on June 1, so why did the community come together around this initiative? The -- today we know that we're suffering from crime and crowding and disorderliness, that there's barriers to service and safety, and that there's a lot of police interventions. Tomorrow we know we want to get to a clean and safe city. We want to ensure that there's no barriers to services and we want to make sure that people have support and housing that they need. But in order to do so we have to interrupt the resolving door that people are going in and out of jails and emergency rooms and shelters and we're doing that with targeted outreach. The idea is that we need to make this greater than the sum of our parts in order to make this effective. This is a picture of a brainstorming session that we had with the team at the Austin resource center for the homeless. What we've tried before hasn't really worked. In this instance we sat down and we said how might we positively impact safety around the Austin resource center for the homeless? The idea is traditionally to have a

[1:36:11 PM]

large presence of officers. Those officers have had struggles moving folks and making it sustainable for various reasons, including there's no place for folks to go and they will be asked that, if I can't be here where can I go? They also have plenty of other people who will come in behind them. And when they can't make that sustainable and stick, then they say hey, they tell the police officers, go over there and get those people into services. And so that has barriers as well and sometimes even when people are waiting to change and willing to change, there's no place for them to go. And so what they all said, and this was your social workers and your emergency medics and your police officers coming together have said we need three things at the same time. We need to interrupt crime, we need to provide sanctioned places for people to go, and we need to reduce barriers to services. And that's ultimately -- they know that they can try to get people into services and they can try to be more effective when they're fully deployed on the streets, but if any of the other areas don't have appropriate investment the team -- whatever the team does won't work quite as well. So we know the costs of our siloed and transactional approaches in the past. This data is from the ending community homelessness coalition pay for success task force where they've looked at the data of how much a day costs for shelter, a day in jail, the jail booking, the E.M.S. Transport and emergency room visit and inpatient hospital stays. And we know that permanent supportive housing tends to be cheaper for the taxpayer than all of these emergency services. These slides here about this data are from echo's needs and gaps report which you can find on their website, but here is when you add up those daily costs over the course of a year, you're spending on

[1:38:15 PM]

average $220,000 per person that is using these emergency services when really what they need is permanent supportive housing. They've looked at what permanent supportive housing yields in terms of public health cost avoidance and so you're really looking at some significance savings. But until we can get there what we're really looking at is how to do harm reduction on the streets both for our community and for these clients and folks who need to get services. So let's talk about host results to date. Again, we've only been operating since June 1. And I would also say that for the office of

innovation, what we're doing is meeting with the homeless outreach street team every Thursday and every Friday and what we're presenting to you today is their learnings. This is directly from the folks who are working on the street. Our job is to facilitate and synthesize and bring to you what those learnings are. And what they've found so far is that 300 unique clients have entered into the program. They've had 303 individual needs, and I'll tell you more about what that looks like. And only 215 of those needs were they able to meet. When we talk about these figures, because we are just getting started and we have multiple different agencies at the same table at the same time, there are some flaws in our methodology, which is why we're running this as a pilot. What data we're giving you now are these certainties. We know that there are 300 unique clients. We're not able to tell you how many repeat clients, for example. And that's some of the things that we're working on right now. This is kind of a complicated slide so you may want to look at the paper version. What you see here in terms of the top needs are coordinated assessment. This is what the ending community homelessness coalition asks all of the service providers to do. It's a questionnaire

[1:40:16 PM]

that helps identify the vulnerability of these clients and therefore who needs to get the limited housing available first. So the higher your vulnerability score the quicker you're able to get into housing. And host finds people who have not yet taken this assessment so they're not yet in the queue for housing and sometimes they will update that if that person has not had their coordinated assessment coordinated for a long time they will get that updated. They also look at mental health assessment and treatment, so has this person been assessed? Do they have an appointment? Are they making their appointments and are they getting referrals? They are connecting folks to shelter. Every single one of these clients need shelter so when you look at the shelter number that's really like an emergency voucher or emergency bed so it's very limited there when the picture is really -- we know that there is permanent supportive housing units that are short and there are 800 shelter beds that are short and that's from echo's needs and gap report. There's also general medical needs and there's two figures here because they're two different databases. They have logged 22 physical health needs and through the emergency medics, the community health paramedic team, we found 80 different health needs that have been met. When you see the needs pending thighs are where either because the system isn't working efficiently or the client themselves is struggling as to why those needs aren't being met. We hope to have more research done by the end of the pilot period which is scheduled on September 30th, but as you will sigh we've really learned where you need to continue to do more learning and we're hoping to continue that pilot B so far what we know is that there is a lack of available resources. For example, there's a three to four month wait for safe place shelter. If you are a woman who

[1:42:17 PM]

is suffering from domestic violence and you need to get out, it will take you three to four months to find a place to go. The service contracts of some of our agencies lack the flexibility to play the necessary roles. So for example, our mental and behavioral health specialists will say we're required to close out a case if there's been no activity, whereas when they're deployed on the streets they have more flexibility to keep following up. Our system is very fragmented. There's a lot of charities, a lot of service providers, that's a lot of different places to get help, but it's also very difficult to navigate, particularly when you're at a very low point in trying to heal. There's also lack of advocacy for clients. There's a lot of roles being played, but navigating the system, particularly on the street, is not one of those roles. And that is a role that host finds itself playing to some extent. On the client there are barriers because there are folks who have substance use disorders. They may be missing appointments. They too have their mobility

challenges. They may not be interested. They may not be able or willing to change yet. They often lose motivation when the services are not readily available. If you score low on the vulnerability index, you may not get housing for years, and that tends to demote evacuate people because they feel somewhat hopeless. There's a lack of trust in the system. I may have taken an assessment a year ago and nothing came from it so why should I trust you now. But there's also fear of the unknown, just like any of us making a life change we sometimes stall in making the change. What I'd like to do is give you a sense of what this really looks like when we're talking about these needs and how host is bridging and finding these gaps. The stories we'll tell you now, the names have been changed so these are not the names of the individuals, but the stories are host

[1:44:17 PM]

encounters. So the Johnson family is a husband, a wife and two children. They came to Austin for a job, but that job did not pan out. They found themselves homeless and stayed at the Salvation Army. This family is very motivated to change, but their situation is in crisis and host encountered them outside of a church on a Friday night. The Salvation Army was at capacity and they worked with the Salvation Army to access their overflow room. Host worked to help get the motel vouchers, food and supplies from various donors and they began a social security income application process. And the family themselves continued to make calls to resources with host guidance. The change mechanism that we see host using here is barrier busting. It's a term we use for successing access to services while managing stressors and increasing hope and having this orientation towards the future. Result and outcome thus far is they are connected with the Salvation Army family dorm, they've completed their coordinated assessment, they've applied for public housing. The wife will be receiving her social security check soon and they're waiting to hear back about more stable housing options. And host will continue to keep a lookout for this family until their situation is stabilized. That's an example of what the barriers are that they help alleviate, but what is making them effective? Out of this pilot so far what are we seeing? We know that this multisectorrial team is it reducing service duplication, by reducing service repetition and restart, by reducing wait for services and closing service gaps want. And I'll tell you a story of what each of these things look like. First we understand that our entire system has many programs for outreach and many programs for

[1:46:18 PM]

intervention. In this slide again, sorry it's a bit complicated for the seen, but you have the paper copies in front of you, and I'm going to focus first on the outreach column. So our currently existing outreach programs there are various agencies, for example, the austin-travis county integral care's path team who make up host. Some of those members are on the host team. They deploy by doing this ongoing standard schedule of entering safe places and engaging with people. They collaborate with within their agencies and through other agencies through referral. They interact with clients by meeting them, engaging them and building trust in relationships and they follow up according to their agency specific protocols tracking cases and databases with a time frame to close out if there's no progress. I'm going to skip over to the other column for intervention because we have many intervention teams, crisis intervention team with the Austin police department, the mobile outreach team which they have expanded as well, the psychiatric emergency services. These types of teams deploy referrals and on call for precarious situations where a person is of imminent danger to themselves or to others. They collaborate by doing research, paper and doing a series of interventions. They execute very heavyweight interventions with people who have really are in that imminent danger. And it's emergency crisis response only. So host fits in right in between these two. They meet people on the street where they are

and they answer these sort of "Be on the lookout" calls. They enter potentially precarious situation where's some of our case managers would not have previously felt comfortable going. They do research and handoffs. They're doing both. They have shared resources, data, shared knowledge and wisdom. And they can quickly make referrals and connect people to where

[1:48:19 PM]

they need to go. They interact with clients because they're constantly on the street, they're nudging motivations to change and they're following up by tracking clients to see how they are to ensure that these interventions have the intensity and the duration to make things happen. We'll tell you the story of what this looks like. In this instance host meets Bernard, atcic and the Austin police department talk to this person who says he needs a medical access program card. But while they're talking to them they notice he's got gauze on his foot and they ask him what it is for. And then they notice that he has a very serious burn on his leg. So they call over the community health paramedic. One paramedic starts to do the map application and the other starts to look at his leg. The client says he didn't want to go to the E.R. Because he didn't want a bill so the medics call the street medicine provider to look at his leg. This has been happening in a span of 20 minutes so now within 30 minutes we have the community street med team arrive. The card is approved. That medical evaluation allows a non-emergency transport to the E.R., saving a resource because the ambulance is very expensive, and the community health paramedic transports Bernard to the E.R. Meanwhile the community health paramedic connects Bernard to the Austin center for the homeless. He has a respite bed and can have follow-up wound care at that shelterer. What we know is five agencies took 70 minutes to save a life. The follow-up was that the doctor said that he ended up having a blood clot and congestive heart failure and that within 72 hours he would have most likely had been dead had they not encountered host and received this intervention, and it only took 70 minutes to get this.

[1:50:20 PM]

The community health paramedics were continuing to follow up with them and make sure he knows how to take his medicines and take his injections. What's happening in terms of the effectiveness is that host -- >> Casar: I had a really quick question for you. It's obviously a really powerful anecdotes in here. The one question that came to mind to me was just how do the earn counters usually begin? I don't know if you know this particular gentleman's story and how that happens, but when itcic and A.P.D. Begin talking to this man that y'all encounter him on the street while you're walking or it's in response to a call, but it's the proactive encounter. >> It's proactive encounters. >> Casar: That's helpful to understand. Thank you. >> Proactive encounter do also receive referrals. So if somebody notices somebody in a deteriorating state, if they're concerned about somebody or if we have a story later about someone whose number was up for housing but they couldn't find them, they get these, the "Be on the lookout" calls. So they're doing both. There's a proactive deployment navigating the streets, but they also will receive referrals. >> Casar: And those are referrals from -- >> Other A.P.D. Officers, from community members, from churches. They're coming from a number of places. >> Casar: That's really helpful. I would like to thank everybody involved with these sorts of stories. It's very impressive. Thanks. >> What we know from these stories and experiences is that every member of this steam feels like they're bigger than the sum of their parts. That the team approximate members have shared wisdom and experiences. A lot of these folks have previous relationships with these individuals on the streets but being on this team together has the flexibility of playing slightly different roles, gives them the flexibility in operations and deployment and it gives them different professional networks to tap into to deploy more

[1:52:20 PM]

seamless handoffs. We're learning a lot from each other including the community health paramedic team, so in the community health paramedics they've been running for five years now, going on six years, and they have a goal of preventing individuals from reaching a point where 911 is their even resource. And they do that by collaborating for comprehensive solutions to connect individuals to resources for their well-being. Their approach is to provides that unconventional individuals have unique needs and need solutions and they consider alternative measures and they collaborate to streamline efforts to get those unique solutions. They target frequent systems users, vulnerable persons at risk for detear rating and provide valuable systems response. We're learning how to do the measurement in order to replicate that performance measurement. So Andy sitting next to me has taught me how you understand the optimum use of an emergency room bed, for example. If I put a client in that bed, that might not be the right resource and they take that bed for 12 hours or more. If that person receives the right resource then that bed is freed up for any number of strokes and cardiac arrests and other emergencies that are more appropriate use for that resource and the community benefits as a result. So we're learning from the community health paramedic's operational model and sharing that across all the systems. There's a special ingredient that's going on here on why host works. And it's about building relationships and trust. Not only with the folks on the street, but between public safety agencies and service providers. Every Thursday and every Friday we get together and we examine what's happened that week, what's worked that week and what we need to solve for in the week coming. And what you get is this trust equation. This is an analytical framework for really breaking down trust. That you need

[1:54:21 PM]

reliability plus credibility plus intimacy over self-orientation. People trust individuals, they do not trust institutions. It is an interpersonal thing. So when host is out on the street, consistently you get reliability and everybody on the street knows it. When the community health paramedic can help deliver a medic intervention, an access card, a prescription, you get credibility. And there's this sense of intimacy where you can walk up and say "Hey, how are you doing today." And they're starting to build trust and word is going through the grapevine about what host is doing. So we can see this in David's story. David has been on the street of Austin for years and he's been known to many A.P.D. Officers and he has a long history of substance dependency. David himself approached A.P.D. Officers and disclosed that he had a recent heroin overdose. He says that he doesn't want to die and he asks for help. The officer connects David with the rest of the host team. The medic connects David to the downtown Austin community court roads to recovery program and he enters a 90 day substance abuse program. I would suggest that not everyone knew about this road to recovery program before we all got in the same room together and now we're knowing how to leverage this resource immediately. What we're seeing as a change mechanism is trust in supportive relationships. The fact that David felt like he could approach an A.P.D. Officer and discuss his failure and still be accepted and given an opportunity to change, plus this immediate connection to services. Currently the result is that a case manager is working on his post-treatment housing options. He has a sponsor and he's looking visibly healthier and he's expressed gratitude for host's help. Meanwhile he has introduced peers of his to host. And he's begun paying back his child support.

