

City Council Work Session Transcript – 02/28/2017

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 2/28/2017 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 2/28/2017

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[9:14:49 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: All right. I think we have a quorum, and we do. So I'm going to convene the work session here Tuesday, February 28th, 2017. We are in the boards and commissions room, Austin city hall, 301 west second street. It is 9:14. We have two briefings. We have a couple of matters to be considered in executive session. And then we also have items that have been pulled. And in addition to the initial items that were pulled, we have more items. We have one, two, three, four... 11 items that have been pulled. Obviously a busy morning. Unless there's objection, I would propose that we start with the briefing from Russell Reynolds, out of town person, to talk to us about the city manager's search. When that briefing is done, we go to our pulled items. That we make sure that we break for lunch and executive session because some people are suggesting now that when we postpone executive session people are having to leave because of commitments in the afternoon and that's the one thing you can't catch up on later because you can't go look at a video to see what happened. So I see us pretty much trying to go to a noon stop wherever we are, come back out off session, come back after sexual harassment if we need to and -- after executive session and continue with pulled items if we need to and continue the day with the transportation briefing on the layout of the bond program. Obviously, when we go through the pulled items, this is really the time for us to talk to one another and we should take use of

[9:16:49 AM]

that. Let's see if we can get into the substance of what we can talk about as a group as quickly as we can and on a busy time like today we can all concentrate on trying to make our points quickly or ask our questions quickly. We're going to have to move quickly enough or there will be some things that we may not be able to get to at all. Is that okay? Russell Reynolds and staff talking to us about the city manager search. Thank you for coming and joining us. >> Good morning. Thank you for the confidence you have placed in us. We can assure that you this has our full attention and we will work closely with each member in this room to have a very successful outcome. I would like to turn to my two colleagues to my left and right to introduce themselves to you, Stephanie thomas. >> Morning, I am with Stephanie thomaso with the Russell Reynolds Washington, D.C. Office and I work in our non-profit secretary Andy do the bulk of our work with policy oriented organizations, associations and other entities that often have a tie to municipal government. So we'll be working with Steve and Aaron as a part of this search to make sure we pull have a very diverse slate of candidates because I know that was one of the things that was very important to you all coming into the process. >> Good morning, everyone. My name is Erin. And I'm a research associate with Russell Reynolds in our Houston office. I will be partnering with Steve and Stephanie on this search for a research standpoint and look forward to working with all of you

[9:18:49 AM]

on this search. >> I'd like to start off by addressing three points that were made at city council when you were debating our -- the merits of our firm. The first is diversity stakeholders, and whether we've done a search for a city manager before and how we make sure that you are comfortable that we cover that point. With regards to diversity, member Houston, you had questions as to whether our numbers referred to our international scope or whether there was simply the domestic numbers. Those were our domestic numbers. We do not track diversity in the same way internationally for obvious reasons so those numbers are referred to the U.S. Let me emphasize the fact that diversity is a hallmark of our firm. You will see diversity at every corner of this process and it's something we take very seriously. The second point, and I will now turn to my colleague Stephanie, to address this issue of stakeholder outreach because we recognize, as do you, that it is really critical to our success in understanding the points of view of community and making sure they feel understood. I would like Stephanie to speak to that point. >> Sure. Thanks, Steve. As I mentioned in the introduction of myself, a lot of the work that I do is in the non-profit arena. So that tends to involve organizations that have a far broader set of stakeholders than your typical for-profit organization or business. This can include boards, this can include an organization like the American medical association, for example, that has 400,000 members across the country, all of whom want to feel like their personal interests are being met. This also includes working in academia. You know, a lot of the work that we do with arecolines can be in an environment where the folks across the stakeholder set, again, want to feel that their needs are being met. And the last piece that I had mentioned, and it kind

[9:20:49 AM]

of ties to point 3 that Steve had raised, that while we have not conducted a city manager search before, I personally have been involved in the recruitment of the ce Os of the national league of city and the CEO of the national league of counties. In both those sentences not only heavy engagement with the organizations themselves, but with people in cities and counties across the country. As it relates to how we might envision stakeholder engagement for this particular search, and this is something we'll obviously discuss in a lot more detail today, but the types of things that we often do really span a broad spectrum of activities. One on one in person conversations with folks on the council itself, with other key individuals at various agencies and departments across the city. Town hall style meetings where citizens and engaged community members would be invited to help come participate in sharing their views. And when we do those kinds of meetings, we stick around for awhile afterwards. There's a lot that people may be interested in saying in front of the cameras, in front of the spotlight and in front of their community peers. A lot of times people want to have that one on one engagement and be able to share with us a particular viewpoint that they have. So we do keep ourselves available across the process to hear the input of people in the community. We'll also establish a dedicated email box for this search so that folks can research out to that individually and be able, again, to share their comments either anonymously or in a way that they feel is confidential. One of the things we often do as well is spend a lot of time feeding back to you what we've heard.

[9:22:50 AM]

Nothing directly attributed to any one person, but the vast majority of the folks we spoke with that this town meeting said X, whereas the folks at that meeting said Y and sometimes you will sigh because of the demographics of the city what the types of interests of those groups may have been. Lastly I'd say

that, you know, we would envision doing a very significant outreach, again, to the community, and we'll talk more about what the constitution of the group might look like, but truly making ourselves available in large and small settings to ensure that people can have their voices heard. >> If it's appropriate let us just turn around and ask if there are any questions specific to the outreach process itself? Good. So we have a presentation. It's on the screen and I'm a little new to this in terms of what you are able to see as we go through this, but I'm assuming that you all have access to it. >> Mayor Adler: They do have access to the screen. And by and large if we could hold all our questions while they go through the presentation to the end, I think that that will enable us also to move most quickly through our calendar. So we've handed out extra little stickies so that if somebody has a question and wants to make sure that they don't forget it, they have the opportunity to be able to tag the report and do that. Hold on one second. >> Garza: Could you move the mic closer? >> I'm sorry, of course. Is this better? >> Garza: Yes. >> We're going to focus on two essential parts to this presentation. The first is going to be on a number of questions relating -- that we really want to understand around your interest and your concerns. These are not questions we need answers to right now, but these are questions we will want to have answers to from you as we move into the search process. And the second process we will focus heavily on is the search process itself.

[9:24:50 AM]

We want to make sure that council is comfortable with our recommendations and that we can move forward in an expeditious way. So as I flip forward to what we need to learn about the city of Austin, what we have here are some questions that we will be asking all of you to address individually with us, and let me suggest also just to put a point on a point that Stephanie made a moment ago, is we would like opportunity to meet each one of you individually for whatever period of time that takes in order to really hear from you directly what your aspirations are and the goals that you will set for the new city manager. So these are the questions that we think are relevant to this discussion. Of course we're open to others as well. What is your vision for the city? How does this translate into goals and milestones. And one thing that every candidate will want to know is how will I be judged at the end of five years? What defines success for me as a city manager? This is what we want to hear from you. Opportunities as challenges we can read about them and we have read about them. We were asked about some of them the other day by councilmember pool, but we want to hear again from you exactly what that means from an individual point of view. Competencies. When we talk about the research we do, we define candidates based on core competencies. Competencies are areas like creative thinking, like influence, communications, business acumen. We want to hear from you and we'll get to a table in just a moment what you see as is critical to the success of this individual. We'd like to understand also from you your perception of the staff. We've heard a lot about the staff publicly. We'd like to hear from you as well because obviously this person has a significant management role and this is an area that we want to hear in terms of what makes sense from a skill

[9:26:50 AM]

set point of view. And we talked about outreach and we would like to hear more from you exactly there. We have three rules of engagement, which I think are important to put up there. Confidentiality. These searches are best -- we understand the law, but the more confidential we can be about the process, the more engaged candidates will be. In other words, candidates are gainfully employed, they don't want their names in the press if they can avoid it. They don't want their names discussed outside the confines of an appropriate process. So we do request and we will say this, any people outside this council who are involved in the search, the same request. Secondly is communication. Our iPhone numbers and

emails are up there -- our phone numbers and emails are up there. We don't stop working at 5:00. We do not start working at 8:00. We are really around the clock for better or worse and we would encourage you at all times to reach out for us, emails, phones, whatever works, and vice versa. I think the more communication we have between our team and council, the more effective the process will be. And lastly, candidate it's not surprising to you, but these are all going to be very talented people. How we treat them as candidates will go a long way for influencing them to take the job or not take the job. We want to be on the offense, not the defense. Once a candidate has expressed an interest, we want to make sure even if they're not the selected person that they walk away from the process saying wow, Juan is a great city, I was treated well and respectfully. I want to encourage all of us to think about that. It's very difficult -- once we've lost a candidate in the process because think felt they haven't been cared for properly, it's very difficult to bring them back into the process. Going to page 5 -- excuse me. Let me flip this here. This is something we do routinely with our leadership searches and it's something that again we would like you to think about. It's sort of fun to do it. What we have listed on the left-hand side are

[9:28:51 AM]

the competencies that we typically associate with a leadership role. To the point earlier about city management, non-city management, public versus private, we've adapted this to the role. We don't say it's perfect, but it's closer -- we think it's pretty close. Look at the competencies on your left. I'll read them for the public, strategic and visionary leadership, outstanding relationship build irrelevant. Ability to integrate smoothly and elaborate effectively. Operations and business acumen. Political and intellectual presence, management experience. And finally, passion for the city of Austin. There may be others that we've forgotten and we would encourage you to suggest those if we have. But play with this chart and think about to you what's most important. What's most important to see in this candidate. We're hoping that most of you will be aligned on these balls as you move them to the left or right, but it's very important for us to get a sense from you -- typically we like to put it as what are your top five priorities and what would be on your wish list if you could go beyond those top five? Moving to page 6, we discussed this briefly in our meeting of a couple of weeks ago. We have identified on this chart -- this pie chart, four buckets, if you will, of potential pools of candidates. Starting from the top right corner, private sector. I think that is clearly an area that we will discuss further. Academia and non-profit hospitals. In other words, a large non-profit organization with complexity. Relevant non-profit organizations. And finally, the public sector. I'm going to ask Stephanie just to talk a little bit about the components of the --

[9:30:54 AM]

particularly the bottom three or starting from the bottom right up to the public sector what these look like. >> Sure. So just starting in the academic or non-profit arena, hospitals or otherwise, certainly to the point I was touching on previously. A lot of times when you think about universities or large hospital systems, they can operate as a mini town of sorts, certainly not the size and scale that we're looking at here, but a fairly complex entity. So the folks that have served in president, provost types of roles on the academic site or CEOs of a large hospital system would understand the degree of stakeholder engagement that's necessary, would understand how to manage a large and complex organization, budget, with lots of different functional areas that tie across, would understand some of the infrastructure pieces that could frankly be necessary in a role like this. So individuals who have demonstrated an ability to successfully, creatively, innovatively lead in an area that we could envision mining for talent. Relevant other non-profit organizations, I think that that's also a type of pool where

you could potentially see someone coming from. Frankly, I think it would need to be a very rather large environment like an American red cross or something along those lines that truly has an exceptional management challenge that could be necessary for someone to try to tackle. But again, you see someone who is dealing with lots of different stakeholders, different funding environments, needs to in some ways advocate for the interests of the organization to push things forward, which could be important. And lastly, on the public sector, certainly folks that come from

[9:32:55 AM]

other city management types of roles could make sense, but I think you could also look more broadly at state and national government roles. Folks that have come out of a presidential administration or who have worked at senior levels in state government and understand some of the transportation and infrastructure issues you're facing, educational challenges, health care challenges, et cetera. And those who had operated at the very highest levels, secretary level, deputy secretary, et cetera, would have had that significant management interface as well. >> Finally, just touching on the private sector quadrant, we consider this to be the smallest of the budget. We don't want to overlook it. I think it's been addressed here in the past that there will be individuals who have demonstrated passion for the non-profit and public sector, who have experienced a career heretofore in the private sector, but do have the -- not just the management skills, but also the cultural adaptability to a position such as this. We believe that if they do exist in this role that they will previously have a connection to Austin or else it just becomes more and more challenging to think of the transition from a different city, different environment into an environment such as this. So now I would like to move into the search structure itself. This is a document on page -- not the page you see in front of you, which was forwarded to us by yourselves and we thank you for this, but if you go directly to page 9 I think what we really want to suggest -- and please take these as nothing but suggestions. It is looking at how to structure a search committee. Before we even get into the details of this page

[9:34:55 AM]

and the three of us have worked on literally hundreds of searches together so we have seen in many cases the dynamics of a good search committee versus a less effective search committee. You always end up with the same result. The question is how was the journey? We would suggest there is an optimum ties for a search committee both viewed from a candidate perspective, but also the functioning of the committee itself. Typically we like to see committees such as this in the range of six to seven committee members. If you get much smaller you won't have the diversity of views. If you get much larger the opportunity for each committee member to interact with the candidate becomes that much smaller and shorter just given the number of questions that will be asked around the table. The second concern is one of purely logistics. It's hard for me to organize my own calendar. It's harder to do six and it's really hard to do 11. So please bear that in mind. In terms of the actual organization of a search committee, we like to see a search committee with a chairman, a vice-chairman, and the search consultants will be in the room at all times during the interviews. Typically a first interview will take anywhere from an hour and 15 minutes to an hour and a half, allowing time for questions from the candidate, which means that you do really want to make sure that each question is very well thought through and certainly orchestrated such that each candidate receives the same questions and the process is equal all the way through the process. We have on page 9 two options for your for your consideration, and please consider these just options to consider on your part. One is to do a large committee with as many members as you have

[9:36:58 AM]

around this table either enterprised of ourselves or delegates of yourself or a smaller category. Under the advantages of option 1, which is a larger councilmember, obviously there are more points of view. And it will be a more inclusive process at that point. I think I've outlined some of the disadvantages there. On the other side with a smaller committee they will be exposed to fewer people and most importantly this group would have to come to a consensus on a smaller group of potential interviewers on this process. Again we will talk it about this in a few minutes. I do believe that it is -- you should consider appointing members to the search committee as opposed to having yourselves on the frontline. The idea would be to have this committee recommend three candidates for you to visit with in an extended period of time. So non-committee members -- non-councilmembers as committee members, followed about I this committee interviewing the three finalist candidates. And finally, the last slide for today is the search process itself. Very important that we follow this rigorously. We always do. We have three categories or I should say three sections in this. The first will be the period at which Stephanie was describing in some detail, is the outreach, getting the feedback, building the job description, making sure that everyone's views in the community are known to us, known to you and incorporated in the process. From that point we begin to target a market and we begin to screen prospective candidates. This whole process we hope to accomplish in about six weeks. It's very heavy lifting. It involves a lot of logistics to get the meetings set up. We don't limit ourselves to that six-week period, but we would like to keep it to that if we can. The following 10 weeks

[9:38:58 AM]

are really where you are involved or your representatives are involved in interviewing candidates. We will talk about the interviews with you. These will be people we will have met, interviewed, assessed and scored based on the competencies that we have all agreed upon. The committee will meet. Typically we like the committee to meet in a single day to visit with as many as four or five candidates. This will tip click take several days because getting everyone commission for the aligned on the same day is typically a challenge. We will work closely with the committee to script the questions so each member of the committee understands the role that they will play in the session. That's very, very important because we want to ensure a consistency throughout the process. At the end of our first round of interviews, we will have one of two options and we can take -- we can discuss this today. We can go to a second round of interviews can our candidates before they are presented to council or we can present them directly to council. A second round -- the question is why would you have a second round? Typically what we like to do in a second round is make it very different than the first. If you think of the first being a series of questions about their core competencies, in our second round of interviews we like to present them with effectively a business case. The business case will look like what they might do in a business school setting on what they would do in a problem facing Austin. Councilmember pool you asked me a couple of questions like that and we would ask them on a much more sophisticated, detailed level, please respond to this, because we want to see their critical thinking. I can assure you that we have seen in more cases than not where the role is reversed. Your top ranked individual drops because someone else has shown better critical thinking at the moment. After that second round we will present to a R you a group of finalists, two or three,