[1:56:25 PM]

So how does host fit into the bigger picture on ending homelessness? Because we know that this is a small and mighty team that is fully deployed on the streets, but there are many, many people working on issues of homelessness. And what it is about is getting to housing at the end. We can see this in Patsy's journey. She was known to be homelessness since she was 10 years old. She was known to host members before the pilot started and she had completed her coordinated assessment before the pilot. She's a talented artist and people built a relationship with her by providing her arts supplies. She has mental health needs and she's struggled with substance accidentcy. When her name came up for housing the host medic knew how to find her, but she was afraid and rela cantera standpoint to -- reluctant to take the step. Host said I will sit would you and go with you when you get your housing at community first village. We see that this is an instance where the barrier is in our own mindset sometime and they were able to bust that barrier and give her the confidence that she needed through trust and supportive relationships. Afterwards the medic asked if she could have water from Patsy's fridge, and she said do you see what I did there? That's your water and your refrigerator. They helped set her up and register as a vendor so she could help sell her artwork and host is following up to make sure she's stabilized in her housing. Meanwhile Patsy has a partner of seven years who has reached out to host and now he's trying to change his life. That's how we know the program is being effective and we have next steps because there's still a lot we have yet to learn. There's two main things that we're two maven things we're doing here, number 1, enabling across sectors and across agencies. We began the pilot on June 1 with no plan other than to learn and iterate and all of

[1:58:25 PM]

the resources that started this were on loan from all of the different agencies. We have an iterative approach to test our hypothesis that this forward deployment would work and administrative and data support to support the learning so the innovation office is helping with the facilitation and support, we have data folks coming from the community tenth helping out -- technology helping out with data sharing, we have needs in terms of you're forms, the -- uniforms are on loan. We need tablets. Trying to use a laptop while deployed on the streets is super awkward so if we had tablets it would be a lot easier. Meanwhile we're documenting this approach and we're putting it on the web so all of the other homeless outreach street teams around the country can learn from what we're doing. It's really important -- I'm going to go back a slide here. Once we enable this collaboration and finish learning, what we need to learn, then and only then do we want to right size this capacity. We want to quip and calibrate these teams before replicating. We need some data sharing agreements and some methodology for measuring performance in place. We require team members to join us who have the temperment for dealing with this population, and those new team members would likely need training before they deploy. And so in the near and midterm for this pilot, we imagine remaining one team that deploys to expanded boundaries. We started with boundaries of the Colorado river, I-35, 29th and Lamar and that really is our focus, yet this population is emotional, and they don't always stay within those boundaries. They go and they come. And so we envision being able to have more permeable boundaries, maybe deploying to an encampment, to learn how this approach may help in an

[2:00:26 PM]

encampment situation. We want to continue to adapt our operations, fine our methodology and get some formal evaluation on this type of a pilot. And we want to plan -- if this needs to scale in a particular way, we want to be intentional about that, and we're considering looking at a broader road map of how this fits into larger efforts and perhaps having a provider summit in the late fall where we can take problem frames and generate more ideas. For example, on Friday, we sat down and we talked about k2

and we said what can host do about the k2 epidemic and immediately in an hour we had several ideas that can be tried. One is really marketing what it is it's a toxin and a poison, not a drug. They can go out and test that on the streets and they're doing that now to see if that will change people's attitudes related to this drug of choice. There are other things that we are surfacing as problems, and really understanding those problems that maybe the community -- the broader community can help solve for. Most importantly, when we talk about investing in this, it's these interlocking investments that are needed. We need to interrupt crime without criminalizing homelessness or mental illness. We need to reduce barriers to services, and we need to create sanctioned, safe places for people to go. If we step up criminal interdiction and interreputation but don't have places for non-criminals to go we're not getting anywhere. If we don't lower the barriers to services and help people get the treatment they need, we still have a revolving door. So that's where we are with our host pilot. And I would welcome any questions or comments. >> Mayor Adler: Council?

[2:02:33 PM]

>> Pool: Incorporation want to tell you how appreciative I am of the program. I knew the host program was having some wonderful successes. I like the information that you provided on the specific types of cases that our officers are dealing with. I just -- I'm really glad that the mayor pro tem brought you this as a pilot program, and I think we have done tremendous work with this, and just my thanks to y'all. There will probably be some other questions and stuff and I may come up with some, to but I'm just really blown away. This is a huge success for the city. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Kitchen? >> Kitchen: Well, I just wanted to also add my thanks. I think it's a fabulous program and so I think that it's something that as you learn and you document, I will want to know, I'm sure others will too, how we replicate and expand it as needed throughout the city. So -- and what you all need in terms of resources to do that. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Renteria >> Renteria: I also want to thank you. I drive -- when I ride the bus to 17 to capital metro, we have to pass by there on the way back, and I've seen the challenge that's there. It's overwhelming. I've walked in that area, and -- during the lunchtimed and seen what's out there, you know, and there's just a lot of people all over that area. And especially now with the k2, you know, that's -- must be just really overwhelming, and I know it's very costly, you know, to have an ambulance down there. You had mentioned that y'all needed some tablets. How many would y'all need for that? For your operation? >> The team has four mental

[2:04:33 PM]

vehicle health specialists. That's really where it would be helpful to sort of do the data entry into the homeless management information system. The A.P.D. Officers and the community health paramedics have their own system. I presume tablets would likely be helpful for looking up non-sort of official resources, like if you wanted to know the latest charity who is handing out clothes, for example. There's other informal resources that are available that those tablets would be useful for so I would say it would probably be useful for everyone on the team to have one. >> Renteria: Thank you. I'm going to see if I have money left over in my budget and I'll be able to make a donation for that. >> Thank you so much for, you know, the efficiency that is produced by a program like this, it's such a good collaboration between different entities, both city and private sector and nonprofit. It's really important as we all talk about very limbed resources. You know, we wish we had enough money to fund everything. It becomes even more important to build those -- those relationships. I know at one point the police department had a place where volunteers could go in and I think it was maybe helping with -- not detective work but just like the threats and burglaries, doing data entry from kind of a civilian volunteer basis. Have you thought about incorporating some type of volunteer program where the community could actually

come in and help with some of the things that you don't have the funding to actually get paid staff to do? >> We haven't figured out the specific tasks yet, just when we were preparing for this and we were sitting out in the atrium, Preston from the ending community homelessness coalition and I were talking about ways in which volunteers could get involved and I think that would be what a summit type event in the fall would be really geared towards, is -- what we call is is

[2:06:34 PM]

latent resources, right? There's a lot of resources in our community but matching them to the right problem or the right opportunity or the right activity is a bit of a challenge. Right now we know that it's easy to feed the homeless, and it's -- it's easy to cloth them or give them donations but we also know that there's a whole host of other -- pun intended -- activities that are useful, that volunteers could come in and do. So we are eyeing those, those ideas as well, yes. >> Gallo: I think that would be good. You're right, we have a community so willing to give both monetarily and also of their time and often it's just making those resources and opportunities available to them. So as you work through that, I hope that you will let us -- you know, we all have pretty robust ways of connecting with our districts, and I think if -- as you put that together, if you'll let us know, we're happy to push that idea out and help get volunteers so that you can use the money resources in other ways. Yeah. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Where are you with respect to money on this? I think there's a, what there's a concept menu item? Mayor pro tem, I think that you've put on that? What happens with that concept menu item that wouldn't have if the concept menu item doesn't get put into the budget? Where are we with respect to the pilot continuance and the right sizing its capacity issue that were raised? And then, mayor pro tem, if you want to respond to that. I don't know who best responds to that. >> Tovo: I'll jump in and y'all can fill in. So the item that I put on the comment menu is to continue the pilot in its current form as one team with the expanded -- with the primarily the same boundaries but with some expanded capacity. And as I understood it the estimate has actually been

[2:08:36 PM]

revised down because of the Austin police department's willingness to continue to provide staffing for it and emss as well. The dollar amount at this point is 300 -- that is being requested is 314,873 from the general fund and 116,000 thousandish from one-time funds. It's not clear that's all the needs you identified but I'm hoping we're getting pretty close to a figure. I would say as I mention in some of our previous budget sessions I regard this as one of our very highest priorities in this budget cycle and I just really want to say thank you very much, thank you doesn't even really begin to capture it, you've done extraordinary work in a very short amount of time. I know bill Bryce is here, he's really helped leadhe charge for bringing this asset here to Austin, in addition our downtown commander, Corcoran, I know you've been an advocate as well, thank you all. And Katherine Casey has also been a leader. So thanks to all the partners, you're really doing tremendous work and we really need to continue it so I hope we'll figure out how much money this team needs to continue in its current form and be able to identify those funds in the budget. >> Kitchen: Mr. Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: That keeps the existing pilot continuing through the year. What is the total -- the total universe in that community? The community that you're serving with this, that you're trying to move to better places? What's the number in that universe relative to the number that you think you'll be able to address with the continued pilot program through the year? >> I would like to perhaps ask

[2:10:37 PM]

Preston from the ending community homelessness coalition to provide the number since they are the keepers of that data. What's the size of that? >> Kitchen: Mr. Mayor? There's another item on the concept menu, too, I'll speak to. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> I would also say we've all talked about a shortage of case managers as well as and that number being around 67 case managers to help produce barriers to services but in terms of the population, Preston -- >> Mayor Adler: Generally speaking, the last citizen essay we had in January -- census we had in January, is there a component of that universe that are the -- the intended community addressed by this? >> You can tell it's my first time here. Sorry. >> Mayor Adler: Welcome. >> Of those 2600 total you can kind of imagine there's a spectrum of need and a spectrum of engagement requirements so of those 2600 or estimate is about 900 are the highest of the highest need, chronically homeless folks where they do need some really, really personalized, intensive intervention and engagement to connect them to the resources that are there for them. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. And so that's the community that you're going after primarily with the host program? >> Correct. >> Mayor Adler: And then what was the -- through the year, if it's funded through the year, how many of that 900 community do you think you get to? >> Well, we've -- since June 1, they've interacted 300 unique individuals. I don't think we have enough information yet to say what those interventions have yielded as a sum total, right? We know we have these anecdotes and touch points where we follow up. I believe that everyone is waiting until September 30,

[2:12:38 PM]

when we thought the end of the pilot would be to do this kind of an analysis and a briefing to better understand what those 300 intervention yield in terms of sustainable connection to housing. So my -- you know, it's iterative in learning and so I would say that if that's the thing we need to be setting as a performance measure then that's the work of the next month, is to figure out how to set that performance measure is and yield those 300 individuals, how would you make 300 individuals into 300 individuals housed, right? But of course you have to have the housing and you have to have the wrap around services as well. So host can only play a really tip of the, you know -- tip of the spear type of a service on that. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. And I understand that too. This has all the social service agencies all working together with that. I know that in the veteran homelessness deal one of the things that enabled us to get additional housing was the creation of that risk fund, which I think has money in it and still seems to be an attractive way to get people to contribute in a way that is directed toward trying to increase the number of housing units that are offered. But I'm sure that Ann and caritas are all over mixing those ideas together. Ms. Kitchen? >> Kitchen: I was curious about the -- how the program is supported by the other -- the different agencies in town. So particularly with regard to funding. So you had mentioned that -- I'm sorry, I'm not remembering exactly, but the composition of the team. So I know that the community paramedic program is a piece and our police department is a piece and you mentioned some -- social workers. To be more specific, what role

[2:14:42 PM]

is -- are the other agencies in town playing? In terms of financial contribution and contribution of resources to the team. >> In terms of contributions of resources, atcac has, you know, staff. Downtown Austin alliance has contributed funds. The other agencies are providing liaisons. So they come to the meetings every Friday and work through troubleshooting about us to help make those connections to services. So it's a nonmonetary contribution, for example, front steps at the arch, they have a navigator that they put forward to be the liaison with host. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> So they still do what they do. They have better connections with the deployed team when a need arises they can address. They also are the folks who may refer host to a person, you know, in eminent crisis or need. So it's communication

and pathways. >> Kitchen: Okay. So atcic, so they're contributing staff? >> Correct. >> Kitchen: Okay. I'm sorry, you may have said this earlier. I'm just trying to remember. So they're paying for and contributing to behavioral health staff? >> Correct. >> Kitchen: What about physical health staff? Is that part of a team? >> That's the community health paramedic and Andy can speak to -- >> Kitchen: The city is paying for the community health paramedic. What about the hospital community in town or the health care community in town or the hospital district? Are they contributing any funds for this? >> Yeah, so we work closely with the different service providers, the hospitals, community care being one of the largest. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Clinic systems here in town. So just like Kerry had described earlier where the host team has a connection with those individuals, we have that same type of connection with community care and some of their specialized

[2:16:46 PM]

teams like the street medicine team. They are used to deploying out into the streets. They have a physician. So we have ways of serving to the point we can set it to. >> Kitchen: What about central health? >> Yes, variety of ways. Community care is under some of their as you piss and then some of our funding for that team and some of the support we get in terms of different connections within and participating within the transformation of health care, we participate in that and they support. >> Kitchen: Is central health contributing any dollars to this project? >> I wouldn't say directly to the host team, no. >> Kitchen: Okay. So they're only contributing -- well, but that's through community care. The -- what do you call it, outreach -- not through central health. There's no dollars coming through central health to this program? >> Not directly to host community. >> Kitchen: So the community -- for any of these folks that we're providing services, are they -- is there a source of reimbursement for any of them, for their sneak. >> Yes, yes, a fair number of them. >> Kitchen: Okay. What is that? Usually -- is it medicaid? Is it -- >> So central health funds the medical assistance program and what we do is we have access to the system to get them enrolled in the medical assistance program, and then that helps funding in terms of connecting them with community care and services through the hospitals. >> Kitchen: Are they payinger you for your services. In other words we provide the community paramedicine program which is a component of ems. >> Yes. >> Kitchen: And we bill, ems, bills for some things. Can you bill for your service this is. >> We can't bill, no, not for this service. >> Kitchen: And you can't even bill central health? >> No. >> Kitchen: That's what I wanted to know. I think those opportunities for community community partnerships here, including with central health. Central health has a lot more

[2:18:47 PM]

flexibility through the map program in terms of how they fund programs, and so I think this is a fabulous program and when we're thinking of taking it to scale, I think we need to look at the other community partners in town who can help us do that and I think that this -- this saves dollars for central health as well as our other partners and so, you know, for future reference that would be something to tan in terms of scaling the program. So thank you. >> If you don't mind, I wanted to let you know we do participate. They do help fund certain -- >> Kitchen: I'm sure they do. >> We do have a good partnership with them. It's not directly related just to host. >> Kitchen: I understand that. I'm just thinking in terms of -- they're a great partner. I'm not trying to suggest they're not a good partner. I'm just saying in terms of, you know, when folks need care, if there's a reimbursement source, an insurance, in effect, source connected to them, that really helps them and their access to services. >> Sure. >> Kitchen: So and that is something that central health does, to some extent, and so if there's opportunities for more of that to occur for these folks, it just helps everybody. >> No. Absolutely. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem. >>

Tovo: Councilmember kitchen, you were talking -- I think a little earlier -- I think that's a very good point that you just raised. And then you had an item on the concept menu about expanding -- or was that councilmember Casar? >> Kitchen: It was me. >> Tovo: He might have a similar thing on here or maybe it got listed under Casar. >> Kitchen: I know. Maybe he listed it -- in any case, I don't remember how we did it. Anyway, it's all righted but it's not the same. There's overlapping circles. Last year we funded additional resources for the community paramedicine program and so we were -- we put some additional dollars in this time also. So it's just for discussion

[2:20:48 PM]

purposes about where and how we put resources. It's such a great program. It's very cost effective program besides being a program that really, you know, connects people to needs but it helps -- I mean, the program that you guys do, it really helps keep people from turning -- churning, churning, to the emergency room, hundreds and hundreds of visits to the emergency room every year, that's an astronomical costs and they still get the care that they need. So it's just a wonderful program and I wanted to make sure that we continue that program and so that program is helping host, but host is not that program. There's more that the community paramedicine program does than host. So. . . >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: If I could ask the team to address, I'm looking at ps1.05, and I don't know if councilmember Casar intends to -- for -- to put this forward but it is to expand the team. I think what we're hearing from you is a recommendation that the team expand its boundaries a bit in its outreach but how a -- have a few more months at least to continue in its current iteration to learn from it. Am I reading that recommendation correctly? >> Yes, that is correct. That if we were to scale too fast, we would lose a lot. There's still a lot that we're trying to learn in deployment methods, what's the right way to deploy, what's the right size of the team, and we talked about the team maybe being more of a hive and then spreading out and cross-pollinating and coming back together because we're finding that the effectiveness is their shared wisdom, shared networks, shared access to data, and we don't want to fragment that. We don't want to accidentally recreate a silo somewhere. If we can recalibrate how the team ought to operate and figure out what the implications are for scaling that and then what the costs would be to scale it, that

[2:22:49 PM]

would be preferred. But like the commander said, you know, if we have more permeable boundaries rather than rigid boundaries we can take different instances, like going to an encampment and learning how the interaction and intervention might change because of that location and then coming back and writing, you know, a flow chart or a handbook, you know, for that. And that with that sort of flow chart and handbook we would know exactly what it would mean to deploy and scale. >> Mayor Adler: Anything else. >> Tovo: I wanted to say two more things. You know, one of the ways that it seems to me you're operating is by also keying into existing resources where they're available. I remember hearing about a need for prescriptions or for support for prescriptions and you weren't able to connect with one of the churches in the area that had some funding they could use for that and so I think that is just a key part of the success, is that you're able to key into these existing resources. But I appreciate that you underscored the tremendous need for housing, which this is not going -- you know, the host team is going to to have a lot of success in a lot of areas but won't in and of itself create that housing so we still need to be mindful of all of the many services around the city that need to grow to scale to meet the capacity. But the fact that you're able -- that the host team is really able to intervene with meeting some of those other needs for individuals waiting for housing is really very compelling. So thanks again. >> Thank you, mayor. I wanted to take this opportunity in addition to recognitioning our community

partners and departments that have been participating in this to also pay special recognition to Carey o'connor in the innovation informs who have been really at the core through this effort. It's through her participation in terms of bringing

[2:24:49 PM]

integration techniques and different ways to think about and coordinate all the different partners in this that have really resulted in some of the results you're seeing today and hope to see again in the future. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Good job, Carrie and everyone. Thank you so much. We're -- >> Good afternoon, mayor, council, Greg Guernsey, planning and zoning department. Today we're going to present the mobility prescription paper, and give you an overview. I'm joined by Dave Sullivan, a mobile of public cag, Monique, with the Austin transportation department and Paul, who is with the planning and zoning department. I'll turn it over to Paul and they can walk us through. >> Good afternoon. It's our pleasure to be presenting you to the third in a series of codenext code prescriptions. As you know, code prescriptions are papers that identify recommendations to change our land development code to address major topics that our community faces. So in the past you've heard presentations on household affordability as well as the natural and built environment and today we're going to talk with you about prescriptions that we think are needed for changing our land development

[2:26:50 PM]

code in order to promote mobility. And so we're going to go through a presentation that you've seen the format, you've seen before, I'm going to cover briefly the existing conditions. Those are the conditions that we're trying to resolve, the challenges we're facing in our community today. Dave is going to lead the discussion on what imagine Austin says about transportation. The three of us then will spend most of this presentation talking about the actual prescriptions themselves and then I'll wrap up with our next steps. So regarding our existing conditions, Austin is fortunate in that it has many ways in which we can get around, by rail, by foot, by car, by bike. The challenges though for most austinites, the most convenient way to do so is by car. So when you think about Austin, if you look at in and around downtown, in the old neighborhoods, that's a part of town where we're fairly well-connected, we have rail, we have most of our buses run through here, we have a great trail system and so forth and also that are uses, if you live and work in and around downtown, the uses that you go to for your daily needs, you could actually walk or bike to them or a short trip. The challenge becomes when you get outside of the old parts of the city where the services aren't quite what they are, you know, close in. In addition, you have -- your daily needs are oftentimes a car trip away from where you live or work. So what this ends up doing is it creates a couple problems. One, it helps to contribute to the traffic that we see. Another challenge that we start to see challenges with our ridership and uses. We've certainly heard stories about challenges that capital metro have been having and part of that ties to how our

[2:28:52 PM]

land uses coordinate with our transportation. Also a major topic is vehicular safety. Anyone on the road is subject to safety issues and should be -- you know, that's obviously been a top priority for the city. But we obviously look at traffic fatalities and traffic accidents as an issue that's a concern. The remaining two major issues we've actually presented to y'all in the past. One is on parking, and primarily parking in the context that our parking -- are parking standards in some parts of the city may actually result in overparking, say, in an area where we want to promote walking or transit. Finally affordability. Being so dependent on the car does have a financial cost. In Austin, on average, we spend about $12,000 a year

to operate our cars. Of course lower-income populations have a real hard time with that. One of the driving factors for that high number, which is about $2,000 above the national average, is the amount of driving we have to do in this city. Well, it's my turn to talk about why we're here, which has to do with the fact that we have a new comprehensive plan that council approved in 2012 called imagine Austin. When we were putting together imagine Austin, we had work groups look at land use and transportation at the same time. And so much of what is in imagine Austin deals with how you tie together land use and transportation. I know campo has also taken that approach in looking at land use and transportation at the same time. The overall vision within imagine Austin though is to look at the diversity of transportation, and part of what we're trying to do is increase the number of options that people have to get around and not always rely on the

[2:30:55 PM]

single occupant vehicle. So basically we're going to be looking at ways to change what -- the current practices are and create more diversity. >> Oh, I've got the -- one of the things that we did in imagine Austin was create a growth concept map, where we want to show -- showing where we want to be in 2039, our buy centennial and we identified centers and corridors, basically the centers are our regional centers, such as downtown, up at the domain, out at lakeline. We also have town centers, which are smaller than the regional centers, which would be at the major -- intersections of major arterials and we also have neighborhood centers that you would find, for example, around the mlk train station. Those would be neighborhood centers. A major corridor, such as burnet road, south congress, Lamar, both north and south, east seventh street, and a number of other streets, these are the places where we expect to see growth and that way we can preserve the single-family homes that are around -- outside of these areas. So if we can focus growth in those area, one of the benefits of that is that you'll have more people living within the ride sheds for buses, trains, et cetera, and is so that's one way we can increase the diversity that we'll have buses running more frequently if we can fill in at the centers and along the corridors that will make it easier for people to use the bus. >> The -- one of the things that we have to remind people is that codenext is not gonna solve all problems. Maybe only 99% of the