[9:40:58 AM]

hopefully three candidate that you will consider for the position and then we will go through a similar process with you interviewing the candidate. We will do extensive referencing and we encourage you to

be part of the referencing process. Background checks. We do an extensive amount of what we call Google checks, which is to really make sure are there any stories out there that we need to know about. And that is incredibly important as you might imagine. We will work with you to the extent you want us to on salary negotiations, although typically in our city searches we find that the city handles that. So that is the process. We would like to get it done by summer. Because it is a typically good time to move people in their lives because of families and what have you, it tends to be a better time for them to move. So that's sort of where the process ends. And we hope that would meet your calendar. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you very much for the presentation. I have two quick questions I would like for you to speak to. The first one is that you -- when the mayor pro tem and I posted on the board a conceptual framework, which I think you have included generally in the city of Austin elements of engagement and proposed structure, I have two questions about that because they were questions that we raised and has also been raised in conversation on the dais. The first goes to the group to which this is being entrusted, that group. We laid out the possibility that each one of us would nominate one person and there would be 11 people on that group. We also talked at the time about seeing before we did that if collectively we could agree on six or seven

[9:42:59 AM]

people without regard to each one of us having someone to see, to go through that exercise to at the if we could achieve the voices and diversity in the room we would want to have. So I would like your advice or thoughts on whether that would be important or not important or whether we should try to go through that exercise. Then second thing is we also laid out on what we presented two places for public engagement in this process, one of them being upfront where the community was real involved in helping to set kind of the expectations for what we wanted to have in a city manager, those kinds of things. And then also an engagement at the end of the process to vet three finalists before the council would make a choice. There have been some people in the community as well as voices on this dais that have asked the question of whether or not we should do that. Insofar as how that might impact or not impact the applicant pool that we would have. I guess the alternative would be to vet it publicly the final three or the council makes a decision from the final three or four, whatever the final pool is. This is a community that has by custom and practice laid out several names for the community to vet. But given those other voices I want you to speak to those things. >> Sure. On the first point,, it's a little -- it's an excellent question and I don't think there's a right or a wrong answer. If we were to provide

[9:44:59 AM]

guidance, though, my belief and best practice would be let's come up with those five or six low hanging fruit ideas that are known to the community, perhaps viewed across the community as individuals that kind of can carry everyone's interests forward and are going to represent diverse interests. I think that would be very well received by the community to make sure people that here are some people who are truly representative of Austin and can carry the interests. Then you develop the rest of the constitution of the committee through appointments, nominations from this group. I think the challenge in that situation -- and I'd put it back to you all is how do you determine who gets to make those additional nominations. >> Mayor Adler: Do you want additional nominees? >> Not necessarily, no. >> Mayor Adler: My question is do you want a group of six or seven or a group of 11? >> No. We would much prefer a group of six or seven who would be viewed by all of your external constituents as being able to represent the interests. >> And to point to the number -- the other point is it's not just a number. What are we want to make sure is that the collective group works together. If one of you were to designate one person and you each designate a green person, you have 11 green persons on that committee.

What you really want to think about is how does the collective group work to make sure that the full interests of the city and this council are represented? And when I say green I didn't mean it politically speaking. We want diversity on the committee, but we also want a little bit of people with different skill sets who can really probe in their areas of expertise. So as one example, business acumen. Business acumen is in there where some people feel more comfortable probing than others. We want to make sure that there is someone on the committee who has that expertise. Councilmember? >> Kitchen: My

[9:47:00 AM]

preference is for the 11 and I absolutely a thousand percent agree with what you're suggesting. It needs to be a group that works together, it needs to be a group that represents different kinds of expertise as you gave an example. An 11 member committee actually gives you more diversity. And the fact that we're all involved in that does not mean that we can't as a group make sure that we've got the diversity of who we're bringing forward. I think this is something we can all commit to do that together and I don't think that that necessitates a six-member group. We're 11. We can work together. It's not too many. I understand what you're saying. I just any that six is pretty small for a community of this size. So that would be my preference. >> Mayor Adler: I don't know if we want to have a conversation about that now? >> Pool: My question falls along in this train. These meetings will be open, correct, follow the Texas open meetings act, so you will -- what is your concept of how the meetings would be conducted? >> The candidate interviews? >> Pool: No, the discussions -- no? Everything else like the discussions on what are the criteria, when the group meets it's open and posted and -- okay. So when that -- when we have that situation, quorum is an issue because you can't take any action without a quorum, and the larger group actually sends us to provide more opportunities for people who are pretty busy in this city to come to more of the meetings than fewer. And I also prefer to be able to select someone who would represent my district in a larger construct of the city knowing that the person I would pick, and I think my colleagues would be doing this also, how that person --

[9:49:01 AM]

what skill set does that person bring to the table? >> So may I make a comment on the 11 for a moment, if that's the direction that we head. It's absolutely reasonable and it's not so unwieldy of a group that we couldn't handle it. I think the point comes, councilmember pool, to your point. While it's more people it provides more opportunity. It can also be difficult to try to align the calendars of 11 people while moving the search process forward in -- as expeditious a manner as possible. So our request in these kinds of situations, something we work with all the time, is that we ensure that those disinterested designees and nominees are fully aware of the time commitment that is being asked of them and that's something we can work to flesh out to say there are going to be X number of meetings that will be two hours in duration, one set of first round interviews that will require two full days of your time out of your job or children or whatever the case might be. So I think as long as those parameters are set upfront it's manageable because the other piece from the candidate side, if you have an 11-person search committee and five of them show up to a meeting, it doesn't say a lot to the candidate about the engagement of the city. So that's a concern as well. >> Pool: Certainly, that's reasonable. I would expect as we develop the timeline and when the meetings are -- the time and place for them, that that would be provided to whomever it is that we're looking at appointing. And it's not at all unreasonable, what you're saying. And when we put people on boards and commissions at the city, they are well aware of the time commitment in advance and then -- so that is part of their decision about whether to serve. >> So to answer the second question, mayor, the at what point to engage the community is the question. Do we engage them in the

[9:51:02 AM]

early part of the process? And I think that's a given, the answer is absolutely yes. Again, we will suggest that once their views are taken into account and you have a fully representative body here in this room, plus those who will be on the search committee, there may be some small outreach elements at the end of the process, but to open up the candidate pool to the entire community we believe puts the process at risk of candidates not wanting to go through a public vetting after they've been screened on this level. So our recommendation would be to do the homework upfront. Make sure the community knows that we take their views very seriously and that you've been entrusted as members of council to represent their views and that you're taking your fiduciary role very seriously. That would be our suggestion. >> And something that helps you be successful in making the community feel good about that at the end of the process is that you've put a document together up front that says we solicited everyone's opinions. This is what we're looking for. The candidate needs to have these five skill sets on the "Must have" list. These two or three are the nice to have. So when the two, three candidates are brought forward to council, we can very clearly map this person is what you told us you were looking for as opposed to everything having been conducted in a complete black box and all of a sudden three theoretical candidates pop out and nobody knows why we like them. >> At the end of the day with bringing the community in at the beginning, our goal is to align expectations around with what we're looking for in the new city manager and what this individual needs to bring to the table. Once they've that write up it gives us a map of where to target and where to go from there, but also understanding what the community and values at the same time in each of your respective districts and areas. >> Mayor Adler: Could you speak to whether or

[9:53:03 AM]

not the public should be involved in the vetting of the final three candidates? >> Whether the public should be involved in the vetting of the final three candidates. Again, our preference would be this be the body that vets the final three candidates. We can open it, but it does -- candidates are going to ask the question how public is the process? And there will be candidates who will subject themselves to a public hearing and all that goes with it and there will be those that will drop out of the process because of that. So there is a trade-off there. Our preference would be, again, to get the public vetting of the job description. The other problem is this: They will know -- they will not have the same context that you will have at the point where they are meeting the candidates. They will see a snapshot, but will not -- will not have seen the bigger picture. We can do it both ways, but that's our preference. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Garza, Ms. Alter. >> Garza: You mentioned that you hoped to meet with each council office. I would hope that's -- I would think that's a must. >> We plan to. Oh, absolutely. From our point of view it's absolutely a must. >> Garza: Because when we are -- we met with over person -- >> Oh, no. >> Garza: I wanted to make sure that went wasn't a maybe. >> That only related to your time availability. We would like to meet with each person here and each person you would like for us to meet with in addition to yourself. >> Garza: If that is a given I can save a bunch of what I have to say for that one on one. I had concerns about a firm that had no experience with hiring a city manager. And when I hear statements -- but I'm willing to see how it all works out, obviously, but when I hear statements like we think the community would be happy with six people, that already

[9:55:03 AM]

gives me pause because the community would not be happy with just six people. And with regards to just scheduling, we schedule meetings all the time, not only the 11 of us who this is a full-time job, that's one thing, but we also have boards and commissions who people who have full-time jobs that are more than 11 people. I really hope we go in the direction of 11. And just one other quick concern. On the slide that gives the competencies, I'm very open to the idea of going into other sectors that aren't necessarily public sector. Maybe there is some great person that works in the private sector that would do a great job, but I think something this that oooh has to be in here is some strong understanding of our charter and of the strong manager form of government that we have because that is really important part of this job is knowing the limitations of management and policy. I think it's important that they have worked in that environment because it's very complex environment and so that definitely has to be on here. And I guess I didn't see -- maybe it's a given, but there needs to be some recognition of diversity and recognizing that we are economically segregated city, and a lot of people in this community want to make sure that we have a diverse pool to pick from. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Alter. >> Alter: So as you say earlier in this presentation, this is one of the most important decisions that we're going to be making as a council. I'm really excited about the opportunity to get a

[9:57:03 AM]

world class person in here to help our city to grow in a responsible way and to maintain the quality of life and expand it for everyone within our community. And I'm very excited to have you on board as our partner in this process. I agree with the general direction that you're going where we do not make everything open to the public in terms of the three candidates that come out. My experience with searches has been in the academic environment and even sort of vicariously through searches that you have run or that other firms of your caliber have run. And I know that in the academic situation when you're choosing a chancellor or choosing a president you have a lot of politics involved, you have a lot of input and processes that go into that that while not equivalent to what we experience, are similar. I know in those occasions -- and this was the case when president fenves was chosen, there was an opportunity for some of -- at the later stage for a few of the candidates to be viewed by some groups that were beyond the search committee where they were able to provide their opinion on the different candidates in an advisory capacity. They were asked to key confidential the names of the candidates. And I don't know how many of those groups actually met because it was a secret process. But there might be an opportunity to do something similar in this case for an expanded group of stakeholders when we get to a certain stage. And I don't know exactly what point in the stage -- in the process that would be most appropriate, but if we could get people who are willing to do it under the circumstances of keeping it confidential, we may be able to have the benefit of the advice of that group and their impressions on the candidates in addition to the search committee that's actually doing

[9:59:03 AM]

the whittling down to the three. So I'd love to hear your thoughts on how that might work. >> Mayor, if I could butt in for one second. I want to make sure we would work with the firm to make sure that we would comply with all the open meetings act and the public engagement requirements during the search. >> There are laws that I believe apply to academia, but again we want to make sure that you understand from our point of view that we want this to be an inclusive process from beginning to end. To the extent that we can do that in a way that meets the legal requirements, we would fully support that. I don't think we need to decide who those groups are now -- >> Alter: I just meant that the way that it's being presented as if nobody knows except for the search committee who those three candidates are until those three candidates come before council, and what I'm wondering is if it's possible to widen

that circle, but not make it so public that it undermines our ability to attract the candidates so that they would have an opportunity under some sort of personnel exception kind of rule. And admittedly I may be treading on the wrong ground with open meetings, but my intention is to be able to preserve our ability to hire the best possible person, but also see if there's a way to expand that process. And I believe UT is and I believe UT is subject to open meetings as well. >> I'll need to refer to the city attorney. >> We'll be happy to work through all those issues. This will be a very transparent process. This is Austin, but we will work to provide as much coverage as we can, as you all direct us. And in accordance with the law. >> Pool: Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. Ms. Pool, then Ms. Houston. >> Pool: I just, based on what my colleague, councilmember

[10:01:05 AM]

alter is talking about, I would actually like for the council to be in the circle of knowledge, who all the candidates are. I don't want us to be excluded. Whatever information is given, if we do have a citizen commission to be the intersection working with you and candidates and recruitment for the vetting, I think we also need to be part of that assist. >> That would be our attention, absolutely. Everything that's sent to the committee will be sent to this group as well. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston? >> Houston: [Off mic] >> Tovo: I was just going to suggest -- multi-family, I suggest -- first of all, I really appreciate your help and advice. We're all experts in city of Austin, not necessarily conducting a search. I appreciate this is what you do, and that we will, I think, take your -- take your advice seriously and take it to heart so we end up with the best candidate possible. But with that said, it sounds like there -- I don't know -- if there's an interest, council, in moving forward with an 11-person search panel, it might be helpful for you to provide us with a list of qualities that you would seek to have in that group, so that we're not each appointing someone -- each appointing a person that has expertise in the same area, but not in other areas, so that we can have that cohesive -- so that we all maintain our kind of ability to appoint someone we think would best represent the city and our district, et cetera, in the search, but also have the skill set that you mentioned as being important in the cohesive group. >> We will do that. >> Troxclair: And then maybe between us, we can kind of say, well, I have someone in mind who meets this criteria and this criteria so we make sure there's no gaps. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston?

[10:03:05 AM]

>> Houston: Thank you. And thank you all so much for all of this information and the presentation. When we hired a police chief the last time eight years ago I think now -- and this is different; I understand the differences, but there was, at the end of that process, an opportunity for the public to meet the three final candidates at palmer auditorium. And I'm not sure how that conversation -- I mean, I was there, I remember it, and people -- each one came in and said something. People asked questions. I don't know how, then, the council made the decision to choose that last -- chief Acevedo. But just saying we've done that at a pretty high profile level, I understand city manager may be different, but it has happened before. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar. >> Casar: I'm interested in speaking with you all and with other folks about that seemingly important decision about whether the very final list is public or not. How much time or when would you -- it seems to me the candidates would want to know that up front, so how much time would we have as a group to be able to, you know, mull over this and speak with you all to start coming to that kind of a decision? Because, obviously, I take seriously that we want to get this done in a timely manner, so I don't want to slow that down, but at the same time, I don't want to make that decision, you know, today knowing that that's a decision -- >> When we begin -- thank you for the question. When we begin to talk to candidates, that's when we want to be able to tell them what the process will look like. So take a couple weeks. We've got a couple weeks of homework to

do here, outreach, meeting with councilmembers and so forth, so that gives us -- hopefully that gives you enough time to come to that decision. >> Casar: I appreciate that, and I appreciate y'all taking our honest calls and concerns about both ends of that situation.