[2:32:56 PM]

problems. But no, really. [Laughter] We have to rely on so many other things. We have to rely on the capital improvement program, big -- we're very hopeful that in November the citizens will come through with funding for more money. That's something that we're gonna have to rely on. We also have other partners out there, capital metro, the crmta, cam pokers and the county. And so what we can do with codenext is limited, but it is very important. Then there's also what you guys, do just in terms of policy. It's one thing about what the code is but we also have policy issues. Lastly, I want to mention that part of what we're considering with transportation is not just transportation for its own sake. There's getting from point a to point B. However, how you get from point a to point B can affect affordability, how much you have to spend to do that, whether or not you enjoy it. That has to do with place making. Do we drive through a desert? Do we drive through nothing but billboards? Do we have opportunities to pass by parks, et cetera? With regard to the economy. Can you shop along the way? Can you doer ranking oner Rands on your route, cut down on overall driving. With regard to health and safety, obviously, can you do it safely? We had 102 deaths in 2015, break a record, and we want to make sure we implement some of the vision zero ideas and so we want to make sure that trip is safe. Then also with regard to health. There's a lot of research that tells us if you can walk or bike or combine it with a bus

trip you'll be in better physical condition. Also if you can drive safely and without stress that also affects your health. So we're considering multiple goals in our transportation planning. >> So now we're on to the majority of our presentation, which is on the actual prescriptions themselves. And I just want to point out, again, that our prescriptions are based strictly on changes to the land development regulations. So I also should just point out that these topics you see here are general themes but under each of them there are roughly two or three prescriptions, except for the first one we're going to cover, which has about five. So we're all going to participate in this, and I'll have the first one, which is the general theme is focusing on going from an auto centric community to a multimodal or simply providing more opportunities in the ways in which we get around. The first prescription you've actually seen before when we've presented, and that is planning for development along our imagine Austin centers and corridors. And the intent of that is to try to provide more opportunities for more people to be able to ride transit, take their bikes, or walk to nearby stores and other goods. As we are developing more development one of the tools we'll have in the toolbox within codenext are these new zoning districts you know as form based codes. The benefit of the form based codes is that it actually provides more form standards that can help assure that when development occurs, that the -- a new development will fit into the context of the neighborhood better than the use-base zoning districts that we have now. In addition to that, we also are looking at the definitions that we have for remodels and redevelopment. And the challenge here is that when a project goes through a

remodeling, we do not see -- we do not require a trigger for the new -- for a project to be brought up to the new city standards. And while oftentimes that can be a good thing, because of the nature of the remodel, do keep in mind that by our definition, remodel could be a building torn down and just one wall standing and that meets remodel definition. Whereas if it qualifies as a redevelopment then we can require the sidewalk improvements, the street trees, and other street benefits that we can't get under -- when a project remodels. It's important to note that many of our corridors are seeing a significant amount of remodels occurring, and we're not seeing the streetscape improvements. >> All right. Thank you, Paul. The second recommendation under this prescription is related to creating an update to our current transportation plan that we're calling the Austin strategic mobility plan. Imagine Austin is a 30,000-foot view of our city, and the Austin strategic mobility plan will take the transportation element down to a 10,000-foot view by recommending more specific programs, strategies, projects and metrics by which to realize and implement imagine Austin's transportation element. The connection to codenext comes in a regulatory connection, which is the roadway table that is part of our current transportation plan and which will be updated with the Austin strategic mobility plan. The significance of the roadway table is it sets the future condition for our roadways, how wide they should be and the right-of-way recommendations. I'll stress multimodal recommendations that will come with the update. So the Austin strategic mobility plan is going to inform the new roadway table which is referenced multiple

times through codenext with regards to transportation, impacts and mitigation. The next way that the code is going to -- with its prescription and its recommendations help changing Austin from a auto centric city a multimodal region is through network design. So specifically creating and -- creating a grid system and completing our network. We need to complete our network so that we can have more efficiency in our network. So rather than having one or two ways to get to work, we can have three or

four. That also enhances public safety as well as far as access. So with stronger recommendations for design, every step in the development process is an opportunity to implement our existing mobility plans. And so with enhanced prescriptions and recommendations and regulations with regards to connectivity, we will get better design and build-out of our transportation network. So it's probably not surprising that one of the recommendations is specific to one of our systems in the network, which is sidewalk connectivity and quality. So the three main prescriptions related to sidewalks are closing loopholes, related to sidewalk installation and maintenance, for example, requiring sidewalks on two sides of a corner lot rather than just one side is one example of improvements that we'll be making to the sidewalk regulations. Another is with driveway cuts. We're looking to minimize driveway cuts, better regulate driveway cuts, rather than having one cut for every property, having one cut serve multiple properties. What that does is limit the conflicts between motor vehicles turning with

[2:41:01 PM]

pedestrians, other vehicles, and bicyclists. Finally Paul mentioned addressing remodels, which is significant to many development improvements that we get or don't get with the current system with remodels, but specific -- it's very important to -- when sidewalk requirements are triggered. So important enough to mention that again here. >> Mayor, can I ask a question? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Garza: Driveway cuts, can you explain that again is this. >> Sure, I'll think of an example of burnet road, north Lamar, south Lamar. A lot of times there's so many driveways along the corridor for each individual property that it's basically one big driveway. There's not really a proper sidewalk there. There's a lot of opportunities for cars to access every commercial business along there, so, you know, looking at ways to minimize those and require or incentivize shared driveway situations where one driveway with access multiple properties so you're trying to limit those conflict points. Does that make sense? >> Garza: Yes. Thank you. >> Utilities is another area of prescription that needs to be looked at. The new form-based code and the new street cross-sections that will be informed by the strategic mobility plan have to consider overhead and underground utilities such as telecommunication, electric lines, waterlines, et cetera. So we are going through an internal process led by the capital planning office with involvement from all the utilities and transportation and public works to ensure that as codenext is being developed concurrently with the strategic mobility plan and as we're looking at new placements for different aspects of our transportation network and the building forms along our corridors that we're assuring that we can be compatible and balanced with utility feeds.

[2:43:04 PM]

So now we're leaving the first prescription. There were a lot of recommendations in that prescription and now we're moving to the second prescription, which is to mitigate the effects of congestion. That's a big one. So there are two here. One is a focus on transportation demand management, and the other is a focus on variances. So let's take a minute to talk about demand management. Transportation demand management by definition is the application of strategies and policies to reduce travel demands, specifically that of single occupancy vehicles or to redistribute that demand in space and time, so flex time, teleworking, that type of thing, as well as incentives such as bus subsidies or B cycle passes, that type of thing. In transportation not like -- or like other networks, water, and energy, managing demand is a cost effective way to add capacity to a network. Many of you saw the report that was issued by Jeff, who was here consulting with us on our transportation issues back in the fall and he stressed that the fastest and most cost effective way to manage congestion is through demand management techniques. And so in the code we are look at enhancing a transportation demand management section. Right now we do have incentives throughout the code. They're not all in one place. We're going to make it easier

to look at how regulations and incentives for demand can be easier found within the code, looking to strengthen them so that they can be more broadly applied throughout the city and not just in certain situations. Variances. You know, simply put, if there's too many variances to the code regulation it's dilutes the code's ability to implement imagine Austin and do the job it's supposed to do. So I like this example because over time we've given a lot of variances to vote connectivity, and -- street connectivity and the more we do that dish spoke earlier on

[2:45:05 PM]

the importance of completing the network and having more of a grid system. It doesn't have to be an exact grid system like downtown but having more connections is a good thing to distribute our traffic. So over time one variance, another variance, another variance, over time we've created this disconnected system and it becomes really expensive if not impossible to come back with a C.I.P. Project to build those projects if we can. A lot of times the variance is sought because there's a desire to put a building or some sort of structure in that area. So codenext, which is a theme throughout the entire code, not just transportation, is looking to make it easier to do the right thing, and so that we're not granting variances one off and we can be more consistent and predictable with variances and waivers. So that concludes those two prescriptions. And now Dave is gonna talk about parking, which is a big prescription. >> So, your honor, when you came and talked to the cag you asked us to point out areas that you think might be rough spots in developing codenext. I can predict that parking may be one of those. It's a couldn't -- relatively controversial issue because many have trouble parking around the city. You mentioned possibly reducing parking. Then gonna raise a red flag. This is an illustration, though, of how parking can affect the costs or the affordability of a housing project, and this illustration, you've got an 8,000 square foot lot, the minimum size for multi-family. If you had a multifamiliar 6 zoned property there and you could build to maximum entitlements in terms of impervious cover and height, 90 feet, you could potentially have an eight story project with about 50 units -- I'm sorry, the yield would be 80 units. Well, that is with no parking at all. So you can imagine 80 units on

[2:47:05 PM]

a relatively small 80 -- 8,000 square foot lot. The reality is that we require up to 1.5 parking spaces per unit, and that would take the yield down to a two-story building because you'd need ten parking spaces and so you could only have seven apartment units. The point there is that the value of the land then would then be divided into that smaller number of units instead of the larger number of units if you could have built the larger building, making the cost per unit higher. Alternative is to do structured parking, but a structured parking space would almost in -- in all cases would cost more than a as far as parking space. What we find, though, in practice is that because of the market and because of the financing that builders have to get in order to finance a project, sometimes they would add in voluntarily even more parking than the minimum that is required. And so the last illustration shows more parking and fewer units so now even though it's a taller building, it's more expensive than it would have been if it had met the minimum parking standards. Overall, we want to look at both what the market is, what the current requirements are, what the uses are for parking, and be more sensitive to these things to try to minimize the total amount of excess parking we have and then we have hope that that would translate into lower costs for the ultimate consumer. The specifics are that we're goon be more context sensitive. That's kind of a buzz phrase throughout codenext, is that things are "Context sensitive." It means we're going to pay more attention to the environment in which a change might occur. So with context sensitive, you can imagine if it's a family-oriented business, that

[2:49:07 PM]

you would have families trafficking with children, they're almost always going to drive and, therefore, you would need more parking. If it's a senior citizen activity, you would expect seniors to be more likely to drive or be driven and so you would need more parking. But if it's something that is oriented to young people, millennials, to use the general term, you might need less parking because of the higher likelihood those people would walk, bike, or use transit or car pool. And so if we can pay more attention to the actual use rather than is it zoned commercial, is it zoned office, is it zoned multi-family, then we may be able to be more efficient. Another point -- and in doing that change the parking standards for minimums. With regard to how we park, we now have sensors in many parking lots that tell us how many spaces are taken. We have them along our streets, where we know how many permits have been purchased to park along the street. And so using our smart technology, we are now better able to gauge how much parking is used and then factor that into what are the needs for parking at a location. We're also going to be looking at the residential parking permits to see how effective they are, because that's one way that we constrict parking in areas, and we are considering that there may be other alternatives. I have personal experience in my own neighborhood where the city came in and painted little hockey sticks in the street to indicate where the parking should be for commercial people that -- people visiting commercial business that's park on my street, and that wi we didn't need to get an rpp because we were able to protect driveways, which is one of the big issues when you have residences near a commercial area. People irrespectively -- non--- without respect park in front of people's driveways. Anyway, we're gonna be looking at that. As Monique mentioned, the

[2:51:10 PM]

tdms, one of the issues, if you can reduce the parking need because people are carpooling, using car to go, using a tnc or transit, then you can reduce the parking. And then, lastly, there's an idea that when you're in a downtown area, for example, we've already implemented this downtown by having more paid parking, that creates an incentive for people to use other uses, that we may do that in other intense areas, as I mentioned earlier, in the regional centers. Those may be places where we have such intense land use that any parking there would be a paid parking. And of course we wouldn't take away the entitlements of people who right now have free parking. One of the issues that came up at one of our meetings was when a realtor queried us, does that mean you're going to make somebody who now validates parking no longer be able to do that? And I think that we've talked about that and said, no, that wouldn't be the case. But there would be an incentive that you could reduce your parking if you required paid parking. But we wouldn't necessarily require people to do that. Then with regard to -- I mentioned -- I mentioned these parking reductions. In many cases these would come along with a density bonus. Might not -- it might be in some cases by right, and then in other cases part of a deal where in exchange for having more on-site, affordable housing you could get a reduction in parking. Something we already allow with the vmu but we will look at it to see how well it has worked and can it be applied in other areas, in particular along our corridors where we want to boost transit. >> Mayor Adler: Before you go on to the next one -- I do appreciate you pointing us to the ultimate issues on here, and this is the kind of thing we need to start talking about. We need to resolve this. With respect to parking, a lot

[2:53:10 PM]

of people find it counterintuitive to remove parking or make it more expensive in order to be able to address parking. In fact I think we have our first building going up downtown that's a tall building

without parking and I've already heard some of the legislature are going to look at passing an ordinance directed at our allowance of that. It's just counterintuitive to a lot of people. How do you respond to that? Are there -- >> Right. >> Mayor Adler: Are there examples we can point at where cities have successfully made that transition? How do you respond to that? >> Well, yes, there are cities. I've been reading about them by -- one that comes to mind right now where they have removed parking minimums and they leave it to the market. But we've got experience with our downtown, for example, where we've been able to get people to pay for parking on the street and then have districts within which -- and we're doing this now in Miller, is that correct? We're creating a parking district where the cash revenue that comes from the parking goes back into pedestrian safety, sidewalks, streetlights, benches, things like that. The point Doug Shoop, done a book called "The high cost of parking" has done research to show all of our free parking that creates incentive for people to drive and use public areas on streets or in parking lots, without paying, translates into higher cost. If I walk to the grocery store, is it fair that I had to pay more for the head of lettuce that I buy because part of that cost is for the real estate taxes that are paid on the parking lot that I have not used. So that is a real example of how there's an unfair balance and how it would be fair if somebody who did park in that parking lot paid to cover the

[2:55:11 PM]

real estate taxes for that parking lot. Because that is a real cost to the business. So I'd refer to you Dr. Shoop's book, and we can provide you other examples and more information on this before this gets to council. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Kitchen and then Ms. Pool. >> Kitchen: I have a question on the parking fees. This is a little bit tangential but one of the things I've been wondering is the level that the fee is set at. My understanding is that it's been some time since that's been revisited. Are y'all -- maybe you're familiar with that? It's just that, you know, we've talked a lot -- the fee structure we have for a number of different things across the city, we've started to talk about cost of service and those types of things and revisiting our fee structure. If I'm understanding correctly, I don't think we've revisited the parking fee structure. If y'all don't know -- >> We can answer. We've incrementally, very incrementally looked -- you know, looked at the price of parking and rob could probably give you an update on anything that's eminent with regards to pricing. But recently we did increase them, but it's been an incremental increase over time. >> Kitchen: I'm wondering if we're due for them. If we're not, that's okay. I'm just wondering if we were do for studying any of the -- these -- the fees on parking. >> Councilmember, Robert spillar, Austin transportation department. With regards to parking fees, you'll remember this last year, we actually went up. >> Kitchen: Yes. >> By some amount. [Laughter] And, I'm sorry, I don't remember how much. >> Kitchen: That's right. >> 25 cents, 50 cents, whatever it was. The point being is that, yes, we do monitor our parking fees. That was the first increase in a long time. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> And what we based that on is the occupancy. We try to achieve between an 80 and 85% occupancy rate

[2:57:12 PM]

because above that you're starting to induce trips looking for those parking opportunities. We also have, you know, extended parking in the evenings, when we had overdemand and we may come this year and talk to you about looking at an additional day in downtown for that long-term or late-night parking. What has not dramatically changed is another set of fees, which is the enforcement fees for violations. >> Kitchen: Parking fines. That's what I was thinking. >> We started to hear communications from folks saying that the cost of a ticket violation is cheaper than the off-street parking, especially during events. And so that is obviously an issue. Those rates are set by the community court, and so we're happy to

work with them to look at those. >> Kitchen: Do you know how long it's been since those have been revisited? >> You know, in the past eight years I know we've increased them once. That's all I can tell you. >> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you. >> Pool: I had two questions. I think -- now I remember when those fees were increased last year. During budget we had -- we got concerns from our creative sector folks who were having to pay and it was an affordability issue. The other side of that issue, that -- that you're presenting to us is how much it costs for people if they don't have convenient bus rides and there's plenty of folks who don't and it will be a while before the bus routes are as robust as we need for those, that frequency to be every ten minutes on all the routes and we're just starting to look at having more east-west routes in the new plan for next year from capital metro. So I just want to temper some of the comments that you're making and saying, please, look also at the affordability side of the questions for the people who do have to bring a car into downtown and they

[2:59:12 PM]

have to park and they don't have free parking. For example. Underneath the -- building that they work in or they work in a service industry and don't make a heck of a lot of money. Another issue for another day, which we've talked about wage stagnation in the city. But affordability also comes home to roast roost here. That's a general point. I want you to be mindful of that. I get that you're trying to put people on to alternative forms of transportation, but that won't happen next year. It may happen incrementally over a period of time, but we have to be mindful of that transition piece, so I'm very interested in how you would recommend we address that. Then the second piece, and Mr. Spillar, you're off the hook. >> Thank you. >> Someone else can come back up. On the context sensitive requirements that Mr. Sullivan was talking about, I like the idea that you're presenting that a senior activity center, for example, would have maybe more parking for people with disabilities and van spots and that sort of thing. I think generally that's a very smart approach. But what do we do when a designated use shifts over time? Say a senior activity center -- say it becomes the next millennium center like we have on the east side. Maybe the senior activity center on north Lamar turns into a teenaged neighborhood center or it goes the other direction where you don't have as much parking, but now you do need it. I would say that the connectivity is a good idea. I would like to chance that down and follow it and think about it, but you are also to a certain extent locking in future uses by assigning a particular age group to be -- for the parking to be

[3:01:13 PM]

addressed. Have you thought about that? >> Yes. What I've thought about -- and this necessarily hasn't come from the staff or our consultant, but the fact that we've got other uses for parking lots. So if you did go into an existing property and you did not need all of your parking because of the context that you were in, mobile food trailers now have become a popular use within parking lots, farmers markets. Skateboard parks, bmx parks, basketball courts. There are a number of other uses that we can put parking lots to. So part of what I think we will be talking about is -- one thing about a brand new project, but it's another thing about the reuse of a building. And so if you're going to reuse a building on burnet road and right now you have excess parking, then perhaps it could become a small mobile retail center, et cetera, and the city wouldn't hold up your permit for some use that millennials would use because they don't need the parking, but they would use the mobile food trailer. So you wouldn't need 30 parking spaces, you would only need 20 parking spaces so you would be able to put one-third of that to some other use. >> I get that, but what about if it goes the other direction? >> Then you take the mobile food trailer out. >> Pool: That's because you have the parking available now. >> Right. >> Pool: In those instances where we build without parking and then that use changes and we find ourselves in a position

where now that owner or university of that building has to locate parking in order to -- to be successful. >> Right. Your question is what about in your green field development where it's new. If we're going to a regional center such as the domain where you've got the opportunities for shared parking, we would look -- there's other alternatives for it. But if it's a one-off spot along a major arterial roadway like

[3:03:15 PM]

burnet road, then we would probably use the -- take the same approach, which has been to use the standard -- what's the organization that does our parking counts? The transportation engineers counts per square footage, but we've also found -- >> Ete. -- Ite. >> That's come down because of transit and fewer people relying on driving, so we would update the ite numbers. >> Pool: And you may also have the opportunity to designate or make that change, information available to the transit agency, for example, and maybe they could come in with a transit stop to take care of the fact that there isn't any parking. I'm just trying to think in terms we don't want to lock ourselves into a required use for a building if -- simply because of what kind of parking we are saying should be there. >> Right. We're a diverse group on the cag and we're not going to overwhelm neighborhoods with overflow commercial parking. I would mention my colleague Ellie Mckinney is here from the cag and we're very sensitive to that. The point is we want to make better use. Right now there's something like eight parking spaces for every car because of all the commercial property that we have as well as our own driveways. >> Pool: And you're talking about around the city? >> Yeah. >> Pool: I would just say I'm not sure you can count a driveway. But that's another conversation. >> But point is there is more parking in the world than there are cars. >> Pool: Okay, thanks. >> I was going to add, and Greg can chime in here, I don't think the situation happens now with regard to change of use, right? So there's a process in our site plan processes to catch a change of use. And you're right it will either go down in parking based on the ite parking requirements that we use to

[3:05:15 PM]

reference, or it will go up. And that's part of, you know, the speculative market site selection process of looking at, you know, do we need more, do we need less? Can we use car share spaces on to reduce? I'm hoping we would be improving and making that process simpler and being more efficient with how we -- how much parking we're recommending with the new code? Like there's definitely low hanging fruit to make it more efficient while solving for the situation that you point out, which does happen now. >> Right. >> Pool: And for future use. >> And when the use changes the car sharing is the perfect example because you get a great why number or reduction in required spaces if you utilize car sharing. So if you have a use that goes up and doesn't have enough spaces and you're introducing a use, there may be other tools that you could introduce on your property, whether it's providing bicycle parking and showers or providing shared parking on the site for like cars to go, then you could bring down that number. Some of the context we have is whether your house is only 300 square feet and it is a small tiny house. Or 5,000 square feet, and we require the same number of parking spaces, which is two. So there is some context you need to look at where it's perfectly fine for two cars in a row, tandem in a single-family neighborhood. We didn't have parking before 1955 requirement for single-family homes. It required one up until 1985 and now we require two for everything regardless of how big your house is or how much parking is available on the street immediately adjacent to your house. So there's some context that needs to be looked at for even a single-family home. >> Pool: But Mr. Guernsey you've now introduced a different element. We were originally talking about the -- how

[3:07:15 PM]

many units were in the buildings, right, for how many cars were parked. And now you're talking about the size of the overall home. >> Right. I'm saying the context could be for multi-family, it could be for single-family, it could be for commercial. So we're looking at parking not just for multi-family project or just a commercial project, but also for single-family and a range of residential. >> Pool: And that also goes to the point about the driveways. I was thinking residential driveways and you may have been talking about commercial driveways. >> I was. You. >> Pool: Yes. And I wasn't. So I think we should be really careful that we identify which type of development we're talking about. Thanks. >> Lastly, about the density bonuses, one of the things about having more density along our major corridors if you allow density bonus and they have some submarket priced housing the fact that they have better access to the bus and to walking to destinations, that saves money also. It's not just the rent is lower, but the transportation costs could be lower also. Then another idea about parking is, look at some of the good practices that we have now in U.N.O., in the university neighborhood overlay we have a requirement there if you build a taller building you must charge separately for the price to park your car versus the rent for your residential unit. So we call that unbundling. It's about $70 per month to park your car. And if you don't bring a car to campus then you only pay the rent on your apartment. So that's a practice that to me seems very fair. Why should one person who has two cars pay the same rent as somebody who has no cars if they're parked in the parking lot again where the taxes are being paid on that parking lot? And the maintenance costs on that parking lot. And another idea is cash out where -- I've got a personal experience with

[3:09:16 PM]

this, where my niece now works for a company that pays her a dollar a day to not park in the parking lot and to prove that she rode the bus. Show has to have a bus pass and so she's not parking nearby and walking in, so she demonstrates that she has a bus pass and she gets paid by her employer a dollar a day. So we're calling that ashout, and that's another option for -- cashout, and that's another option for reducing parking if you can have a deal with your employees and a business that they use some alternative means they get paid if you're allowing free parking for everybody else, you pay the people who are not using the parking. So that's another part of the transportation demand management that anike talked about. >> All right. We have two prescriptions left. And this one is a big one, an important one, accounting for the cost of growth. So the important prescription coming out of the paper is the coredation to make improvements to our current practice for transportation impact analysis. And the recommendation is to take again a context sensitive multimodal and best practice approach to looking at how we scope our tia's, when and how they're triggered, and generally -- right now it's one size fits all with regards to how we do it. Looking at the fact that different parts of the cities have different needs, different transportation systems that are more mature than others, and can we take a more context sensitive approach oh how we do assessments of the impact of a development on the transportation network. So it's important to also note that transportation impact analysis and its requirements as triggered by the code is different than what you all have heard about -- which the city is also developing concurrently, which is a street impact fee program.