[10:05:06 AM]

Thanks for your recommendation. I'll take that seriously. >> Mayor Adler: So if you're looking for that direction in two weeks, do we want to have the opportunity for each of the councilmembers to be able to visit with you over this two-week period of time so that they can engage in conversations to inform that decision if we have to make it in two weeks? >> I'm kind of asking, if we're going to do it in two weeks, if you can get with everybody -- >> We will get with everybody. >> -- In that short period. Period of time. I think that would be helpful. >> We will work with everyone the next two weeks. Does that work for you, sir? >> Mayor Adler: Yeah. I'm just thinking, there are a couple big decisions that we have to make. If the threshold of this -- we can probably identify those and identify them, and part of it is you advising us -- >> Right. >> Mayor Adler: -- These are the threshold decisions we need you to make. In fact, a note from you that sets those out would be really helpful, where you came to us and said, we really want the council to give us instruction on these two elements, or eight elements, or whatever it is. So that we know what your expectations are. And then to be able to get your counsel and advice on what you think we should do, and then the council then would be able to meet and then decide, or ask further questions or something. >> Right. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem? >> Tovo: That's very helpful. I'd like to get a very -- a little bit even clearer sense of what the next steps are and when we would be taking them. Our next council meeting is the 23rd. Are we contemplating having -- having some items, some action items on the council agenda that would make decisions of this sort? And let me just mention that in the next two weeks is also spring break, and so that's -- you know, will certainly be a scheduling challenge for some

[10:07:07 AM]

was. >> Mayor Adler: My sense is, looking at their schedule and what they've said, I can see us putting it on the agenda. >> Tovo: For the 23rd. >> Mayor Adler: For the 23rd, with the understanding that if we're not ready to do it, we would just pull it off the agenda. And part of it is -- I don't know what the two questions or eight questions would be, or how controversial they would be, or whether you're actually going to have the opportunity, with spring break as the mayor pro tem mentioned, whether you're actually going to be able to visit with everybody. But my preference would be for you to be able to visit with everybody before we have that conversation so that they can get to know you and visit about those, as well as the larger context questions they might have. Does that work? >> Tovo: It does. I just want to get clear on, at that point, what we see those decisions -- what we see those questions that we would be deciding on, being, on the 23rd. One would be whether or not to have a committee, and if so, what size? Is that one of the questions before us? >> Correct. >> Tovo: What the role of that group would be? Whether they're just conducting community engagement, or whether they're interviewing candidates and providing some more formal guidance? What are some of the other decisions? >> The involvement of the public at the end of the search process, whether or not, you know, there's a public hearing with the presentation of the three, or two -- three candidates at the end. That's major decision as well. >> Tovo: Right. And that's something you said you need to know at the outset -- >> Again, putting yourself in the shoes of the candidates -- >> Sure, I got it. >> They'd like to have some clarity on what their public exposure is going to be in the process. >> Tovo: So those are three decisions that would require kind of affirmative action on the part of council, is that what we're thinking? To provide them with that direction, we would like to have a formal vote on the 23rd with regard to those issues?

>> Mayor Adler: I think to take action on those items. >> Tovo: I just want to -- thank you. That's helpful to know what each of us should be thinking about

[10:09:08 AM]

in these next weeks. I appreciate my colleagues' comments with regard to particular, you know, kinds of candidates, and, you know, I'm certainly going to be open to the candidates who might come forward from the private sec for --private sector or academia or private organizations, but I hope we would get some strong candidates coming forward from the public sector. Working within the city environment is really very, very different from working in private industry, even working in academia, and I have worked within academia. It is a very different animal, as councilmember Garza said. We are governed by a charter. They would really need to understand what that means on a day-to-day -- you know, on a day-to-day basis, in terms of their interactions with council and with the other staff. And while I certainly think that's within the learn abilities of people operating at level of people who would come forward for that position, I think there's a real value in having done it before. So I'm reminded of -- I think we've had some examples of individuals who have come from private industry and served in high level positions within the city, and it was -- and there were some challenges within that. It is very different serving as a city as within private industry. And the rules that govern behavior and our accountability to the public is really quite different. So, again, I would put in a plea that we see some very strong candidates come forward from the public sector as well. >> Mayor pro tem, that is absolutely our intention. You will see very strong candidates. We just want to make sure that you have a range of candidates, great candidates from which to select a person. And our point of view is not at all contrary to what you just said. >> Mayor? I was just going to say, there's degrees to the public hearing, and I understand why somebody would not want to participate in that.

[10:11:08 AM]

But there's -- I think there's a middle ground that we should all consider, and that's where it's just an introduction of the candidate, and not necessarily a Q and a process, and that might be a little bit more palatable to two candidates. So if you can also provide some options. >> Sure. >> Garza: You could do no, you could do this you could do this you could do a full-on Q and a. The last thing was, we keep talking about three finalists. Is that the decision, or that's just a recommendation? Okay. So it could be five finalists. >> That's just a suggestion. It's certainly not a recommendation. >> Garza: Okay. >> It's certainly not a decision. >> Garza: Was part of this action that we'll be taking possibly in two weeks -- because of concerns about where the candidates are coming from -- I guess when I heard three, I'm concerned about, you know, one candidate from the public sector, one candidate from the private, and one candidate from academia, and I would have -- so that's not what the goal is. >> Huh-uh. No. The three best -- and if it's three, the, set your number, best candidates that have been, you know, nominated to move forward by the search committee that this group would select. >> Garza: And I guess when we say best, that's open to interpretation as far as -- I wonder if we can give some direction, when we're giving direction in two weeks, to say that for me, there's a preference -- I lean heavier towards public sector candidates, so if there's five and -- you know, anyway, I think you understand what -- >> Ms. Garza, that's exactly why we want to sit down with you individually and hear those concerns. As far as the role of this committee, this will be your decision as well. What we have seen work best is where this committee, however we define the committee, will interview the candidates, the larger number, and will make a recommendation without a specific number -- now, you can instruct the committee to say we would like to see no fewer than three, and keep looking till you have three great candidates, but

[10:13:09 AM]

our recommendation would be that this committee do some heavy lifting and sort through the candidates and recommend to you a number that you will find sufficiently broad, of people for you to see. Typically, we see these committees as being advisory committees. They're not fiduciary committees, they're not making a decision, they're simply recommending to the council a number of candidates. But there's nothing sacred. Three -- the last public search I did, there were five, but with -- these are our top three, and these are the next two, and the mayor chose to mix that number up, but he saw five profiles before he ultimately selected one. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Alter? >> Alter: The search has taken a long time at this point. I'm very excited that we have a search firm here. And in the interest of kind of moving the ball along so that on the 23rd we're able to actually keep on schedule, I'm not sure if I heard any of councilmembers who was advocating for the six or seven-member committee. So if I'm right in what I'm hearing on that, I know that you would prefer a smaller one, but I didn't get a sense that anyone had that as their preference. If we could, you know, move along under that presumption, and we could get from you the list of the kind of people that would make up that committee so that we can begin to identify the people that we might want to appoint, and we could even be -- you know, having some discussions on the message board or doing something so that on the 23rd, we may be able to put forward our slate of nominees because I'm guessing, given how everything else works in the city, that we're going to have to vote on the slate of nominees, and that could just keep delaying the process. And I'm not sure that who we choose for our eleven is dependent on how public we make the search at the end of the process, which seems to be a

[10:15:11 AM]

decision that still needs to be made. And there was a request, I think, from councilmember troxclair, which I would agree with, to get those criteria from you. And I know there are groups in the city who have lists of people that they think might be good, to be on this committee, and if anyone wants them to share that with you, let me know, and I can ask them to be in touch with you. I have not vetted that list. I just know people in the community are anxious for us to get moving, and they're willing to help us to move this process along. >> Mayor Adler: By way of check marks I think I had raised that issue, both orally from the dais and I think in one of the postings that I had put on it, because I had heard that a smaller group would be better. And the first thing that I thought about was just among us, just picking four of us or five of us to do that. We don't do that well. The alternative then was to have a committee where we each did one. But I did suggest that we at least take a stab at collectively coming up with that list. And it could be that we sit down where everybody brings in nominees that we want to have, and we sit down in this group to make sure that we have each of the different views and make sure that we have diversity rather than people just appointing, the way we've done boards and commissions, but actually having us do it collectively. And if we could do it collectively and we found that we could do it -- and there were six or seven people, that seems to be -- I like that choice better than having 11 people that are divided in half, just because -- I mean, I don't know how that one feels. I read that here. So -- but if I'm the only one who feels that way, we don't -- we could move past that real fast. But I see us -- for me in my mind, I was coming with names, each of us coming with multiple names, and then collectively trying to fill it out and then seeing if it's 11, fine, recognizing that at the end of

[10:17:11 AM]

the day, the security that everybody has is the fall-back position, is, everybody gets to appoint whoever they want, and we have 11 people to appoint without with regard to anything else. That's the fall-back position, but it seems to me that's what it should be. >> I'm just wondering how that plays out, if we have to do everything in an open meeting. I mean, if we could have that discussion in executive session and come to that agreement, then I think that is a conversation we can have. I'm a little bit uncomfortable doing that. I mean I don't mean to go against open meeting, I just don't think it's fair to the people that we would be asking to serve in this capacity, to have that kind of conversation. And I don't -- you know, being a Newby, I don't know the limits of that. >> Mayor Adler: That's a good point. >> Alter: I see the advantage of what you're talking about. >> Mayor Adler: Let's ask the question. So if we're talking about filling what is, in essence, a personnel decision, is that a conversation that can happen in closed session? Talk about individual people relative to other individual people? >> With the personnel executive session, you can talk about individuals, but not about process. So this is sort of a new situation because it's not one of your typical boards and commissions. So let me just check into it. But if you come -- if you're actually going to come and talk about particular people, then I think we might be able to meet that exception. But I'll be sure and figure that out. >> Mayor Adler: I think that Ms. Houston was next, then Ms. Kitchen, and then you guys raise your hands. >> Houston: Thank you. Because we have three meetings, three council meetings or three days a week, once we come back in April, my preference is to try to get to meet during spring break. Because when we get back, we've got three weeks of three days a week of council meetings. And so that's going to limit people's availability very -- it would impact my availability. So anytime this next week or the

[10:19:12 AM]

week after, I'm fine. I have no children. The other thing that I said earlier, and I'm going to restate, is that I don't want to delegate looking at the finalists to anybody but me, because the people elected me to do that, and we have enough -- we have things leaked from executive session all the time. I don't know where -- how it gets leaked, but it does get leaked. So when we have citizens in that process, even though they raise their hands and swear that they're not going to divulge any of the candidates, that will happen. So I'm uncomfortable with giving that responsibility to a citizens group. I think the other things you have outlined here are great. Go and find out what the community thinks about what a new city manager -- the qualifications they should have. But then after that, then that's just keeping up with engaging in the community and where we are in the process, so that they feel connected to the process. I just wanted to make my position clear. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Kitchen? >> Kitchen: Just a couple of points and then a quick question. I like the idea of having a conversation so we can come up as a group, as a group conversation, and come up with this citizens group. I do not have any -- a preference for the smaller group. I want to make that clear. I have a preference for 11. And I think that we can come up with that, and I've done a lot, a lot of work with groups, and I think 11 is a very doable number. So I just want to make that clear. But I think it would be useful to have the conversation to make sure that we've got a diverse group. The second thing is, I would like to see some recommendation about how we can involve the pickup. I'm certainly sensitive to the kind of concerns about, you know, a setting that would really limit our -- limit our choices. So maybe something along the

[10:21:15 AM]

line of -- that councilmember Garza recommended. I'd like you guys to come back and give us a range of options. >> Uh-huh. >> Kitchen: Because I think in this community, just saying there's no opportunity for the public at all to have some back and forth -- or at least have some setting, is going to be difficult. So I'd like to hear that. And then last is just a question on the -- under client candidate interviews, there's a

reference to an rra psychometrics and assessment interview. Could you explain that a little bit more? >> Yes. So we -- and I do want to come back to the first question -- >> Kitchen: Okay. >> -- Just to make sure I understand it as well. Couple of days okay. >> As to the psychometric testing, we regularly are asked by our clients to do psychometric testing of the one or two or three finalist candidates. >> Kitchen: Uh-huh. >> In addition to the interviewing we've been discussing over the last hour or so, the process involves three tests, all personality-based tests, which are then reviewed by an independent industrial psychologist to give you a further vetting of the individual. So this is in addition to the Normal interviewing and referencing, and it's something that we are seeing more and more, and we would be very happy to provide you with additional information along those lines. >> Kitchen: What instrument do you use? Is this a proprietary instrument, or are you using something that's in the public domain? >> Public domain. >> Kitchen: Which instrument is it? >> Opq is one of the three. >> The hogan. >> Kitchen: What's the other one? >> The hogan leadership assessment. And what is the third one called? >> I can't name the third one, but these are standard personality tests. >> Kitchen: The reason I'm asking, and you can provide that information later -- >> Sure. >> Kitchen: -- Is to what extent to these tests -- I mean -- to what extent are these tests asking in relationship to the criteria we're looking for? In other words, what kind of --

[10:23:16 AM]

what are they looking for? I mean, obviously, there's standard leadership -- you know, there's standard leadership skills and those sort of things, but there's also specific things that we're looking for. So I'm just curious about the test and the degree to which -- you know, tests have -- tests can have bias built into them. And so I'm just -- and that's not a bad thing, necessarily, as long as we understand what it is. >> Yeah. >> Kitchen: And that's why I would want -- you don't have to provide the answer right now, but I would want further information about what these tests are looking for, or -- you understand what I'm saying. >> Sure. Absolutely. >> Kitchen: What's the criteria built into the test so we can just understand it. Personally, I think it's an interesting idea, I kind of like the idea, but I would want to understand what we're -- you know, what we're actually testing. >> And one of the challenging things, just to be very clear, is that the tests may come out with a different result than this group will come out with. >> Kitchen: Well, and that's why I want to understand what the test is testing for. >> We'll provide you full information on all the tests. >> Kitchen: If we know at the outside it is a different orientation than what we're looking for, there's no reason to put someone through that. >> Understood. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> May I come back to your earlier, councilmember kitchen? Regarding engaging the public. >> Kitchen: Uh-huh. >> Your question was specific to the end of the process. >> Kitchen: That's right. >> Not the beginning of the process. >> Kitchen: Yes. The end of the process. >> Thank you. >> Kitchen: Uh-huh. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar -- I'm sorry, wait a minute. Did you have something? Mr. Casar. >> Casar: So to address councilmember alter's question and points, I do think that in a public session, it is difficult for us to sort of collaborate on names and to cut names, but I would be -- just to sort of answer your question on my own end, I think it's good for us to come back in person, that's what I'm more used to, but if we have the opportunity when legal comes back, for us to discuss that in executive session, we might -- I would be open to being

[10:25:18 AM]

pleasantly surprised that we all bring -- that we bring 11 names, all of us brings 11 names and a couple of folks bring the same name and there's a way it works out. If we have an opportunity to discuss in executive session because it's a personnel matter, I wouldn't want to shut the door saying, we're going to do 11 before we even have that talk. So just to put my opinion out there on that. And then I did want

to ask one question, which is, I understand -- which we'll be making a decision maybe in a couple weeks around whether or not the finalist or finalists is public at the end of the process, the reason that those finalists would be nervous about being in public, would it be the actual setting that they're in, the kind of -- of Q and a or the kind of meet and greet or that thing, or is it just the idea that their names would be public and they're employed as the -- >> It's the latter. Right. It's the fact that they're fully engaged, fully employed where they are, and the view that they're looking for another position or open to another position is [indiscernible] >> Casar: So generally it has less to do with how we do it and more just do we do it or not, if we do it, then their current employer -- you know, be they the city manager of somewhere else, they might be seen in the public as, oh, that city manager is ditching us to be city manager of Austin. >> But there is a compromise where you bring together a small group of citizens at the end of the process to expand the pool, versus a large forum, which is what I heard about a moment ago, regarding the your police chief search. So I think there are options that are -- will be more palatable to candidates because of the size and the nature of the meetings, versus a larger, more open -- >> Casar: That's helpful. So there is a range, but really the trigger point for what could eliminate candidates is whether