[3:11:17 PM]

These two are two different things. The street impact fee program will be a separate ordinance, will not be part of the land development code once it's enacted. We are just starting on that June 9th. Council approved a consultant negotiation and execution contract to move forward on that. That was executed about two weeks ago and we're moving forward with the local government code required studies to

look at enacting that tool. So the next two slides I'll talk about how these two things work together. >> Kitchen: I'm sorry, you may get to that. I was one that was maybe confused about thinking it was part of codenext. You will be explaining where it sits. It's a different part of the code? >> It's a different part of the code. It's still part of the code, but it will not be part of the land development code per se. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Right, exactly. So what you see here is the plethora of ways that we can get improvements to our transportation network through the development process. I talked about the sidewalk ordinance. Y'all are familiar with how we are able to get sidewalks built and we'll be looking at strengthening those loopholes through codenext. We have right-of-way dedication in the upper corner. I use the example of variances. That is something we're looking to strengthen. Through the code we're allowed to look at our transportation plan and get land for right-of-way for future connections. That's going to continue through the current code. We're going to be strengthening other tools, lower right-hand corner there, transportation demand management, which we just talked about, and the transportation impact analysis will be the main staple. If I can bring your attention to the large circle around all of those, all of those improvements are still subject to a rough proportionality limit which is the state mandated way that we set a ceiling on the level of transportation

[3:13:17 PM]

improvements that we ask to be provided by a development. So said another way all the tools that we have to obtain transportation improvements to the development process will be strengthened through codenext however the amount is still subject to the rough proportionality ceiling, but often cases these don't get us to that ceiling. So this slide in the lower left-hand corner shows the ceiling at the top, total allowed by rough proportionality, and the color block show all those things we talked about, the sidewalk recommendations, the tia analysis and the recommendations that come out of it. Right-of-way dedication, et cetera. And the street impact fees will come in that dash box that is currently the unmitigated amount. That's how the codenext will work together with street impact fees to get us in a better place with regards to looking at the impact of development on the transportation network. And then finally, safety. The changes to the land development code that support transit, walking and bicycling, also improve safety. It shows as density goes up, serious crashes go down. And that's simply because we're lowering vehicle miles traveled. While also making improvements to all of those systems as I just talked about, limiting driveway cuts, protected bicycle line implementation. Looking at the safety of the transportation network and that we can look at through codenext and can be strengthened through current code. With that I'll turn it over to Paul to talk about next steps. >> Thank you. So obviously the major -- the one everyone has an interest in is when is the draft code going to get released? January of 2017. We're on track for that and so the draft will be coming out in January. Along with that we are looking at roughly a

[3:15:19 PM]

six-month public review process and we'll be working closely with the advisory group and other boards and commissions and large numbers of members of the community to collect feedback on the draft code, which we would then have a period of time in which we make up dates to the draft and then would start the adoption process. Prior to January we have one more code prescription coming out, coming out very soon, next week, I believe I believe, and that's on fiscal health. And in fact, it is scheduled to come back here October 18th so that's the next big milestone until we hit January. So that concludes our presentation. If you all have any other questions, we'll be happy to answer them. >> Mayor Adler: This is helpful. Greg? >> Casar: This is helpful. I appreciate it. I know that we've had discussions about getting cag members together with councilmembers on the prescription papers and I

appreciate the work y'all have done so far on this in your presentation today. Another way of all three capital metro here, I do want to go back to make sure that the message is clear that it's not just that we're trying to push people to get out of their cars and on to public transportation because I think that there's a lot of people that really want to, but I hear all of the time -- as we heard mobility talks and anybody you talk to on the street there's lots of people that would really like to, and I think the trap that we sometimes get caught up in is who is going to go first? Because we really like capital metro to do it, but capital metro needs the land use patterns and the sidewalks and the infrastructure and the density to do it, but we're afraid of doing those things because there isn't a bus route, and that's why I'm glad we have a comprehensive plan and we're going through a comprehensive process where we both hold hands and jump into the pool together and get ourselves out of the trap that we're going to follow the plan and to put the people there so that the routes can be more frequent and

[3:17:19 PM]

recover more of our costs and run along those corridors. So I'm appreciative of getting to be on a council that is getting to the point of implementing that because I think it's a really hard problem to solve because we can't ask cap metro to do it if there aren't people to ride the bus. And so -- but we can't be scared of doing it, thinking that capital metro's not going to put the buses there and having three of our councilmembers there on the board is an exciting opportunity here in this coming year. So thank y'all for doing double duty for us. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, pool. >> Pool: I had a question for you on your page 6 and this is the growth concept map. And there are significant areas west of town, for example, that are actually locus for commercial, like spicewood springs and Mesa. And then also far west. So I think I remember that those locations were in fact on concept maps years ago and then in the adoption of this those northwest hills, west Austin locations were removed from the map. Is that correct? And if so, can you talk about why you would not have growth and activity centers west of mopac? >> We'll have to get back with you to see about Mesa and spicewood springs. I don't recall off the top of my head if they're on there or not. But as you know we went through an extensive public engagement process where we went out into the community and community participated in something called the chip exercise. And that. >> Pool: Oh, I did that. That was when you had the pop-up on second street. Just up the street from here. >> Right. That was one of them. And so the public largely helped us with the development of the

[3:19:20 PM]

growth concept map, so we were looking major roadways and centers and we were also trying to combine this with campo's activity map, activity plan map. So there was a lot of overlap with that as well as any neighborhood plans that had identified corridors, but I think we'll have to come back and let you know whether or not spicewood and Mesa are -- >> As a matter of fact, far west is identified -- far west boulevard is identified as a -- no, as an activity center along far west, and that is at the neighborhood scale. Neighborhood center scale. I can send you a table of all of the different ones, but you're not limited to these. It's on your agenda I think to consider the south central waterfront area as a any center within the imagine Austin comprehensive plan. >> Pool: I think we should revisit some of that because far west is clearly a commercial area and it's a fairly broad boulevard. There are a lot of medical offices over there and more. That's where Murchison middle school is. >> It's in the plan now as a neighborhood center. >> But it is more than a neighborhood center. >> Well, you. It's interesting, the scale in the imagine Austin comprehensive plan it talks about how many tens of thousands new residents and jobs go into these centers, so you might be surprised and alarmed at how many go into a neighborhood center. It's something on the scale of 5,000 residents, 5,000 new jobs. So it does not say

it's a small amount of growth. It's still something that is walkable and neighborhood friendly, but it's not -- it's still a large number.

[3:21:20 PM]

>> Pool: So it could be that there aren't a lot of new buildings on far west at this point. It's pretty well built out. So maybe there aren't 5 through new jobs going in there. >> It could be redevelopment. It could be a block away on a commercial street on hart or one of the other streets, but -- because by identifying the name of the street we're actually several blocks over if they're still commercially zoned. So it could be an empty parking lot or underutilized parking lot based on what we've observed that puts in structured parking and becomes a multi-storied building based on the entitlements they have and the demand. >> Pool: And the other side of that coin since I've been flipping coins today, are the intense developments that are underway in areas that are in fact not designated as either activity or growth corridors. And so if we are not putting dense development in areas where it would seem reasonable or rational or logical to put them like far west or spicewood springs and Mesa and where it backs up to mopac, but we're putting it in other parts of town where you don't have roads that are rated at that level, then how -- how do we manage, you know, to make policy based on a document that we don't really seem to be following? >> I can add one -- sorry. I was going to add one thing about street impact fees and then Greg can chime in. So one thing about street impact fees is that it can be a growth management tool as well because you can have the ability to set the fees -- >> Pool: Except that we're always waiving them and the developers want to waive them. >> We don't have street impact fees right now. >> Pool: What fees we do have. >> Sure. That's always the flipping coins again, that's always the -- that's the whole variance and waiver discussion that I was talking about earlier, that the more that we do variances and waivers to whatever policy that we have, the more diluted

[3:23:22 PM]

the spirit of that policy becomes, right? >> Pool: Right. >> I did want to mention that in setting the fees for street impact fees, it can be a growth management fee where you set them high where you want to discourage development and you set them lower where you want to encourage development. So that is a tool that will be available that we don't have now. >> Pool: Is that what we did with the desired development zone years ago? >> Similar, yes. >> Pool: That didn't work too well, did it? >> Maybe Greg can speak to that and I'll let him say what he wanted to say. >> Pool: I've been around a long time so I remember the desired development zone conversations. >> We still encouragement on those portions of the city where it's most likely to flood and where there's a transportation system. Earlier you had asked about the different roadways that we have and if they're not an activity corridor. We still have a complete streets policy that we try to make STAAR it's safe for pedestrians, cyclists, we try to encourage all those different modes on the appropriate streets and bring them to a place where we have a complete street that people feel safe to walk on or ride their bike. Or if a motor vehicle motorist was driving down, all those things are blended together and that applies citywide. In the context of imagine Austin, certainly sister does promote growth on nodes and on the corridors, but not necessarily limited to those areas. We do understand that there's going to be development elsewhere in Austin. There's large infill tracts that need to be looked at and looked at on a case-by-case basis. When you talk about the desired development zone, the drinking water protection zone and imagine Austin having certain nodes, but also to have the sensitive environmental features that are out there so when you look at the map it may have had like a green dot instead of yellow dot. To say that these are

[3:25:23 PM]

important areas where a certain amount of growth is concerned or developed, but also take in environmental elements as well. >> Pool: Thank you. Thanks, mayor. >> Mayor Adler: I think we have some planning commission folks also wanting to talk about this same topic. Thank you very much. Very good, very helpful. Thank you for your patience with us today. >> Good afternoon. Thank you for having me. I'm Steve Oliver, I'm chair of the city of Austin planning commission. I think I've met most of you at one point or another. If I haven't, all in good time. I'm glad to follow that conversation and actually if I am permitted I would like to follow up on councilmember pool's question about the corridors and nodes and stuff. The last planning commission meeting we did, I think we're bringing a recommendation forward to you all to ask that as part of the five-year update, which we're rapidly approaching here, we are at year five, which is when we take a big look at everything that's in imagine Austin or the parts that need to be relooked at because of a fast pace of change that we struggle with, we were looking for west Austin, areas that did we leave something out the first go round or have things changed so much in the last five years that -- let's look at the study as to what created these corridors. Do we need to look at those areas again. And not just those areas, throughout the entire city, southeast Austin, up by lakeline, northeast Austin. Have we got the dynamics right now with our growth concept map understanding how all these pieces have come together in the last few years and how they impact code, our conversations about land use so that this remains fresh. So from that standpoint

[3:27:25 PM]

I think by spring staff will be coming back to planning commission with, you know, the next update, the five-year update. And it should be a bigger -- we would anticipate, the planning commission, this is a bigger effort than our first four annual updates to imagine Austin. So when this information comes to council I think it's going to be along those lines of what are these nodes and centers about today versus what we thought they were about four years ago from a decision-making standpoint. >> Pool: That is really great to know. And I also recognize that there is a push and pull between how much the city can do to direct growth and where developers actually find the land to buy or the area that they want to put their project in. And that's a natural -- it's organic and it -- and on a good day we can align together on that with -- where the development is trying to go and where we'd like it to go. And I'm not even trying to indicate that the city should only allow in a certain area. I'm not saying that at all. I think that it's good that there's that push and pull. >> Yeah. That's a very relevant topic in and of itself. I think there's a lot of confusion and disagreement. Sometimes it's a necessary disagreement, but it's one that we need to really vet out in the next stages of working with the prescription papers and the draft code of -- the draft code we will get in January. I think there's a lot of different ideas of what is allowable redevelopment. And some people think we will not redevelop anything in this hypothetical part of town, but technically that would be illegal to tell people you can't redevelop your property. The question is what is it redeveloped into. We get into a lot of agreements just on the nuance of the language, the language we choose to use and it's embedded in imagine Austin. So we look at some of those pages and say nothing will happen

[3:29:25 PM]

here. That's not really fair to say, something would happen. So point of this conversation was to have a quick little talk with you all and let you guys know that planning commission in the last few months has set up several work groups, one to look at each of these prescription papers as they have come before us. You know, these prescription papers have a lot of meat on them in some ways and in other areas there are people that -- people would want more information and it's like this is too gray. I need more

specifics. And I think that's a fair criticism of any product is it's going to satisfy some and not others. But from that standpoint we had groups of three, four, five for these first three. We're waiting for the next one as well. We'll establish another work group to look at -- working group to look at that. By no means -- each working group represents the majority opinion of the planning commission. So the from that standpoint we bring it back to the full planning commission so we can vet it as a group and then share our thoughts with you. And with the cag as well. And that's another area where we think increased relationship with the cag, particularly as we come to the draft code, is going to be critical. We need a working model, a mechanism as boards and commissions and the cag and council and staff and the consultant to review all this collectively, but then independently that is digestible because there is -- there was no way we could come to you and go, the planning commission thinks this, point by point by point on each of these prescriptions. That was outside of our capability as a body. However, we were able to read them individually and then as a group and go, generally here's our impression of this document. So that's what kind of today is. And I'm not going to go through all the points that we made as a body or as working groups, but there are five areas I did want to use today

[3:31:26 PM]

to talk about. And some of these you will probably hear from the cag as well as other meetings. Number 1, we cannot underplay enough the importance of understanding mapping and what this means. We heard today around you will see in the prescription papers context decisions, which is this about -- the zoning would be based on context. If we don't have the resources and understand the resources necessary to do the mapping of our city, then the impact of what we want to see will be minimized, it will be localized, it will not be -- it will not be in a way that the private development community will be able to handle well. It will create very diverse -- you're going to create increased costs for some if we cannot get this across the board. And I don't think I've heard a full discussion, at least at the planning commission level, as to what is what's success -- what do we have to do to have a successful game plan for mapping? I think we've talked about putting our toe in the water, doing it here and there, but we know 20 years later after neighborhood plans how long it's taken us to get to this point and we've got so much more ground to cover. We have neighborhoods that want to be relooked at again. They want resources again to do a new planning effort or update their plan. And we don't have the resources to do that. So we need to help everybody's expectations that if we say this is going to happen, then we only do it for a little bit of the city over an extended period of time, we're going to have increased frustration and I want us all to be very careful about that because the planning commission, we are hesitant now to make some decisions at times because codenext will take care of that. We're banking a lot on that. And we keep doing it again and again. And I don't want to set us up for failure either. Nor would anybody in this room. So I think we've got to be realistic about how

[3:33:28 PM]

to get successful fly through the mapping process and tackle those decisions now because I think we saw in the planning commission -- the planning commission definitely saw say on an issue like compatibility that we were punting the compatibility debate. And I think that's unfortunate that -- and it's kind of a natural part of the process. I think sometimes we're a little fearful of having the toughest talks. But if we haven't had the full blown compatibility talk before we get to the draft code and we're going to have it as part of the draft code process, I think we're going to start to -- we're going to starting to down argument tracks about maybe what is appropriate for compatibility in certain contexts that could derail the process and nobody wants to derail the process. So the more we can front load and stop punting some of these conversations before the draft code discussions, I would highly -- I would strongly

encourage. >> Mayor Adler: How do you front load that? I'm sorry. >> Well, we had -- we had -- I think there was an attempt a couple of years ago. Feels like a couple of years ago. It's been a long process. I was on the cag. Staff brought something forward called code talks and compatibility was supposed to be the first one. And that was the only one. And I think it was a great first step and there was supposed to be -- we had several people up on stage and it was a large audience. People talked about all the nuances and misunderstandings and difficulties and how do you come to some agreement as to what compatibility can be and does best and does worst? We never came back around on that conversation. And I think in some ways those conversations need to -- at this point they need to I think tie back to the policies that we're talking about in imagine Austin. And I'll talk about that a little bit more in a second. But the more we --

[3:35:28 PM]

>> Kitchen: Could I ask a question? >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Kitchen. >> Kitchen: Thank you. I wanted to go back a minute ago to something you said a minute ago and get your thinking and ideas for this. You had mentioned there was a lot of different folks that need to be reviewing as we come forward. There's the cag, there's the planning commission. There may be other boards and commissions. So I think you talked about there needing to be some mechanism or some approach to how this is coordinated. So I wanted to drill down a little bit and ask what your thoughts were. I know that one of the things that's been real important is how the cag fits into the process because, you know, they are sort of the frontline for awhile in terms of how we connect the public to this process. And so then of course the planning commission has a role to play as this all goes forward. So do you have some thoughts about that relationship there and how the planning commission can be working with the cag? >> I think certainly more conversations between -- okay. First of all, let me say what we currently have. We have a planning commissioner on the cag. Commissioner Zaragosa brings us information at times that makes us more aware. I think there are obviously more things we could be doing besides just having a designated person. I think there could be more done between the groups, the zap chair, other boards, the design commission. Eleanor Mckinney, she and I were talking about this just the other day, having multi-- I'll just say multiboard or multidisciplinary groups come together at a higher level, helping share what's been discussed at different points would benefit each of the bodies. I'm not sure if it would

[3:37:32 PM]

make sense this time around, but I go back to a little bit of commercial design standards. It's my experience of what happened when we tried to pull together a bunch of the code or rewrite the code at once. We were every Friday locked in a back room for several hours and kept tweaking and tweaking. The consensus approach, I'm not saying it's the best approaching but we need to get outside the current model because the current model has us all eye lowed and we know it's not working. So I would say let's get outside of our box. >> Kitchen: I think that would be very helpful for me from a council perspective because the input that y'all provide is central for us as this starts to come to us in the next year. So if -- having it come to us in a way that has had the benefit of you all working together on your thoughts and your recommendations and your ideas, I think that would be very helpful. If there's anything we can do from a council perspective to help set some structure perhaps or guidance or whatever to this process, then perhaps we should talk about that. >> And I think there's a lot of -- a lot of organizations within the city that probably feel like they haven't been heard enough through this process. That they've given input and they don't know where it went. That some of their involvement -- I would strongly recommend organizations that deal with the code or respond to code changes, we need -- the cag is a great place for that, but I think we're going to need something maybe at times a little more robust.

Second item I want to make sure we touched on was the relation -- I did a little bit ago with the mayor's comments, but I think they're critical. It's hard for me at times when I'm reading prescription papers to see the long train of thought between what are

[3:39:32 PM]

our goals in imagine Austin and how ultimately it arrives at that prescription. And we've got in imagine Austin great policies listed of how might we reduce vehicle miles traveled. I think for the public's benefit, for our benefit, we need to see that correlation, this was the goal of imagine Austin and here it is showing up in the prescription paper. And along the way this is how it was part of the code diagnosis so people don't think these are individualized or decisions of the moment only as part of this work product. I think that will help the public truly understand. Three, taking that step forward to the draft code, I think the draft code -- the planning commission thinks the draft code needs to show these links back to the prescription papers and the draft code is going to be potentially written in a way that doesn't make that so easy. And I don't know what it means to staff and consultant, but when the draft code is before us if the public and the boards and commissions and council cannot see how that prescription relates to this section of the code, it's going to make it more difficult for us as people who are not code experts to see, again, the full train of thought of imagine Austin said rewrite the code for these reasons. Here's what's wrong with our code. Here's how we make it better and here's our new code. If we can't clearly see that path, I think it forces everybody to try to become an expert. And maybe that's an unfair challenge for us all. Then I think -- I want to bring to you the fact that we heard from several people as well as at the commission level that they were hoping that there was an opportunity within these prescription papers for input to be reflected. That there would be like a rewrite of the prescription paper when it's done, taking into account everybody's input. We understand that was not the intention of this prescription paper process, but we would

[3:41:32 PM]

hope and anticipate that there is an appendix at the end that everybody can see how -- people need to see that their input did not fall into a black hole. Cag brought that for us this past week as well that people need to see that their input was meaningful. And I think also more importantly it would be great also to see at some point how input moved the needle or the meter within the process. That may be a tough task for the code-writing team or staff, but it's something that would I think benefit the overall trust level of how people participate in our process. And lastly, we know, we've seen that there's been a lot of leadership changes within the codenext team from start to finish, and we also have heard that at the last couple of cag meetings or in recent meetings that the consultant opticos has had an increased presence and that there was a lot of positive feedback of seeing them there. I don't know what all the resources might be necessary to get us from a staff level, from a consultant level, as well as from all of our bodies that are involved with this that we need to make sure that we've got the right leadership level, like the -- that staff has the support they need, consultant with -- if we need the consultant to be there more that we are. Because we're nearing a really important milestone and it's too important to fumble it by not having everything we need in the room. So leadership is so key to bringing these next steps forward to us. So those are our thoughts at this stage, and I'm available for any more questions you have. >> Pool: Mayor? Mr. Oliver, thank you so much for your summary and the presentation. I know -- and councilmember kitchen has stepped away, but she and I, and there were others of my colleagues that joined in this. We were very interested

[3:43:33 PM]

and supportive of having increased presence of opticos. And I know that they're also really busy, but we did put additional money in the budget last year in order to ramp up their ability to come and meet with the citizen advisory group and any other bodies that were able to make the time to meet with them. So I agree. I think the leadership is key and I think the leadership from the consultants we should be seeing as much of that as we possibly can. I agree with you on that. I have a question with you on mapping. It seems to me there's two different kinds of mapping that I'm hearing you talk about. One is geographic and the other is like a crosswalk of here's what we used to have and these were the changes. And you talk about moving the needle and whether you can perceive any change by it. So my thinking is we need both kinds of mapping. We need to see where on maps, literal maps, where changes will be made, but we also need to have the documentation mapped to show how we are changing either priorities or policies through this process in order for people to be able to follow it and know what the past is and where we are heading. Does that track with the kinds of mapping that you're talking about? Have I gotten the essence or have I missed it? >> Yeah. I think there's the mapping from the standpoint of what people understand is their neighborhood plans for the portion of Austin that has that. There's portions that need planning. And if we're doing form based code across the city, if it's only in commercial areas or beyond commercial areas, what is the tool that we use in which to lay that upon the ground? Form-based code isn't something you just scatter. It's something that's thought about intersection by intersection, street by street. It needs that level of

[3:45:35 PM]

discussion. If we do it in such a way that we have been doing this neighborhood planning process, the resources to do that may not be available. So I know staff has looked at alternatives to that. It's something that's probably in the works maybe. I can't speak to it, but we need something that allows it to be done efficiently and obviously input from the public is critical. It shouldn't be bypassed, but a two-year process for each neighborhood is probably -- if we did that in the entire city we couldn't get it done, so what could we get done and how do we want to do it? I think that conversation should happen before we need to map. Otherwise we're already approaching it a little too late. Also mapping needs to be done by complete community standpoint, tying us back to the imagine Austin plan itself where if one neighborhood is five percent affordable to rest of the city, do we have a goal that a neighborhood should be 10 percent affordable? And from a mapping standpoint, what are the tools in which we do to implement those aspects of affordability neighborhood by neighborhood. That is a mapping aspect that I look at a little different because the metrics of the performance of the plan itself should be consistently looked at. And here we are coming up on five years. Do we understand which parts of Austin are now more or less affordable and how much? And from a planning standpoint what should we be doing about that? >> Or can we? >> There are other aspects that we can do, that maybe we have more at our disposal than the affordability discussion, but ultimately many things do come back to affordability. >> Pool: And then as far as mapping documents is that something you have talked about with the staff to track the changes to the document so we can also follow that? >> I can't think of anything specifically, but for mapping