[10:27:18 AM]

we could -- >> There's a range subject to the open records law. >> Casar: Okay. Thank you. >> Flannigan: I think just photo, I'm always open to be pleasantly surprised by the legal department, so keep that on your list, for all matters. But I do want to reiterate a lot of my colleagues' comments about 11. I think that's what we're set up to do. It makes the most sense to go that way. And I do think, though, there's an opportunity when consultants come back with the types of qualifications that make up a good member of the search team or a public team, or we could have a conversation about thinking through in your communities and your districts, you know, who you think might be willing and able to serve at this capacity, and knowing what their -- what qualifications they meet. I'm just sitting here thinking of two or three people in district 6 that might be willing to do it, and I go, oh, they've got some business experience and private sector experience, but I don't really have folks that are public sector experience. I'm sure that might be something that's useful. I can find someone who can do these two or three things. We may still be able to have a conversation about making up 11 that meets these qualifications, just talking about the qualifications. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston. >> Houston: And then councilmember troxclair has her light on. I'm smiling because I remember trying to come up with search firms, and how that went. So this is going to be interesting, coming up with 11 people to serve on this very important committee. And I wasn't here at the time, but I do remember that when we had our last city manager, there were two candidates, and there was a public process. So somebody at H.R. Could help figure out, help you all figure out how that was handled, but there were two candidates and there was a public process in that, open to the broader community, not just a small

[10:29:19 AM]

select group of people. >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> So I just want to respond to your question about potentially coming up with a list of a smaller group of people that we can all agree on, and I'm happy to participate in that, and if it doesn't work out, then we can did understand we can all go appoint people individually. And I just wanted to suggest another idea for the public or private -- the question of whether or not the finalists are public. I don't know if you have done this before, but it may be possible that we don't make their names public, but we provide them with a questionnaire or something where their responses are all public. But, you know, how do you handle the situation? What do you think you're strongest skills are? Whatever the most relevant questions are that the public would want to

know about that person's skill set and experience, and so they can be anonymous and you can have candidate a, B, and C, but have a -- have detailed responses to a specific set of questions where the public could give their feedback. I really like what this person had to say about diversity or inclusivity or whatever it is, so you could get public feedback without protecting their privacy. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any further discussion for the search firm? If you would get us back a list of questions you think we have to decide, if you could talk to everybody, we'll put it on the agenda for the 23rd to see if we're able to move it forward then. Thank you very much. >> Thank you for your time. >> Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's go then to the pulled list that we have. And, again, it's 10:30. Let's see how quickly we can get through these pulled items.

[10:31:22 AM]

The first one pulled is item number 32. Pulled by pool and troxclair. This is the Austin affordability action plan item. Ms. Pool or Ms. Troxclair? You guys pulled it. Someone want to lead off? >> Troxclair: Sure. I pulled this just because I wanted -- of course I posted the language of the affordability action plan on the message board last week, but this was the first time for us to have a public discussion as a group about it, so I just wanted to, I guess, probably briefly lay it out, then get anybody's feedback, and of course hear the questions from councilmember pool. So the purpose of the affordability action plan, I think, just in a nutshell, is to have some kind of roadmap for -- for the community and the council to point to when we're asked the very important question of what are we doing to address affordability in the city? I know it's something that we all still hear a lot about, and, you know, it's -- the struggle with that word "Affordability," is that it encompasses so much. Although this is not a completely inclusive list of everything that can ever be done to address the cost of living, it is intended as -- as, yeah, laying out five particular areas that the council does have either direct control or a specific control over, to give us some kind of shorter -- short-term and long-term targets. And there is a coalition of several community leaders and community organizations that are excited about us really taking this issue up and focusing on

[10:33:22 AM]

it. And I just want to thank, in particular, the co-sponsors who have really stepped up and provided so much input and feedback and helped -- helped the group to come up with a document that I'm really excited about. So if you haven't had a chance to read it yet, I would hope that you get a chance before Thursday and I would invite everybody to a press conference on Thursday morning at 9:00 A.M. Where we're going to hear fill from residents and business owners, and one -- groups that are concerned about health -- public health services and other things that are encompassed in our resolution. So I invite you to join us, and would leave it to, I guess, each of the co-sponsors also to add any input that they want to into this conversation. I know the mayor was really critical in coming up with some points on an economic development and how we worked to make sure that our programs are meeting the needs of the community and that we're providing jobs in places that might not have benefited from academic incentives in the past. We brought in the Austin independent business alliance where -- for some language to make sure that we're focusing on our small and locally owned businesses. I worked with councilmember kitchen to come up with some language about transportation and made sure that we -- because that's such a critical aspect to affordability, make sure that we're maintaining our focus on that aspect. And councilmember Flannigan had some really great input on budgeting issues and department reviews and how we can improve our process going forward.

[10:35:22 AM]

I thank councilmember Houston for her cooperation, as well, of how we can -- what we can do to make sure that parts of the city that have historically not been included in processes are included in our decisions going forward. And I just want to underscore that a lot of the things that are included in this resolution are already underway, and it's a combination of things that are already underway and some things that we want to -- we want to focus on in the future. I thought it was important to put everything together, so, again, we kind of had a roadmap or a document to point when we're -- when we're asked about affordability. And I'll touch on the budgeting section just really quickly because I know that might be a question for a lot of the councilmembers to see that effective tax rate and wonder what the impact would possibly Ben city services. I just want to underscore we carefully worded this section to make sure the city manager had the option of providing us with a budget at the effective tax rate. Of course, she has the ability, as the city manager, to provide the budget that she most -- most strongly recommends, but I think that myself as well as community members and co-sponsors, had an interest in seeing kind of what that -- what the barebones base model looked like, in order to give us more flexibility to then prioritize funding from there, rather than starting at the top and potentially working down, but starting with a base budget, and then seeing -- well, you know, we think that we need to add more in this area, or it's really critical that we have the money to do this. So I, of course, don't have any intention of -- I don't think that this council is one that would be looking to adopt a budget at the effective tax

[10:37:24 AM]

rate, but it's just a model to see -- to give us more flexibility within the range between the effective tax rate and the role roll back rate to make sure we can focus on the areas that we think are most important. So thank you for allowing me to lay that out, and I look forward to councilmember pool's questions. >> Pool: Thanks, mayor. Well, I do have a lot of questions, and probably we don't have enough time today to air them all out, given all the other items that we have on our list today. My staff and I will now good back and match the work that we had already done to see where the changes are. I know that one of the metrics that was in part 1a on housing supply, which in the document that was on the message board, has us agreeing to adopting Austin's strategic housing plan with goals to approve construction of at least 13,500 housing units per year through the year 2025. And I know that that is based, too, in some goals that the mayor has articulated. I really want to understand why -- where the numbers are coming from. We don't have good research on how many units are actually put on the ground, and there's a gap between what we approve and then what gets built. So we need to dig through that so that if we are tying ourselves to a specific number -- and I notice that that number has been taken out of exhibit "A" that's in the backup. But if we are going to align ourselves with some specific metrics, and put timelines on them, we are setting ourselves up for either making decisions at the last minute in order to meet a metric that has been established, or we have one of those report cards, like the mayoral meter, that says half done or incomplete or failed or passed, that sort of thing.

[10:39:24 AM]

And I want to make sure that in my mind, I'm completely comfortable with whatever those may be. So I did go through the -- again, it was -- there was the document that was attached to the message board, and found that most of the affordable document comes from a document that the Austin greater -- the greater Austin chamber of commerce passed out to us, I think it was in January, so I haven't had sufficient time, really, to go through their document to make sure that the initiatives that they are proposing align with what, in my mind, I think are necessary either in district 7 or the entire city. We also have some elements of the mayor's economic incentives resolution in here. We have some of the

housing plan draft in here. The ongoing Zucker reports are mentioned in here. Community workforce master plan is in here. And then, of course, existing efforts and existing council priorities. So part of my - part of the work that I'm doing on this is to determine what do we already have underway, and where are we with that. The regional affordability task force that councilmember Garza is chairing is doing some significant work in this area, and I would like to see -- I think there was a report that was issued, and I'd really like to talk about that. And there are initiatives that the mayor pro tem has been working on for a number of years, and I would like to see what she has to say about those initiatives and how this speaks to them. I'm a little bit old school in that if one of my colleagues has been working on an initiative, or is working on initiatives, I would like that person to have

[10:41:25 AM]

the ability to lead, to continue to lead on that initiative and have the credit for having achieved it. So as far as an affordability document, this is something we've been talking about -- well, we talked about it when we all first campaigned in 2014, and so this is a document that the entire council should be digging into and being credited with. And I think we have many strands of this already either underway or already proposed, so that's just kind of a high level of the questions that I have. And I'm happy to give the floor to some other of my colleagues. >> Mayor Adler: Just real fast with respect to the housing goals, not a number that I originated, and it was, I think, a draft report from the housing group, so I was just looking at the -- at that -- >> Pool: Well, I remember in '14 when we were -- >> Mayor Adler: No, I wasn't using that, it came from mayo and some of the housing works people. That's the draft, coming out -- >> Tovo: Mr. Mayor, I'll have to go back. I thought it originated a couple of years ago in the real estate council's report, but I'll have to line up those documents. >> Pool: And I think the point that I want to get to -- >> Mayor Adler: What I've used then, it's been with reference to the draft report, and we'll give copies of that to everybody. >> Pool: And the point I wanted to hit on with that, whatever the number is -- and clearly, we have some concerns with having specific numbers, so again, I'm flat it was taken out of exhibit "A" in the backup. We also don't have a way to measure that with any clarity. We don't -- there's not a measure between what we approve in our council meetings on zoning cases, what gets put on the ground, and then how those change over time. And so I think we need to look at that as well, if we're going to have any kind of success and

[10:43:25 AM]

sort of measure where we're going on putting housing on the ground. >> Kitchen: Mr. Mayor, could I just quickly speak to the housing? I agree with what councilmember pool is saying that we're going to have -- the council is going to have a long discussion about the strategic housing plan when it comes to us, and councilmember Renteria may remember -- I know it's coming -- and you may also, councilmember -- it's coming to us in the spring. So that's the appropriate time to discuss the metrics. I think it is going to be important to adopt metrics at that time, you know, understanding the concerns that councilmember pool is raising. But it's premature to do it in this document. So I am very comfortable with the language as it is now, which -- you know, which speaks to adopting the strategic housing plan. But I don't -- I didn't want to short-circuit any of that process that's going to come later, because it's going to be a pretty detailed conversation, and we're really going to have to, you know, all understand what metrics we're wanting to work towards. So that's why I asked that that particular language be taken out, and I think it has been, so ... >> Alter: Can I -- just so we're talking about the same document, because my document that I have from item 32 from the city, has the number 13,500 in it, so I'm just -- >> Kitchen: The backup should not. >> Unfortunately, there was just a mixup with the agenda office and what we submitted on Friday wasn't the copy that got posted. So there should be an

exhibit "A" that is either uploaded -- that I believe is uploaded now, and that does not -- so, yes, the version that all of the co-sponsors agree to have that number taken out, and that was the one that I intended to post. So I apologize for any confusion. >> The document that's not the rate -- >> Troxclair: That is the biggest -- I believe there may be some small wording edits, but that was the -- that's the main

[10:45:27 AM]

change from what was posted and what is in the backup. So -- and just because, again, to be responsive to the concerns from councilmember kitchen that were just echoed by councilmember pool, I didn't want that to be -- I really -- I want this -- I mean, unfortunately, as y'all all know, the struggle with the open meetings act, although it serves a really important purpose, is that we can't all give input to the same document at the same time. But I do really think that it's important that this is the council's document, and that each person get -- gives at some input into this. And I want to underscore that this is by no means an all inclusive list, and there are so many priorities that each person on this council has taken on in order to address affordability, these were just kind of the five areas that I was hoping that we could find consensus around. You know, it doesn't include things like the homeland exemption that, of course, I would happily advocate for because -- because I didn't -- I wanted this to be kind of a unanimous council document. And I do want to specifically thank councilmember Garza for the work that she has led on the regional ability committee. In my mind, the master strategic plan that the regional affordability committee has put together -- hopefully this will be a complement to that. If you look on part 3 where it says collaborate with other taxing entities, we specifically called out and said, you know, make these -- focus on these things consistent with the regional affordability master strategic plan. And one of the benefits of the organization that councilmember Garza put together is that so many of these things are dependent on other taxing entities in order to make a difference in the overall tax burden. And the plan that that group has been working on, which I'm so

[10:47:29 AM]

glad to be a part of, is a lot more -- is a lot more far-reaching. I mean, we've talked about food access issues. We've talked about health care. We've talked about a lot of other things that go into -- go into total cost of living. This is, in my opinion, a much more narrow document that's like here's the -- here's a few areas that the city council can directly control, and hopefully these things will work in collaboration with what I see as the larger -- the larger document within the regional affordability strategic plan, so ... >> Tovo: Mayor, there are other questions, but since we're talking about versions, I just need to clarify which version we're talking about. I've got one timed 8:30 from yesterday, one timed 3:00 P.M. From yesterday. There was one on the message board. There was one in the backup. And of course there was the chamber of commerce's, which is very similar. So I just want to be sure we're all working from -- are we working from the 8:30 version from last night? Is that the most recent? None of them were blue-lined so it's a little hard to track the changes. >> Troxclair: If the 8:30 version from last night has that number in the housing section removed, that is the correct document. >> Tovo: Okay. Thank you. >> Troxclair: And again, that was really the only substantial change between -- between last week and this week. >> And I have a quick question. >> Again, I would just like to clarify. I pulled the backup and it still has the number in there. I just want to make sure if we're going to be asked to vote on this, that I'm working if the right document. >> Troxclair: I see Katy in the audience. Can you just not your head that the correct document will be uploaded as soon as possible? And I'm happy to distribute it. In the meantime, again, I don't know how the mixup occurred. I hate for us to spend time talking about the potential concerns with that number, when, again, what we meant to put out

[10:49:30 AM]

there and what the co-sponsors agreed to -- I don't think that councilmember kitchen would have lended her support to this issue without -- without that number being removed. So I committed to her that it would not be. So I apologized again for the confusion, and if you're working from an old document, really the only change is the removal of that number. >> To move on with the confusion of the documents, I have far greater concerns than just that bit of it, the number, or what document that we're working on. You know, this is a really big, heavy lift, and I appreciate councilmember troxclair trying to make that lift, but I feel that this is filled, and I'm just going to speak to a couple of them. This is filled with things we either are already doing, in my opinion, can't be done, or shouldn't be done. And so there's -- I can tell you now, for me, it unfortunately would not be a unanimous vote because I cannot support this. And so I'm just going to speak to, you know, a couple of things. Really, with regards to it's extremely prescriptive, and we often hear about people's concerns about our policy, how prescriptive it is. The codenext -- and again, I'm assuming this is similar to what the current document is -- that codenext will be implemented by April 2018. That is -- we cannot make that decision right now. There's so much in the process that can happen between now and then that I don't think it's safe or good for us to make some kind of commitment like that. I appreciate the shout-outs for the regional affordability committee because I think we have done a lot of great work on that, and we are limited to what real policy we can implement at that level, but we -- it's been a great opportunity to have good conversations that -- that I hope -- that I know we can continue to have. A big, big concern is presenting

[10:51:30 AM]

a budget at the effective tax rate. And there was mention about stockholders, and I'm really surprised when I hear that one voice signed in as a supporter for this document that says a budget will be presented at the effective tax rate. Because we have cost drivers in this city. And I understand the goal is just to present it there, and then there's wiggle room for council to do whatever we want. But if we were to have to start adding at that point, that puts us in a much tougher, political position, when we're adding to a presented budget, we would already -- if we were to [indiscernible] Close to the effective tax rate, being jobs and services. So to say that we're going to support something that opens up economic development and brings jobs, I can't support something that says we're going to bring jobs. But we're maybe going to support something that cuts jobs for our own city workers and cuts services for our own city workers. And the priority -- prioritized health and human services contracts, that has been a policy of this council since -- I don't know when the first resolution was, but it was for us to continue to raise our budget for health and human services, and it has happened. I'm very appreciative we were able to support a huge increase our first year in office to help in health and human services because that has been a priority of mine, and thank you to all those that supported that, but we cannot prioritize -- you can't say we support an effective tax rate budget and we need to prioritize health and human services. You can't say those two things. So I, myself, will not be -- oh, the affordability and accessible transportation portion of it requests that capmetro consider the financial impact for implementation of free fares for seniors and disabled residents. That sounds great. We have considered that. We have considered the fiscal impact of that. Ensure capital metro provides

[10:53:30 AM]

accessible bus service to all parts of Austin. We just went through this huge connections 2025, and of course that's something that we want, but we can't -- we can't, you know, make another agency do something or -- you know, especially for us that sit on capmetro. So I will not be able to support this. I

don't think it alliance with some of the priorities that we already have in place, and I a lot of our Progressive priorities. >> Casar: Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. Mr. Casar, then Mr. Mann. >> Casar: For me, there are certainly ideas in here I support, and then ideas I need to have time to think about if I support, not ideas I don't support. Frankly, some of the ideas, as councilmember Garza laid out, are big enough of their own that they should be their own resolutions for consideration, instead of being able to do this all on Thursday. So, for example, whether or not we should commit as -- I like the calendar of having codenext up in a, but whether or not we should commit and make it council policy that that's when we're going to get it done, that seems to me to be its own conversation, apart from the other 15 things on the list. Having an expedited site plan program, I've had meetings with staff about that, and maybe the sponsors can let me know if they've had some of those meetings, but it's an extremely complicated process, with lots of requirements for staff resources and thought, because it's much more complicated in a site plan than permitting phase. That seems to be its own resolution and own conversation we need to have, not wrapped up into the rest, because there's a lot of catholics to be had about that point. I'm supportive of a goal of 10,000 Travis county residents who are disadvantaged getting middle scale jobs. I don't know if that number should be higher or lower because we haven't been presented with that community workforce master plan to pass yet, and so if that's going to be coming to us in the future, di preemptively, dealing with it in

[10:55:32 AM]

this resolution bundled up with all the other decisions seems really challenging to me. I don't want to rehash sort of what the decision -- the points that councilmember Garza has already made about budgets being presented without any fee increases or budget increases. It's an interesting conversation to have and I'd be willing to have with our staff and with the council. And that probably would merit its own separate conversation, because that's a big deal. That changes the way that we do one of our only jobs that we absolutely have to do, which is pass a budget. On partnering with UT to study the impacts of students on housing, I think that would have to be a very carefully worded own deal within itself because we have an ordinance that protects students as a protected class that can't be discriminated against in housing. So I would really want to understand that beyond just one sentence to make sure we are very clear that we are taking a comprehensive lube look in a way that's not contradict electricity with our ordinances. I think for me, while I am interested in many of the components in this, the economic development policy, we have a resolution coming up on the council agenda that lays out what changes they are that we're initiating. I would be comfortable if some of these things were brought as their own -- especially the heavy lifts -- as their own items with co-sponsors that we could really discuss what significant changes we are making, rather than sometimes, you know, these things being sort of bundled together in a way that it's difficult to untangle the different pieces. Sometimes if they're all related, if there was three policy changes we're making based on transportation, and it's a comprehensive package and we can discuss those three components, that makes sense. But here, I think that if we're talking about an expedited site plan program and the way we do the budget, and sort of preemptively making commitments on the housing plan before we pass it, and preemptively making commitments on a community workforce initiative before we pass it, and there's been months and months of work, it just seems to me that I would like some of these big parts to come together -- to come before the

[10:57:33 AM]

council as separate resolutions with co-sponsors and a little bit more of the action plan and rationale flushed out. So my recommendation will be that we -- that we table -- that we table this on Thursday

and ask for some of those things to come back as resolutions. S. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan. >> Flannigan: A couple of things that -- I have a different perspective. I look at understanding what a budget looks like at the effective tax rate as an easier political question, to say that we know what it costs to maintain the city the way it is, and we're going to provide more, is an easier political conversation than for everything to be presented in a budget, and we're going to say we're removing -- removing things. So I kind of have a different perspective on that. >> That's not an effective tax rate, though. >> Flannigan: Well, that's my perspective. Also, I think the necessity of putting all of these into a single resolution is how you get groups who otherwise disagree to come together. And I understand that breaking it up will allow us to flush things out, and that is exactly how this will ultimately be implemented. Because none of the things in this resolution are actionable on the ordinance level, just like any other resolution that we put together. So one by one, these things do come back, and then we will flush them out. But I think it's important to acknowledge that they fit together. Otherwise, we get into situations where one -- something that may look easy gets done, then the thing that is hard doesn't get done, even though the community that came together, came together because they thought that one was good and worth doing both. So my perspective is that you do do this all at once, because it is what shows the community that you're thinking about all the pieces at the same time. Even though one by one, they will come back for

[10:59:33 AM]

implementation, just as the music omnibus is going to come back one by one for implementation. That's already started to happen. We did have a long conversation about extending the timing on red river, and even though that was likely a component of an omnibus resolution. So I think it's -- it's in that frame that I look at it. And incident that there's going -- and I understand that it feels a little rushed, and I have felt that at times as well, but given that the content of this resolution is not passing an ordinance, there's always plenty of time to flush out those details, just like we do anything else. And so that's just why I worked with councilmember troxclair so hard on this. I think the effective tax rate question -- you know, councilmember troxclair and I may have supported that for different reasons, but there are certainly people in the community that believe in effective tax rate budget is the seen one they don't know the hard choices that come with that, which is why I'm interested in seeing it so that the community can say, oh, an effective tax rate budget means you have to cut police budget, the libraries, whatever it is that that looks like. I think that's a necessary conversation that have with the community. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: So let me start by saying as a general approach I agree with councilmember Casar. If there's a will to move these forward I would only support an effort that separates them into different resolutions. I'm not going to support this as is lumping them all together. And I also just want to add that I completely agree with my colleagues, councilmember Garza,

[11:01:33 AM]

councilmember Casar and councilmember pool. The most significant concerns I have deal with a section of budgeting. It takes hours upon hours upon hours for the city manager to present a budget. We always have the flexibility of asking or identifying cuts that take us back to the effective rate. But I want a budget that reflects the real needs. And there are elements in extreme contribution in -- contradiction in this document. I think there are elements in here that would work against the ability to increase health and human services contracts. There are other cost drivers that not only -- not only cost drivers, but other elements in here, for example, ensuring a turnaround time of 15 days. Well, that requires an investment of significant additional city resources that would not have them available in other areas. These are not -- let me just say as a big picture, this started out a chamber of commerce document that

they did in collaboration with other organizations. I think for that purpose it makes complete sense for organizations who are aligned and finding compromises to sign on to a document. And I appreciate and respect the process they went through. I think it's a valuable document for us to review and discuss with them any other community stakeholders who participated. But it does not seem at all -- from my perspective it is a very different action for the council to say we are endorsing this affordability agenda for all the reasons that have been specified. And let me just hit on a couple of things that were we to take this up on Thursday as it is, I have many questions about all of these areas, including the what happens have already been raised, where we're bypassing a public process that's already ongoing. A couple others I mentioned. The fair housing concern, councilmember Casar has mentioned.

[11:03:33 AM]

Let me just take one example. The city should embrace a variety of tools available to incentivize affordable housing development, including developing a policy to utilize city-owned property in order to meet these do goals. We have policies to do that. We have had policies -- we have had goals of doing that longer than any of us have served on council. They've probably been in planning documents for 15 or 20 years. And I -- I have to just say that it is of concern -- councilmember pool addressed this point, but it is of concern to me when we bring resolutions that sounds like we're initiating new action because then we hear from the community haven't you passed similar resolutions before? Last fall we took the action of asking -- it wasn't an unprecedented action. The previous council did similar things, but we directed our staff to come back this spring with three specific tracts of publicly owned land where we could craft different kinds of housing. They're in the process of doing that. They just got a memo saying it will be a little delayed, but it will come forward this spring. We've asked our staff to develop a specific proposal with aid. So this -- I guess just to underscore what councilmember Garza said, the elements I agree with in this document are already underway and don't need a resolution to move them forward. Again, it's great if our outside partners want to endorse those. I'm happy to have their support, but we shouldn't be in -- we shouldn't be endorsing something we long ago endorsed and set on its path to fruition or implementation. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Garza -- >> Tovo: I still had the mic. I think I too am going to go through and see what we've -- collaborating with other taxing entities, again we've been doing that a long time.

[11:05:34 AM]

I see former mayor pro tem Cole here and she actually convened -- began convening just such a collaboration back when she chaired audit and finance. That was a good idea, it's continued. And I guess that's my comments for now. I like the suggestion of councilmember Casar said of where there are new elements and there are some elements surrounding how we would propose our budgeting I think those would come forward as separate resolutions for us as a council to discuss and deliberate on and hear public comment on. >> Garza: I just think it's really important -- like I said, this is a big lift and there are some terms in here and it's important we're all understanding what those terms mean and are all on the same page. For those of us who have gone through a budget process, we know that we are presented with the effective tax rate and even if we're not we have ability to ask and that is asked every single time. It's asked what kind of budget would we have with the effective tax rate and it is very clear when that point is made that we would have to cut services and possibly cut staff. So I want to make it clear that effective tax rate is not providing the same services, it's the same tax revenue and there are cost drivers in the city that are mainly labor. So if we have an effective tax rate and we push for that we're basically saying nobody gets a raise and we can't honor our labor contracts. And nothing else changes. And there are additional cost drivers. So an effective tax rate is not keeping everything the same and

everybody -- it's keeping the same revenue. And as a growing city, I see that as a quite impossible thing to do. So as we're having these discussions I hope we all understand the things that -- the terms and the position that we put ourselves in. >> Mayor Adler: Okay.

[11:07:37 AM]

I'm going to address it real quick if I can get in line here as well. I think that as I saw this, as it was coming from the offices that were working on it it, it was an opportunity to collect in one place many of the initiatives that are happening in the city of Austin to speak to affordability. And it gives people the opportunity to be able to go to one place to be able to see all the different things that this council, prior councils, future councils are doing. And some people ask so what are you doing on affordability and I don't have a real good place to send them to. So I saw a real value in what was happening here as earmarking. I didn't see it as taking credit away from people that were working on things or trying to do that or slow down or impede the work that anybody was doing. I thought there was value in having it in one place. And it was good to see. I do want to correct or just to suggest, mayor pro tem, you referred to this as the chamber's agenda and that's not my perception of that. >> Tovo: I said it began as a chamber of commerce document. >> Mayor Adler: But a lot of the things that were on this were in documents that I floated, among other people have floated going back two or three years in an affordability agenda. And certainly organizations like the chamber or different social service stakeholder groups have all weighed in on that issue. By the way, in the same thing, the housing goal of 135,000 that you had indicated that you had thought was a reca goal, I never heard them give us that number, but in

[11:09:37 AM]

any event, the number that I used, when I used 135, is on page 16 of the draft, and we posted this, by the way, on to the message board for people to see. It's the Austin strategic housing plan from the neighborhood housing and community development. It's on the city of Austin website. My understanding is that that's probably gone to the showing committee here with the council twice. I think it's also gone to the planning commission subcommittee on this work. It may have gone to the community development commission as well. To source that number, I just wanted to lay that up. >> Tovo: Mayor, if I could quickly respond. The reason I made the comments I did is because as one of my colleagues said, the chamber of commerce has created an affordability agenda. I'm reading it from their website. They've partnered with businesses and social service organizations to create an affordability action plan to advocate -- that was -- the document before us bears a great similarity to the affordability action plan that the chamber of commerce developed in partnership with other community organizations. That is absolutely a true statement and that was -- >> No, no. >> Tovo: If I gave another impression, let me clarify it. That was the impression I was trying to make is it was in partnership with the chamber of commerce and other organizations. I think it's a great -- I think it was a great effort for them to come together and see where they agreed and where they could find common consensus. It's quite a different matter for the city council to endorse the same document. And there are challenges in us doing so, especially when we're -- when some of the languages were going to initiate a policy on X where we've already gone

[11:11:38 AM]

well beyond initiating policies on X. It just -- it is a document that works well for their purpose. It works less well for ours. That was the point I was trying to make. I haven't lined up the four different versions we have in front of us to see where -- but there is quite a bit of correspondence and it is accurate that it

started with them. >> Mayor Adler: If I misspoke, certainly the chamber has weighed in, other groups have weighed in, but I wouldn't think it was fair to say it began with them because there are documents that predate their document that speak to that lay out most of these items as well. So to the degree you're saying the chamber has also been involved in this as long as those other groups, I agree with that 100%. To suggest that this was initiated by them, I know there were other people, myself included, and other people on the dais who spoke to these agenda items long before that consortium item started with their affordability version. So it was begin with word that I was taking issue with. Ms. Pool? >> Pool: I think the begin with language, the reason why those of us who are making that statement are using it is because if you go to that document that they have posted, some of the language in this councilmember tovo, the language is same or very similar. The housing and affordability is from page one of their document and then on the back we have from page 2. So my staff went through and sourced the language pretty directly, mostly because it sounded really familiar to me and I had had a presentation from the chamber. A delegation came and talked to me and some of it sounded like I had heard it before. Whether they came up entirely themselves or

[11:13:39 AM]

whether it was something growing in community I think it's a different question and sure, these are issues we've been talking about for a long time, but the language itself is drawn expressly from the documents that I had mentioned. I have one other document I would like to comment on the housing supply piece. I am supportive of councilmember Casar's suggestion and others have weighed in on this too that we break this up into separate resolutions so we can take each of the resolutions up separately, which I think it will be a lot more helpful to the community because we can dig into them individually other than having an omnibus. I think some of it works. The music omnibus worked because it was specifically about music. This was much broader. This touches on many if not all of the strands that we deal with from the dais. But the piece that I want to talk about right now, the legislature is in session. The legislature is working on a number of preemption bills. There is a bill currently about linkage fee. Linkage fee is one tool we've been talking about. We haven't adopted it because we're not sure how to make that happen, but it's a concept we've been talking about for the last year if not longer. There have been papers written about it and we've kicked it around informally and somewhat formal. And certainly during the campaign, many of us, myself specifically, talked about the value of linkage fee or whatever you want to call it, could bring into putting money into a housing trust fund for use by the city. That linkage fee is being attacked right now up at the legislature. It one of the preemption pieces. I would hope that everybody on this dais would be actively working to oppose that bill. To make sure that municipalities, home rule cities have the ability to enact the legislation we need in order to be nimble and effective in our governance authorities and responsibilities.