[3:47:38 PM]

documents, one of the things I think has been missing at the planning commission level is our ability to look at change in our area over say a 12 month period of time. It would be great as part of our land use discussions that we're looking at the pace of change and within that space so we understand also the aspect of change. This whole process has talked about discussing with the community the anticipated or

expected level of change that would occur in your part of town. That's a conversation that we haven't had despite all our growth. How much do you expect to change? Not what do you like about today? What do you acknowledge the market will put there even if you kind of don't want it? So no neighborhood is going to operate in a static state. So I think that needs to be somehow -- we have a map of within imagine Austin that shows the blobs of red. Look at all the change that's happened. We need to dial in as to what that means in a more localized area instead of seeing a city that's a big red change map. >> Pool: And hope to scope expectations, which is really important too. And the last thing I wanted to ask you before you were done or before I relinquish the mic is we had some conversations with members of the citizens advisory group about being able to take the comments that had been submitted and make sure they were part of the prescription papers and the report. And so I think we kind of worked through what the expectations were there and I had the idea that there was some agreement that they would indeed be captured and become part of the formal document. I'm not sure that is actually happening, so I would ask you do you have any information on that? Are you satisfied that the comments are being captured and that they will be reflected? I think you have in here something about I think we understand staff

[3:49:38 PM]

won't have the prescription papers before the draft is released in 2017. And that was a topic of conversation that a couple of us had with some of the assistant city managers. >> I mean, staff can certainly weigh in on that. What's been told to us and our understanding is that any comments that are given to them formally like this would be captured in some sort of appendix or some sort of attachment that would come back. >> Pool: Is that a decision that was made at the staff level because that was a conversation we had with acm Edwards that the information that was gathered from the public would somehow have an impact whether it was positive, negative or neutral. That there would be some rating. And again you had mentioned moving the needle a bit. So that people would have the trust and be able to see this was the comment submitted. They did review it and it was deemed doable, not doable or some day kind of thing. >> The only thing we felt certain on is that the comments were going to be collected and organized within a final prescription paper that -- I guess the final prescription paper report all gathered together that would come at the end of it all, but I don't think we have a clear idea yet at the planning commission of how staff or the consultant will come back to our body, to the cag, so anybody else and say here's what we heard on prescription number 1 or this paper and this is what we are tweaking because of it. I don't know that that will happen but I think it would sit well with lots of groups for that to happen. >> Pool: I think it

[3:51:39 PM]

would to and staff is here and people are listening so maybe we can move forward in that direction. I would hope so. Thank you very much. >> Mayor Adler: And I need to understand that better. The original intent, as I understood the prescription papers, was to daylight issues. So that the community would engage in a conversation about those issues. And so that people would see them. So that the decision makers, us and the cag and the planning commission could all be sensitized to those issues. And then having been sensitized and having that conversation, the next thing that happens is people actually start editing in the code and they start looking at how it gets mapped. And I think there was some concern about having a lot of people spend a lot of time on another theoretical document and having debates about the wording in the theoretical document as opposed to the next step being now that we've all been sensitized to this issue and can have that value conversation, how do we apply it? I think the concern was that we would just lose a lot of time in trying to come up with something where the

ultimate answer would always be so how do you -- what does that mean when you apply that? What does that mean? >> Our conversations at the planning commission were very similar to what I'm hearing in those statements. We definitely want resources to be used most efficiently for where we are at in the process. I think as long as during the draft code review that if there is a -- a moment in time or part of the documents themselves that show this part -- we heard during wherever in the development of the code

[3:53:42 PM]

process these things. So we may have started here, but we ended up here. If that's part of how the code is unveiled to us that we can see a little bit in wrapped behind the curtain, I think people will feel really good about seeing how the wheels turned. But if it is here's prescription papers and all of the -- and all the comments from the public just kind of get stapled to the back and here's the code and there's no discussion about what happened in all those -- and how people responded to it. And then there's just a code, it becomes up to us as a community to figure out how we impacted it or did we at all. Was it always going to be exactly as it was written? Those are things we don't know. And the more -- motor that is shown with the resources available, the more people I think will feel like they made a difference or maybe that the rest of the community was not in agreement with them. That maybe they were the loan person who wanted that part of the code to be different. >> Mayor Adler: How do you do that if -- because my understanding is that in the prescription papers the conversation is starting in the community, it's actually been going on in the community, it's happening at the planning commission, and it's happening at the cag, and that whoever it is that's drafting that knows that those conversations are happening. My understanding is that it's being incorporated into the work that they're doing. So I'm not sure what you would compare it to. I would hope that whatever that draft is that comes out in January has been aware of the conversations that have been happening in the community and then to the degree that someone's comment is don't do anything about parking, we need as much parking as we can get. This is a failed experiment to demand, I mean, it would be that person and then the other person that says don't give us any parking and people will

[3:55:43 PM]

figure out how otherwise to travel. When the code comes out it's it going to have want different kinds of tools that can be used in different kinds of places, some that has more parking than others and some with less parking than others. Then the next step, which you point out, where the rubber meets the road, is going to be, well, I mean, I'm fine with you having a thousand different tools or however many tools you need, but when you come into my neighborhood, these are the six that we want you to use, and by god, don't ever use number 7. And that's when you actually -- actually when you have that. So the drafting of the code, which gives us the tools, gives us a way to look at what could conceivably happen to any given property or moment in time. But the fact that it's in the code doesn't mean that they would ever actually be used anywhere, or it may be a tool that gets used lots of places. But we have this vocabulary of words that we can use, and then the question is going to be how do we apply it? And that's where neighborhoods and the community and other people will come in and say that tool is appropriate, no, that tool is not appropriate. And I think everybody's anxious to start getting into that. Show us the universe of tools and then let's start sitting down as you say and let's start applying, make sure we have the resources available to do it. But to go back -- I don't know where in that process we have a, let's rewrite the prescription paper. >> No. And we certainly aren't suggest the prescription papers need to be written in any way. It's some sort of dialogue about these are the major points we

were hearing from the public or from the planning commission or from council about the prescription papers

[3:57:44 PM]

themselves. And there needs to be some sort of dialogue that occurs. I'm not suggesting it needs to be some monumental effort. It could be just a meeting that goes -- someone looks -- someone should be reading all the comments. And when they read all the comments they may be saying, wow, this one showed up 20 times or 100 times. We should probably talk about that. >> Mayor Adler: It could be they say that we had 50 comments, we had 3,000 comments about parking. >> Yeah. >> Mayor Adler: And here's our tools. And each one of these tools has something to be said about parking. And that parking, whatever it is in these tools, whatever that is, relates back to those kinds of conversations. But I'm not sure you'll be able to say, but I changed this one because of those comments. >> It may not be able to. From a zoning standpoint, things that -- like this issue of a context-based decision versus a -- the issue -- one of the things in the mobility presentation was remodels triggering connectivity. So I think there could be a lot of discussion, people saying I was just -- I was going to change that -- change that office into a restaurant or just -- hypothetically. But but I wasn't going to do anything to the building. I've got the parking I need why would I pay for connectivity between these two properties? There's mechanisms that stand in the way sometimes. That's not like a context-based decision, per se, but more is that a tool that -- are we really going to have that tool in the box? Some people might have a strong opinion. Maybe -- I'm not in either camp on this, but are we encouraging people not to do remodels then in the city of Austin because it's one more hurdle of cost on

[3:59:46 PM]

a small infill site from a mom and pop that wanted to spend $50,000, and now they've got $100,000 they're going to spend on the outside. It could be you hear all these developers say, no way, and so where's that conversation about that prescription? >> Mayor Adler: And I don't know how it's actually been in my mind, and everybody's mind is different, which is why this is a good conversation to have. In my mind, it happens really when you do the mapping. There would be a tool to map it one way, one a different way, and they have to figure out given the context of that particular location or property owner or that use, how does it belie. At that point you have one person saying I'd use this tool and another person saying apply this tool. >> I don't know if everything -- I don't know if everything is in the -- if all tools are choices or some dinged there's going to some -- I think there's going to be a lot of things in the code for everybody. >> Mayor Adler: You can sit up here too, if you want to. Let Ms. Pool go first. >> Pool: If I could offer to the mayor, the piece we were trying to get were the comments were not even going to be compiled and attached. And when the citizens advisory group heard about that, they got concerned because we were -- you're right, we need to know what all the comments are in the community so we can have that conversation. But originally, and before the cag members raised the alert, none of those comments were being captured. And you would think that's a fairly basic piece of research that you would -- you would want to gather and hold onto. But we actually lost quite a bit of commentary early on in the process because nobody was recording it or capturing it otherwise. So it was -- it was kind of a big deal, even to get as far as we have to say that we will at

[4:01:47 PM]

least gather up the comments and staple it onto the back in an appendix. I'd like to see more happen with that information, but at least we are now -- >> Mayor Adler: Capturing it. >> Pool: -- Hanging onto

it. >> I'd like to introduce my colleague who did a lot of work on the natural and environment prescription paper to explain how we responded to public comments. >> So because of the natural and about the -- excuse me -- natural and built environment paper was early on, and there were those issues, the natural -- our cag report, which you received last night, that's now in your in box, what we tried to do was capture some of those comments. And what we did was, we recorded what people said at three of our cag meetings and brought them forward. We also had a cag public outreach event in which we summarized and said the different categories of what the public had said, and then also we had -- we have our own individual cag comments of the cag members that decide to respond. So we tried to fill that gap in our cag report. The other reports from the other committees have not come out, working groups, have not come out yet, but we are using at least the same cag comment tool in those reports. There are quite a lot of other organizational letters, memos, whatever, that are coming forward. Some of them -- some of the organizations have gotten the word that if they post them on speakupaustin, they'll at least be documented. If they submit their organization memo or letter. Some organizations have still just submitted them not knowing exactly where they're going. So we -- there was so much of

[4:03:48 PM]

that that we did not put those into our report. I mean, it was -- I'm just saying that's -- that still has not been collated yet, I don't believe. And I do know that that is still outstanding for other prescription papers. Just to follow up on that, though, the cag did request, now that you're in the budget process, the cag did request that a public engagement consultant be hired once again for the codenext process. And if you recall, there was a public engagement consultant. That effort was taken out, you know, from the consultant service. And, you know, kind of left to staff, staff being thin. I think the resources were not there. As a result of what happened with the nbe process, said, please, let's request a council that the public engagement consultant be hired for this draft roll-out, so that we do get the type of documentation that we got in the listening community report where it's assessed. It's not just individual comments, but this many groups, individuals, whatever, said this about that. So that's what we're asking for. We didn't ask for a particular dollar amount. We're hoping that, you know, the research is done on that. But we do know that it's a needed slot in the next -- in the coming year. >> Mayor Adler: Great. Anybody else have anything else on this briefing? >> Can you state your name for the record? >> I'm sorry, Eleanor Mckinney, codenext advisory group. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you so much for helping us. It's late. I would point out to council in case anybody is watching on item number 35, that's the permanent manager process, mark Washington is going to put some backup

[4:05:49 PM]

where he puts out his notes on what he thinks the rfq for the search consultant should contain. He's going to post that on backup. My hope is that on Thursday, we might be able to -- to consider telling him he can go ahead and initiate the rfq process for a search firm that would then later help us develop the elements of the manager and all that kind of stuff. When he posts that, I may also post that on the message board so the councilmembers can see that. The other ones we had talked about, I don't think we will cover right now, that would be the tenet deal and the expedited processing, and we'll cover those later. Okay? Then we stand adjourned. >> Casar: And one last thing before we stand adjourned, I think in talking with the sponsor on the tenant relocation, there's going to be some more amendments to make sure that developers cover more of the cost of some demolitions and such and we'll post those on the message board if they aren't already posted now. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Go for it. >> Mayor Adler: And then we stand adjourned.