[11:15:42 AM]

I don't think that's actually the case. I don't know that the dais is actually entirely 100% backing our agenda. I wish that weren't the case. But I would like to see -- so if we're going to include pieces like that in this and advocate for them, then that advocacy should align up at the state capitol as well. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar. Everybody thinks their first and everybody has been raising their hands. Mr. Casar. >> Casar: So if we wanted to put together a place for all of the work that the council and the community are doing, then I would be supportive of a resolution that says city manager, let's put up a website and a place to list all of the affordability work that is currently being done and some of this is being done. My objection is in part to the significant portions that are new work, many of which had significant concerns with and putting us through Thursday, having me and many of us trying to do our job of trying to go

through avenue each of the sections as if it's six different effective classifies, passing the community workforce plan, that sounds like its own public hearing that we'll probably have in the future. The strategic housing man is coming from the planning commission and probably a whole hearing we'll have ourselves. Presenting the -- and I recognize entirely that we aren't passing an ordinance and I hear that agreement, but it is putting our staff to work and all of our utilities to put together a budget without increased fees. It's putting our staff to work to put together the budget in a particular way. It's prioritizing all of that work in the way that we have to balance and that's why we try not to overwhelm the staff with too much work. We try to prioritize the work that we think is important. And just for the expedited site plan idea, I had a meeting with staff on that. It took them over a week to get all the different

[11:17:42 AM]

people together to have that meeting with me to discuss how complicated and hard it is. I would ask if any of the sponsors have met with the staff to discuss kicking off and prioritizing an expedited plan process that's like the site plan process because it's a lot of work for our staff. In the world of things that we are prioritizing our staff's time with, I don't know if that was one for me. If that's one of the 30 things that we have to deliberate on Thursday, it's just like getting 12 different ifcs and a bunch of different areas. So instead of going through all these each things, I would prefer that we table it and the ones that the group finds most important as far as new work for that to be brought as a resolution and as far as recognizing existing work, mayor, I think it's important for the community to be able to see one place and I think that that would be helpful but that's separate separate from this because it's very specifically, and that's fine. It creates new initiatives and new work. And in some ways changes some policies and in others kicks off initiation of other policies that takes up staff time. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Alter, then Ms. Houston. >> Alter: Thank you, mayor. I think I might stand somewhere in the middle on this resolution. I want to thank the sponsors for their work moving things along in presenting an affordability agenda. I want to say that I think it's positive and that we should welcome the fact that we have organizations, including the chamber, including one voice who say so deeply about our city that they're willing to put time and resources in helping us to solve our challenges and our problems and how to take advantage of our opportunities. I think the fact they've collaborated on an agenda of any time of this is evidence that we need to be presenting a coherent approach and there is an appetite for

[11:19:43 AM]

that. And I come from the academic world and from the academic world plagiarism is a sin. In policy world it is not. So I think we -- I think it's good that we're building on things that we already have. I really appreciate councilmember Flannigan's Nancy it is our inability to combine initiatives so that we address multiple dimensions so we can define the win-win solutions that's really ham-stringing this council. So we have to find ways so that we are working together to get the wins that we all need and we have somehow created a system in part because of the quorum rules, in part because of all these things, that does not allow us to do the log-rolling that is the hallmark of successful legislative bodies. And we have to find a way to do that. I'm not sure this resolution does that because everything has to come back as your own separate ordinance and I'm struggling with trying to understand how it is that we do these packages so that every part of the city gets its problems resolved and that we move forward because on a lot of these issues there are win-wins if we can combine them. But we as a council are divided amongst ourselves in allowing other organizations, and we'll all have our own different enemies that we're fighting, but we're allowing others to dictate our agendas and to make it so that we cannot work together. And we are going to have to find a solution to that. I'm not sure that this resolution gets us

there yet and I'm coming with the disadvantage of not having been on the ground floor of 16 different plans that have gone into this. So I won't be quite there yet. What I do know, though, is that we've just begun a strategic planning process and I think what's trying to be accomplished here fits very nicely with that, but I would really like

[11:21:44 AM]

to hear from some of the councilmembers who sponsored this, how you see this resolution fitting into that process because from where I sit it feels like it's putting the cart before the horse and we're getting into some nitty-gritty policy things that would be backing up the strategic plan before we've agreed on the grape and that may be -- on the strategic plan and that may be before we have a lot of the pieces in motion, but it does seem to be jumping the ship on the strategic plan before we have our priorities and our indicators and the things that we care about agreed on. And I'd like to understand that. I also, though, share some of councilmember pool's concerns and Mr. Casar's concerns and councilmember Garza's concerns that there's pieces in here of what I would like to see as part of the affordability agenda, linkage fees is another one, that are in there. We include the mitigation fees for traffic. There are lots of pieces there that could go in there. And on top of that I want to make another note related to linkage fees. We've had a request for a study out from June of last year and we had two studies requested at the same time, linkage fees and density bonus. The density bonus report is almost back to us. The linkage report hasn't gone out for an rfp. As I read this resolution we're turning around and asking staff to do more and more things, but they haven't been able to get back to us a report that could have been sent out through an rfq process for professional services without a public bid. There are four firms in the country that do this. And we still don't have a study back that would allow us to evaluate the very important policy decision of whether we should be using density bonus or linkage fees. And this resolution asks them to do a gazillion other things. Do we have the bandwidth to do it all? And I don't mean that -- that is a criticism of our process as much as it is a question of how things happen in the

[11:23:45 AM]

city. But if we're going to move forward with omnibus type thing like this, we need to be sure that we have the bandwidth to follow up because otherwise it's just words. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston? >> Houston: Thank you. And I want to thank all my colleagues for all of their constructive input. One of the things that I think my constituents want in district 1 is some consistency about how we do policy, how we do the business of the council. And yes, this is perhaps an aspirational resolution because there are so many different parts that are going on. We all have different silos and transportations in one, housing is in another. So when people ask where do I find all these pieces? We have a resolution on this one and in 2011, even some of these resolutions are passed before some of you were born. And so we have to refer them rather than collecting them into one space. So this was my attempt and when I signed on to say let's gather some of these things into one place. It's not about who gets credit. It's not about that. It's how we organize for business and where there's one place for people to see. There's -- sometimes we are too print pre isn't active, times it's not prescriptive enough. Other times things get rolling and it doesn't matter how much additional staff work it takes for things to get going, but it depends on who the initiator is and what their interests are. The fair housing comment about the university of Texas, it's not about where people can live. It's about whether or not the university of

[11:25:45 AM]

Texas is considering building new housing for some of their students. Yes, they've got a project that they're about to build over in blackland about 700 units, but they have other land. So as their population continues to grow, where do they come into the housing concern? It's not about them not -- students not being able to live wherever they want to live in the city, it's about what is the university's investment in this city as far as it relates to housing supply? So that's just a conversation to be had that we haven't had, as far as I know, in a very, very long time. When we talk about health and human services, yes, because of councilmember Garza we were able to add additional money to budget, but ever since we started two years ago on that health and human services committee, we have been asking about metrics and making sure that the performance measures really look at the on outcomes that we are wanting, not just this is the number of people that we serve. That's a good number, but it doesn't say what the results of those provisions of services do. So even health and human services is trying to work on metrics and performance measures that really focus on the outcomes to people, not just how many people we serve and how many money did we give those. So yes, there are things that are in process, there are things that we talk about. This was an attempt to gather under one byob so that people would know these are the things that are going on in our city and how if we pay attention we can start moving some of these things forward, continuing the good work that's been done. So I hear your concerns, but there was no malice intent and thank you for talking about plagiarism because that is an issue in politics as well. So we've seen that in the past. So anyway, those are just my comments. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you.

[11:27:46 AM]

Ms. Garza? >> Garza: I want to make it clear I'm opposed to some kind of document that tries to address all our affordability issues all in one, but at the same time I often want to think practically speaking and the realities of our job and how hard that is because how one councilmember believes is the way to address affordability is not how another councilmember believes that. And I think this document and these comments are evidence of that. There are things in here that I could not support that if I have to point my constituents to something that says, well, this is the document that says what council is doing, I can't do that. I won't be able to point my constituents to this document and say this is what council is doing, because I don't support a lot of the things that this document has. I appreciate councilmember alter's comments about process and I agree with her and she articulated it greatly that, yes, something like this is necessary, but I don't know if this is the right process to do it. The workshop that we had that laid out the garage goals I feel like this would be something to -- strategic goals that would be something to lay for you for this city, but something this important to pass on a six-five vote I think is not a good idea to pass. I'm really concerned that that is what this would lead to. And I hope that the sponsors of this agree with that, that something so big shuck an -- should be an 11-0 vote. And we're not close to that. And we can take another stab at this, but the process needs to be different. I don't think this was the right way to bring it. >> Mayor Adler: Anybody else on this? Ms. Kitchen? >> Kitchen: As a co-sponsor, I wanted to speak to the reasons that I co-sponsored this. Which I think a lot of this has already been said, but just to

[11:29:46 AM]

reiterate, I do think it's important to find a vehicle, whatever the council feels like is the correct vehicle, but a vehicle to make a statement to the public about all the things that we are doing around affordability. The message is not getting out there. That's pretty obvious. So I do think it's of value. Now, the challenges that we face in doing that are all the challenges that we raised today. We don't all agree on everything. And that's fine. And we've got this push-pull between really diving into the detail, which

we've done a good job of on a lot of initiatives, and some we have in process. So I don't know what the right answer is, but I do think it is valuable for the council to put in one place what we're all doing at affordability. Maybe that was the budget process -- not budget. The strategic plan process that was a good suggestion. Maybe it's a suggestion that councilmember Casar had about putting it in one place. Regardless, I do think it's something that we need to do. And I do want to recognize and I know we all do, I do and councilmember alter, you said that very well, I do want to recognize the work that our community group -- community groups have done. I think it's important and I value and really want to hear from every group in community. And I know we all want to do that. Then finally, we've had a lot of good discussion about why this might not be the right vehicle and we've had a lot of discussion about some ideas about what might be. So I'm appear to continuing to hear ideas along those lines. But I just wanted to clarify my reasons for going forward with this -- not forward with this, but my reasons for putting my support behind something is that I really think we need something that mains a statement to the community about affordability. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Renteria, Ms. Pool and

[11:31:48 AM]

then Mr. Flannigan, then Mr. Casar? >> Renteria: Thank you, mayor. I know I'm here in the corner and sometimes you don't see me. >> Mayor Adler: Sorry. >> Renteria: And I am pretty quiet. I don't always have much to say. On this, I'm not going to be able to support this either. We have done a lot and I know about when we request our staff to do something for us, that times it takes some time, that's why we put 90 days to come back with a report or 120 days. And I sense here a frustration here too because I have been frustrated a lot for the last two years that I've been here. I will probably get frustrated a lot for the next two years because there have been events that are outside of our control. There's a state -- the state legislatures are meeting right now and they're coming up with all kinds of bills to punish up. They're taking all our school tax money. It's an outrageous amount of money that your taking away from the taxpayers of Austin and wire constantly getting punished and no one is saying anything about that. It's Austin. That five dollar increased tax that they're putting on you is going to kill this city. It's going to run everybody out of town. And that's not true. My constituents are willing to sacrifice five, \$10 for a good cause, for medical and health care. That's one of the things that they come and talk to me about. We want affordability. I struggle sometimes on votes we're offering density for more housing and people saying that we're sacrificing so much because we're not getting enough out of it. And other people say all of a sudden we have gluts of -- guts of apartments out here

[11:33:49 AM]

where we're having to give two or three months free rent just to get them into our apartment. What is true? Who is telling the truth? But we have worked very hard on this, on a lot of these items that we have -- that we see in this affordability. Now, if they was to say, hey, management, come back and give us a report once a month, everything where you're at or where is this issue and this item, this ordinance, where is it at in the process? And if you need help, let us know what you need? Is it going to be funding to -- the problem is funding, you don't have enough staff? Are we giving you too much work? At least let us know. And that's what I would support. But I'm not going to be able to support this. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool? >> Pool: Thanks, mayor. I wanted to point to what the be it further resolved says on the affordability resolution. It says that the council direction the city manager to prepare a timeline, budget recommendations and ordinances necessary to implement. I think we're a long way from being able to vote that through on Thursday. And that's a very directive. It's not just putting everything in one place and referring people back to it, which I really like that idea. We should have some web presence where it shows the initiatives that we have accomplished so that people can cross reference them, a one stop

shop with initiatives passed and it can be under our Pio folks, we have really talented people who could put it up on the web and show the work that we've done and we could even have a ticker for how many units have actually broken ground and how many units have been broken when we go to ribbon cuttings and that sort of things. There's a lot of information we could start gathering that would flesh out our desires. We clearly want to do

[11:35:49 AM]

what's necessary to help keep people from having to move out of this city because they can no longer afford their property taxes. We're limited in how much we can do, but we work really, really hard at doing what we can do. And I don't want to give any message to the community that we have fallen down on that job or are only sort of kind of mediocre applying ourselves to it because that is not the case. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan. >> Flannigan: -- I really struggle with something that councilmember Garza said about big things should have 11-0 votes. I think the bigger the thing -- >> Garza: [Inaudible]. >> Flannigan: Help me understand then because I must have misunderstood what you said. >> Garza: I thought that councilmember tovo said she was hoping for an 11-0 vote on this. And I said this is something big and I didn't think we would have an 11-0 vote on it. >> Flannigan: Yes. I don't think we should be part of six-five votes. That's part of governing. That's all I wanted to make sure I'm clear on. Thank you for clarifying, councilmember Garza. >> Mayor Adler: Anything else on this topic? >> Tovo: Just a couple of other things. I just wanted to -- we tasked our city auditor can assessing all of the work that we're doing with regard to affordability efforts. And I think this also could be useful in this. I really like the idea. I think that councilmember Casar, you mentioned having is in one place all of our efforts and I think it's very in line, councilmember troxclair, with what you're saying with regard to the pieces that are already moving forward having that in one place and some other things that I think the staff would mention as useful with regard to affordability like our small business programs and some of our other things. Those I would regard as affordability related as well. And having those all in one place would actually meet some of the questions we've gotten from the public. You know, every time the -- using publicly

[11:37:52 AM]

owned land for housing comes up, people would say what about this and what about this, with those initiatives, all of these resolutions in one place so that we could track the process on them. So that would be a really valuable -- a really valuable resource and I would certainly support if this resolution were to change by Thursday to initiating that kind of a pulling together of resources, that would be something I could support. It would be -- I can say if we mooch forward on Thursday, I will have lots of questions and lots of edits and I've mentioned some of them. A couple others I would want to consider that I didn't touch on earlier. Utility rates and fees, presenting a budget with no increase could significantly strap our ability to, say, provide for the customer assistance program through our community benefit charge and others. I'm not sure what major city of Austin fees could be included within this language, but he could also run afoul of some of our other policies to have 100% cost of service recovery in our programs. There's some information in affordable and accessible transportation. Councilmember Garza raised a couple of points that may conflict with adopted capital metro policy, a couple other things. Some of these when I had an opportunity to meet with the chamber of commerce on an early early draft I was able to ask them for some of their sources on it, but things like transportation, being the second highest family cost, I would want that language -- that language I don't believe should stand because for families with children, most resources, like the center for budget priorities, for families with children, transportation is typically not the highest cost, I mean the second

highest cost. It's typically childcare. And so a document -- again, a document that the city council is endorsing just has to be

[11:39:53 AM]

accurate on every single point and there are multiple areas where I think that would need to be addressed. And too, I would -- were we to tackle this together I think we would have to go through and adjust all of the language within it so that it really reflects what is an ongoing initiative that we're saying please, continue, and what is a new issue that would have to be an up or down vote individually. Another one that caught my eye, provide a fair regulatory environment for innovative service providers, an innovative transportation technologies. Well, as an elected leader in this city I believe we do provide a fair regulatory environment and I would not want to endorse a document that suggests that's a new policy. I mean, that kind of -- it's not about taking credit or not taking credit for past action. I want to be really clear that it's not -- that we're not endorsing a document that suggests some of this has been passed when it's actually been our consistent commitment for years to provide a fair regulatory environment, but I would want to have a conversation about whether that language is as clear-- what we're really talking about. But for me it would have to adjust to continue to provide a fair regulatory environment and that for me is the difference between an outside -- between it becoming a document of the council. That I believe our best approach would be to -- there's a lot of good work in here. I think tabling it for Thursday and then figuring out a resolution that allows us to pull together information or directs our staff to pull together information about what we're already doing and as has been suggested, taking up those other items which would be new work separately would be the path that I think makes sense. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember troxclair? >> Troxclair: Thank you, everybody, for your comments. I've tried to take notes and to the extent I've heard a lot of people

[11:41:54 AM]

say that they can't support it and maybe regardless of what changes are made that will still be the case. I would encourage you to hope the co-sponsors and I understand to the extent that there are changes that could be made to earn our support, I would love to know that via the message board between now and Thursday, if it's above and beyond what you've already mentioned today. I see -- I think that the way the community coalition has come together to support an affordability agenda like this is really unprecedented and really speaks to the fact that there is -- although the council -- this council and past councils have done a lot to address affordability, there is still so much work left to be done in the fact that they took it upon themselves to make this a priority with their limited staff and resources and to get the ball rolling in what ultimately the council could take and run with. , Yeah, number one, it's unprecedented and I hope that we will take that ball and continue to run with it. We've been -- for those of us who were elected for our first term a couple of years ago, we're already more than halfway through our terms, and I think if you ask the -- a random person on the street or the person who you are in line next to at the grocery store if the council has addressed affordability, the overwhelming response is no. I can't afford to live in the city. And you have to do something about it. I don't want us to get stuck in this -- in the -- that council sometimes gets stuck in

[11:43:57 AM]

of talking about it and needing a report and then reporting and cataloging. And I want to be able to say yes, here -- check, check, check, here are the things that we've done. But our work is not done and here's what we're going to continue to do to address affordability in the city. This document, there are

things in here that I don't know if I would support them on their own. And I certainly wouldn't want to be the champion of them. But because there is the opportunity for us to have a win-win here. Because there is an opportunity for us to put together an omnibus. This isn't -- this isn't setting anything in stone. It's nothing final. Part of it is aspiration national. Part of it is distribution to staff. Part is recognition of what's already underway. But ultimately anything new is going to come back to council and we are going to have the opportunity to make adjustments as we continue in our strategic planning and make sure that time and resources are being I guess allocated appropriately. But I just -- I want us to be able to show the community that we're taking our concerns seriously. That we are not only following up on not only things that are underway, but thinking outside the box of what we can do to improve affordability in the future. And I'm going to keep hoping for unanimous support knowing that if we don't get unanimous support that sometimes that's just the -- just the way the cookie crumbles and the sausage making or in the difficult policy decisions that we all have to make on a weekly basis. I'll just leave it there. Thank you to everybody for your thoughtful

[11:45:59 AM]

comments today. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Alter. >> Alter: I would love to hear from the sponsors how they were envisioning this fitting in with the strategic plan earlier. I addressed that earlier in my remarks and I would like to understand that perception. You've been here longer and you have a broader view than I do and I know I would benefit from hearing how this fits into that because I see there are synergies but I'm not aware of your thinking on that and it would be really helpful to me to understand that. >> Mayor Adler: I'm not exactly sure how to answer the question. I mean, I think that everything we do should relate back to strategic goals that we're doing and I think hopefully as we go through the process it's going to help us set priorities and make choices. I agree with the comments that councilmember kitchen made and that others have made, councilmember Casar made. There seems to be a desire for us to be able to pull together in a place things that people in the community who are thinking about affordability might be able to go to the page and find in terms of things, well, is the council doing anything on this area? I hear the question about there may be some things on there that different people think about affordability in different ways. Certainly there are affordability needs at virtually every strata of this city the way it exists right now. But what this effort was trying to pull in together one place where that was, I think that's a good thing for us to do. And I see everything. When we actually make decisions about how we're setting priorities, and my read on this is that it was not prescriptive. It was saying these are areas that we should look at or these would be good information for us to have. And obviously I'm one of

[11:47:59 AM]

the voices on the council to push back against prescriptiveness on things like this and say, let's start engaging the community on those topics. So that's where I was coming from and I don't know how to address the bigger question. I hope everything we do gets in the line of that. Ms. Kitchen? >> Kitchen: I think that's one of the things that we'll need to think about as we talk about the follow-up from the retreat. One of the things that we did with the retreat, is we don't have a bucket that's just for affordability for lots of good reasons, because it spans across a lot of the different issues. So I think as we start to do the work around what those buckets are and the indicators and the metrics, I'm forgetting all the words we're using, but all those different categories, I think it would be important for us to think about, okay, here we've got the metrics for these different areas. How do we translate that to the public to help make it clear that these metrics do support affordability where they can? So -- but it's not exactly aligned. And that's been our issue all along with affordability. It's not a neat bucket. There are so many things that go into it. So that would just be my initial thoughts on that. >> Mayor

Adler: Anybody else? Ms. Houston? >> Houston: We've been talking about since we came back from the retreat on how we align ourselves with the strategic priorities and we have not done that yet because we're still waiting on feedback from the consultants. Hopefully when we get that feedback from the consultants, we then can begin to align our work and our priorities to the strategic planning that we did, and it's important. >> Mayor Adler: The manager, by the way, has asked that we consider bringing that back to the council, the next step of that on March 28th. So everybody might want to check their calendars, March 28th.

[11:50:01 AM]

Yes. Ms. Troxclair? >> Troxclair: Yeah, from my perspective to follow up on what councilmember Houston said, we don't have a neat bucket for it but the things that we identified in our retreat that we think will be critical parts to our strategic plan, each of these pieces should fit into one of those categories. And if we make changes, ultimately I don't know how -- although I think our strategic plan is critically important, I don't know how long it's going to be until we have a solid document that we can then make policy decisions based on. And again after serving on the council for over two years now and really feeling like this urgent -- just an urgent need from the community to address some of the things that are encompassed in this, is I didn't want to -- I think that things will be able to align with that document when we ultimately have it, but if we wait for it, I don't want it to be another year, another how long before we -- before I can feel like we have some kind of comprehensive plan that's responsive to the senior who is calling me in tears because she's going to lose her home because she doesn't know how to pay her taxes. So I feel like it's an urgent need and I think that a lot of the people in community feel lying it's an urgent need. Hopefully as the strategic plan process continues to evolve and come to fruition, each of the pieces in our plan will find a home under one of our goals and within our metrics. >> Garza: I wanted to say one -- I have a feeling nobody else wants to say this, but while I do believe it's important that we all listen to different

[11:52:02 AM]

stakeholders and different advocacy groups, I have a problem that this seems to have become from the chamber, because yes, in politics we plagiarize all the time. We usually plagiarize policy that is pushed with a certain -- with a certain agenda. And I have -- that's a big issue for me. Yes, the chamber is a stakeholder in our community and we should listen to them, but for policy to almost read verbatim from a certain stakeholder who has been able to get some support from some -- from some community groups that I support one voice, like I said before, I'm very surprised that one voice signed on to this, but I think it's-- really does things that could hurt organizations like one voice. I'll just leave it at that. >> Flannigan: Mayor? I wasn't going to say anything, but the chamber has been called out in vain throughout this whole conversation. I used to run the game as being chamber of commerce. It is not the type of evil place that evil ideas come from. The fact that they reached out to other groups that, they reached out to one voice, I think shows that they were part of a community conversation. But we often get policies given to us by a single stakeholder group, every meeting, in fact, I think, we get policies given to us by single stakeholder groups. And this conversation to my recollection has not been had about those groups. Every group has an agenda. Our constituents have agendas. We were elected on platforms you could call an agenda. But I don't think it's fair for us to demonize any group that's trying to work with the community, that's trying to build relationships,

[11:54:03 AM]

that's trying to create win-win situations, especially it really hits me because I spent so many years working in the gay and lesbians chamber of commerce to provide good jobs and welcoming workplaces and support small business owners and support people who couldn't find jobs. If we're going to open the Pandora's box of demonizing individual groups, I'm not sure we'll like the end game there. Again, I wasn't going to bring it up even though the chamber was being cited multiple times as the reason this proposal was bad without -- in addition to specific reasons it was bad. And I understand that it wasn't just the only thing, but I think it's a dangerous road to go down because there are other groups that come to us with agendas, with prewritten policies that often just sail right through the dais. >> Garza: And I want to respond to that because -- I don't want this to turn into I'm against the gay and lesbians chamber or their priorities. I think putting that into the same area as the big chamber -- there are big differences in the small chambers and the big chambers. And you're right, we bring forward stuff from advocacy groups all the time and if anybody has a problem with an advocacy group, they can say it and they cannot support the policy. And that is what I've done. I can point out my concern with it and I cannot support the policy. >> Mayor Adler: Gosh. My hope is that we can focus on the suggestions. The fact that the chamber comes in and advocates for an economic development policy that's directed towards having middle class jobs in east Austin, I think is a good thing.

[11:56:03 AM]

And that's one of the elements on this. It's the next item that's pulled on our agenda. And I salute and applaud the chamber as well as any other organization that says that they'll join in setting that as a priority. And I wouldn't discount it -- we should be focusing on the ideas. And there are so many affordability ideas that have consensus here that the chamber is now endorsing, and that's great. That they're endorsing some of the things like that. And I'm concerned, you know, that somebody watching this has the same kind of concern. There are real substance here and policy here that I think are good. We can talk about whether we think it's the right forum to capture them and talk about them. We've talked at length about this almost two hours and I'll think about the points that were made. But I think that good conversation, I think it's good for us to note those things and that we should be drawing and hoping for as wide a participation in that as we can on the good ideas. Ms. Troxclair? >> Troxclair: And I guess I just want to add -- this is not -- I don't think it began as the chamber's document. I think that it was a coalition document regardless of how you feel about the chamber. But again, regardless of your feelings towards the chamber, this plan is -- what is ultimately posted and on our agenda is not the chamber's plan. I mean, it is the product of hours of work by my staff, the co-sponsors. I mean, I joke that while I was out on

[11:58:03 AM]

maternity leave having a baby my chief of staff Michael, this was his baby that he was working on. So I mean, I'm happy to provide you with a side by side of what's different, but sections -- section 1 -- I would say the housing portion is probably the most similar, but we did take some significant changes when it came to actual numbers or metrics. We added a study with UT. We added -- let's see. We changed -- we changed a lot. I'm looking at this list here. We added pretty much the entire economic development policy was something that's been the product of hard work from many months by the mayor. And is significantly -- is actually completely replaces anything that I ever saw from the council. We have a transportation section that is drastically rewritten with many additions. From my perspective I give credit to the community coalition that again has brought this to outside attention and like the fact that we can't all talk to each other all at one time has really done the legwork of trying to communicate with everybody's offices and make sure that some kind of affordability action plan was on your radar,

but this is -- what is before you is the council's plan. And yeah, I think that we need -- I don't think it's -- I don't think that it's a bad quality to be able to recognize someone else's good idea. And I think that that is -- is what we have done here. I think that we're recognizing that the community coalition had some good ideas and I think they're recognizing probably that the mayor and many other councilmembers who ran for office had good ideas when they ran. So it's just -- it's neither here nor there arguing about whether or not

[12:00:04 PM]

what your expression is of the chamber, but I just wanted to shout out to Michael in the office who I think has worked on this document anymore than anybody else in the city combined. Mayor Adler: Any other points on this one? Ms. Pool. Pool: I wanted to ask if we can move on to the next item or the item after that. Mayor Adler: If there's anybody else that wants to speak. The next item related to this is item 34. You'll recall that just speaks to the economic development incentive issue. This was on the agenda a couple weeks ago, paused on that agenda to be part of this omnibus bill, if this omnibus bill does not go I would hope that this part could, and it's just asking the really broad question of is there a way for us to use incentives that would drive middle-income jobs, middle-income jobs on the east side of town, middle-income jobs where we could train people to be able to work on them. It's not being prescriptive. It's saying if there's a way to do that come back and tell us how we can do that. There were questions asked at the work session two weeks ago. We'll bring amendments and post them on the website that I think are responsive to some of the points that were raised, but clearly we're not trying to use public money to bring in low-wage jobs to Austin. I don't want us to do that. Don't want to participate in us doing that. But I would like to see if we can do a better job of bringing in -- actually bringing on the ground middle class jobs and bringing opportunities, doing something about food deserts or health-care activities and it's just going to staff and saying are there things we might or could be doing to be more successful. Ms. Pool. Pool: So women-owned it be appropriate or is it contemplated in here to have a review of the subsidies that we're currently providing to

[12:02:04 PM]

some employers to make sure that those subsidies are doing what they intended and updating that? I know we talked about them last year during budget. I don't remember what the -- if we asked if they were accomplishing the set-out goals. Mayor Adler: I would be happy to have an amendment that added to do that, and I would hope that taking a look at what we do that works and what we do that doesn't work. Pool: Exactly. Mayor Adler: Will be a good thing for staff to do in order to be able to answer the question that is posed by this resolution. Pool: I think the piece that may have been missed on council's previous work -- Mayor Adler: I'm sorry? Pool: I think the piece that's in your resolution that may have been missing in previous efforts by other councils on this area is the targeting of middle-income jobs for people who live here now and training up our workforce in order to take them. And that was frankly the substance of my conversation primarily with the chamber the last few times I met with them because the workforce training is a really important piece for me but workforce training for people who live here now so that we can move them into jobs of that career trajectories to them %-@and I think that is a real strength in this economic development resolution. And I would like to contrast that with efforts that have been employed in the past because I don't know with any certainty at this point how successful the council was in order to target people who live here now. Thanks. Mayor Adler: Thank you. Mr. Casar. Casar: I'd like to just -- I'm not sure if the sponsor might consider, considering that with our existing economic incentive policies with the living and prevailing wage for the construction workforce we are indeed already creating \$18 an hour, \$20 an hour, \$25 an hour

[12:04:04 PM]

jobs for workers who do live in our area who are oftentimes not college-educated just so that people don't have to worry about whether we're gonna be reopening that entire conversation, could we in this initiation just say we're gonna keep that part the same and all the stuff that staff is working -- Mayor Adler: To be clear my incident not to bring in jobs that pay less than living wage. That's not what this is about at all. Casar: I understand that. Just for clarity is that something we could clarify in the resolution so that folks don't have to -- Mayor Adler: The truth of the matter -- help me through this because it was something I hadn't even thought of in this context when we did this because there was -- it was so far afield from what the goal of this was, and now I'm -- so now I'm -- is it -- is there a scenario where we're not -- where staff would come back to us and say the reason you're not able to bring in middle-income jobs in east Austin to train people in east Austin to take those jobs is because of the -- of a salary number that was presented? I don't -- I mean, that seems to me to be a non sequitur. If it's not a non sequitur, then I would probably want someone to raise their hand and says that not a non sequitur but that's not my incident. If someone wanted to bring a resolution to do that, it just seems so far afield to me that -- it just seems really far afield. Casar: And that makes sense to me, which is what I heard you say when you first presented it and when you just presented it again but just to provide that level of clarity, I would maybe type a sentence and throw it on the message board or send it your way. I think it just ends up just like with anything else, all stakeholders and folks want to

[12:06:05 PM]

be involved and be responsible, but if they know from the beginning that it's not only the intent but actually in the resolution I imagine that will save people -- Mayor Adler: So look at the numbers of people on there. I think those are the people we talked to and I think there's probably three, so there might be an additional spot open so I'd be happy to work with you on that. Casar: Thanks. Mayor Adler: Ms. Kitchen. Kitchen: I have a quick question. I'm not sure if this is appropriate for this resolution or not, but I am concerned about our existing small businesses and their ability to stay here. They're feeling the same kind of pressures that our residents are, in terms of rising rents. >> Having to move, either move out of town or close down. So I will go back and look at the resolution. If not here, someplace we need to think about addressing that issue. Mayor Adler: I'd be amenable you to putting it in here. Kitchen: Okay. Mayor Adler: The goal here was to take a look at really specific, targeted workforce or other goals and then going to staff and saying look at the incentives and see if there's a way to us to use it in a targeted way that would help us drive the community benefits. We can have them look at others as well. Kitchen: I'll look at an amendment and provide that to everyone, focused on helping our small business keep our jobs in town that we have right now. Mayor Adler: Ms. Garza. Garza: Because the language on the resolution unfortunately I don't have it here in front of me but I remember reading it earlier, it just seems -- I have -- is the goal -- and I passed this out last time. It was the matrix that outlines the requirements for chapter 380 agreements and I was surprised there were sponsors of this who had never seen that. And so is the goal, you know, speaking of specifics, councilmember Casar, is the goal to reform this matrix and the requirements on it. Mayor Adler: No. The goal is to use economic incentives in a way that

[12:08:05 PM]

actually creates the community benefits we want. And I don't know what they'll come back and say. Michigan goal is really high level. I want us -- I don't want us to invest in jobs that don't pay people a

living wage. I don't want us to invest in high-paying jobs that occur in parts of town that we don't have employment issues. The goal is not to do anything in particular other than to achieve a result and this resolution is just intended to say to the staff and the community, how can we best do that? That was the intent. Garza: I feel like I see similarities with this in codenext where, you know, codenext is supposed to put us on a pathway to motivate or I can't think of the word right now, get people to land develop in certain areas and this sounds like the same thing. We can -- to get incentives to get certain kinds of jobs and codenext alone we all know is not gonna solve all of that, and this will not automatically on its own solve all of that. And so if this is in no way affecting what this matrix is -- and I don't know you said you know staff is gonna come back and mayor pro tem can speak more to that but my assumption would be staff would be, yeah people aren't moving here because you require living wage and that's a non-starter for me. There are other things in here like the requirement of [indiscernible] Training, having to comply with mbe, WBE, domestic partner benefits. We don't know where this administration is going to with same-sex marriage so those are very important things to keep as incentives to any incentive package going forward. So I just -- I can support something that is looking at an overall picture because it isn't just chapter 380 agreements that

[12:10:05 PM]

help drive economic development. It is other things that are economic development, there's other tools reward specifically that -- with regard to small business, chapter 380 are specifically big and I would say they are working, what's in place right now is working. Because if you are going to try -- if you want tax exemptions you have to bring benefits no community. And I don't understand the other side of the argument with that, saying they're not working because jobs aren't coming. That's not true. Jobs are coming. They are coming, and we need -- like I said last time we need to keep the bar really high when we're using taxpayer dollars, and I couldn't support anything that strays from -- much of what is in this matrix, and I'm happy to pass it out again for those that don't have it, but much of what's in this matrix is what we require of ourselves as a city and I don't think we should require anything less of any corporation coming here to get a tax benefit. Mayor Adler: And you're familiar with my political beliefs and my views on values in the city, and I think one of the reasons we're the city we are is because of the culture and the values that we express. I really was just asking a much higher level question than that and the conversation we seem to be having is but what if they come back and suggest this or are you trying to get them to -- I'm not -- I'm just saying is there a better way for us to get middle-income jobs that can train people who live here? And really that's all that I'm asking at a really high level. It is as least prescriptive as I possibly can be by just stating what the overall goals are. Garza: And just -- I may propose one amendment that I do have concerns that the resolution says -- at the very end says the city manager shall present recommendations for reforming. And I don't know. I just don't think that it's -- Mayor Adler: I didn't mean anything by particular by the word, if there's a better word or language than that, I'm all

[12:12:06 PM]

ears. Garza: Okay. Thank you. Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston. Houston: Thank you, mayor. I too believe in keeping the bar high, but the fact of the matter is that middle-income jobs are not coming to the parts of Austin where the jobs are needed. There are parts of Austin that have double digit unemployment and unless we have a way to incentivize people to bring those kinds of jobs into those communities, then ten years from now we'll be at the same place, talking about what do we do because we can't find the kinds of jobs so that people will be able to live in this city? And so at that high level, I think it's now time to look at what other things are available? And how do we in fact incentivize manufacturing jobs to

come into those places where people are languishing and have no hope and no opportunity to find meaningful employment, that they can sustain themselves or their families. So I'm supportive of it, and because of those reasons. We're not eliminating anything. We're just asking what else is out there available, how could that happen? Mayor Adler: Okay. Tovo: So I think that clarifies for me a little bit about the intent. And I think -- and I would agree with councilmember Garza that some language to that effect would be helpful. Because it seems like, as we're discussing it, we're not asking the city manager to present recommendations necessarily for reforming, but we're asking for recommendations that would allow -- that would point to additional programs or additional methods of targeting jobs to particular -- to the eastern crescent. But I have a couple questions. I think, mayor, you talked about introducing amendments that would speak to the concerns you heard last time. Those I haven't drafted yet, but

[12:14:08 PM]

as I indicated last time it's of interest to me to see a section in here referring to the previous process, the special committee, the elements that were introduced. Is it your intention to draft a whereas that refers to that process and calls out some of the additions that were surveyed. Mayor Adler: I'm absolutely happy to include that if you know what they are and have them handy. Let me know, and I'll put that in. If you want to find it -- you know, some some respects a lot of times and I look at these resolutions that we do I don't want to put in any whereas clauses, I want to say be it resolved that we ask the manager and staff to come back and tell us a better way to get jobs and training. I know we have a custom and practice here to put in whereas clauses, but in answer to your question, I have no problem with putting that in. And I'll ask my staff to look and see if they can finalize the economic development staff and if you know what they are -- Tovo: The ones that we've touched on, councilmember Gallo I think touched on a couple that are really important additions and those were the ones that resolved around living wages and also domestic partner benefits. Those were two of the main additions that were new in that - - revision I think are critical. Again, I think it's important to acknowledge the stakeholder work that happened, the council committee and new provisions added. There were other things like on-site child care I think are relevant to the community benefits you're talking about. Two, I'm gonna have to remind my -- you asked a question before. It's the exchange with councilmember Casar. I didn't completely understand the outcome. Is it your intention to kind of say which -- in this resolution which elements will not be -- will not be reopened? I think that that's one of the questions I've heard from the public. Are we reopening, say, the living wage requirements?

[12:16:08 PM]

I have to go back to my folder but it's my memory of serving on that committee that there was definitely an argument that if we set a living the arguments about having that as a provision and I think the way it worked in the end we ended up with a policy that actually allows an exception with a 2/3 vote. We couldn't get that as a hard and fast requirement so there are definitely differing opinions on that point and I think it would ease the fears of some stakeholders who participated in that last process if we could say we're going -- you know, whatever the recommendations are from staff we're gonna stick with our living wage requirements, stick with domestic partner benefits, and, you know, if there are other key elements that we want to stay firm on, I think that would just -- that would reiterate what I think is the intent here, which is to look at additional means that are necessary but not rethinking -- not rethinking those hard thought hard won provision we currently have which, again, I will have to ask the staff. I'm not sure that the staff was in complete agreement on all of them, but Mr. Johns I see is here and he might remind me differently. I can't remember if the living wage, the hard and fast requirement for

living wage was something the staff supported. I know there were divergences in what the staff remittance was. Mayor Adler: Part of that is the context for that. So this is an attempt to try and drive middle-income jobs none of which pay below a living wage job. This is one focused on delivering jobs that pay in excess of a living wage or pay a living wage by its very direct purpose and intent. And it's looking at and saying that there are many people who feel, I feel, that we're not creating as many of those

[12:18:08 PM]

opportunities as we can in the locations that we need them. That's what it's saying. And I -- that's why in part by saying I would work with Greg is I need to think over because there's a connection that's now being made that seems like a non sequitur to me. It's -- the goal is to deliver jobs that pay a living wage. That's what the goal of this is. So I'm -- I don't know how to respond. Mr. Flanagan. Flannigan: I'm a cosponsor, I wanted to be perfectly clear I'm not going to support any action that removes the living wage requirement from any type of economic incentive program. We need to have a high bar. I completely agree 1000% with you on that. I look at this as more about looking at incentives and how can staff help us to think more creatively about addressing concerns about placement and geography and access, not so much that we're gonna undo all of the really hard and important work that was done so very recently to add these requirements and, councilmember Casar, I'm willing to work with you and even adding language to this. I think sometimes, Mr. Mayor, there are non sequiturs that you just have to spell out because the community is just not gonna buy it and there are probably historical reasons that they don't buy it, and we can't -- sometimes we suffer for the sins of our predecessors generationally, and I think we have to really call that stuff out. And I just wanted to be clear that, you know, in the context of these larger conversations, there's -- under no circumstances am I supporting a removal of living wage requirement for incentives. Mayor Adler: I couldn't imagine ever voting for something that created or was trying to

[12:20:09 PM]

incentivize a non-living wage job. What this is, looking at a full range of incentive options and tools, including to job based, investment placed, place based incentives, as well as as say? Financing, potential for matching funds, nonprofit he is not. I'm trying to figure out what can we be doing that we're not doing now in ways we're not doing now because we're not delivering. We're not delivering. It's not -- whatever we're doing, we're not delivering what we would like to see. So this is going to our experts and saying how do we get what we want to see? Any other comments? No? Okay. It is -- yes? Garza: I guess I have concerns when we say we're not delivering because we have created a living wage for city workers, we have created living wages for contracts with the city. You know, there's so much that each and every one of us wants to do to improve the situation of our low-income families but I guess I'm really concerned to hear we're not delivering because we pushed policy that is -- and that is the goal and it is and they're paying people living wages and we did it at capital metro with requiring living wages for the construction workers. So I can support a plan to see what more we can do, but we have really supported policy that has. Mayor Adler: I stand corrected. I think we have clearly done lots of really good things. Garza: Thank you, mayor. Mayor Adler: What I should have said my guess is we're not doing everything we could be doing and I want to make sure we're doing everything that we can do. Ms. Houston. Houston: And we continue to have people returning from the criminal justice system that are not able to get jobs either with the city or capital metro or on construction crews. So they also need to have jobs. When we can say with pride that our unemployment rate in parts of my district is 3%, then I will say we've done all we could do. Until we can get that from

[12:22:10 PM]

double digits down to single digits, I have to say we've got some more work that we need to do. Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool. Pool: I'm not gonna talk on this topic. I wanted to ask -- disagreement. Pool: We can go to lunch. I think that would be awesome to take a break. I also wanted to know are items 22 and maybe another item pulled, I know I -- Mayor Adler: Yes, yes. Pool: I know I got my request in. Mayor Adler: There are items pulled we have not yet addressed are 38, which I have, 38, and it's actually two, but they're showing the same number here. It is the Thorton road issue, new mobility a done must issue -- 39, thank you. 38, 39, 77, 22, 25, 26, 27, 31, and 76. Kitchen: Mr. Mayor? Mayor Adler: Yes. Kitchen: I can expense with 39 and 77 quickly and 38 almost as quickly. So if I could do those real quick before we break for lunch. Mayor Adler: Okay. Kitchen: First off -- Casar: Sorry to interrupt but I may have questions about some of those. Mayor Adler: Okay. Casar: We have a -- one of them is Thorton. Mayor Adler: If other people want to discuss them let's not call it up now and I'm seeing heads nodding. Kitchen: I lumped them all together. First off, 39. Let's just see if other people wanted to discuss them. Mayor Adler: New mobility, autonomous solution. Tovo: I have one quick thing to say about that and I think this is a good resolution I plan to support it. I would ask or I would ask you either to develop or I can develop as an amendment a whereas that speaks to the former council resolution that expresses support and direction to our staff in working forward -- in working forward on developing practices related to autonomous vehicles. Kitchen: We can do that. We'll get with you and make sure we've got the right language.

[12:24:11 PM]

Tovo: Thanks. Kitchen: Okay. So 77. Mayor Adler: Okay. Kitchen: I can actually ask my questions of staff outside this meeting so it depends on whether other people want to ask their questions. 77 is the one that relates to the -- Mayor Adler: Right-of-way dedication improvements. >> I had a question. Kitchen: I thought you might. That one we'll need to discuss. Mayor Adler: We'll come back. Kitchen: 38 then -- Mayor Adler: Is Thorton road. Kitchen: Thorton road. This is not the zoning case. 38 is the resolution so I have just a few things to say about it. I don't know if you want to take that up now or not. Mayor Adler: My sense is that's one of the ones to discuss. Is that right? Casar: I've got a couple questions. Mayor Adler: Let's hold off on that one. It's 12:25 -- Flannigan: I can expense with 31 quickly. I have no issues with this, more staff questions about a better understanding when properties become unable to change their use because of a vote of the voters, like, when do properties become parkland and when their use becomes not parkland as far as when you have to go to the voters to change their use. Pool: That's chapter 26. Mayor Adler: I have questions about this one too so let's hold off. I want to know if we've considered alternate uses, the public engagement process, that kind of thing. That's 31. Anything else before we go to lunch? Tovo: Very quickly, councilmember kitchen, do you still have room left on autonomous vehicles because I can in this public meeting hand over the previous resolution if that's the case if we're not able to talk outside of this meeting. Mayor Adler: Why don't you read the number in, resolution number. Tovo: Somebody will tell her later. Councilmember kitchen, the resolution I was talking about is resolution 2014-2011 11-12, it is directing the city manager -- in any case -- Kitchen: I got it. Tovo: Perfect, thanks. Mayor Adler: Okay. All right. So we're going to now break for lunch and while we're in lunch

[12:26:14 PM]

we're going to into executive session to take up -- up to five items. Pursuant to section 551.072 of the government code, real estate matters e6, municipal courthouse. Pursuant to 551.071, legal issues that would be items e2, e4, power purchase agreement, e7, legal issues related to real property and the municipal courthouse if they arise. Pursuant to section 551.086 of the government code discuss competitive matters of e5, power purchase agreement. E1 has been withdrawn. Yes. Kitchen: Quick question. So could you go over the rest of our agenda for the afternoon real quickly? I know the items we had to take up that are pulled but we're also going to have the mobility report? Mayor Adler: Yes. We'll come back and work through the pulled items as fast as we can did&then do the mobility presentation. Kitchen: Okay. Mayor Adler: See how fast we can work. Anything else? Let's go ahead then. It is 12:26 and we'll come back to do pulled items as soon as we can finish lunch and finish these executive committee items. We're in recess. [Recess]

[12:54:40 PM]

[Recess] >>

[1:59:40 PM]

[Recess]

[2:33:22 PM]

[Recess] .

[2:35:56 PM]

Pool: Mayor? Mayor Adler: Yes. Pool: There's a couple of items I think would be great to -- maybe we could go over the list and dispatch with a couple of the items quickly because I think some folks have to leave earlier. Mayor Adler: We could. We don't have six, we could certainly since we're not taking any action, we could go ahead. We're out of closed session. We took up and discussed competitive matters related to e5, e6, e2, e4 and e7. We're now back on the dais. It is 2:35. And we have a quorum present. So, council, we have most of the items that are on the pulled agenda to -- that we have yet to get to. And we also have a pretty extensive briefing on the mobility stuff that was given to us that is pretty involved as well. It would be great if we could move through the pulled items quickly, but obviously that's our time to talk to each other. We could put off the mobility briefing, but I think they're anxious to get started and it's not set for the hearing on Thursday so we just can't move it to then. Let's see how quickly we can move. Are there any items on this people think can be up and down taken care of quickly? Did you have something in mind when you said that? Pool: I think I defer to councilmember alter and I'll jump in after her. Alter: I need to wait for councilmember Casar and councilmember kitchen for 76 and 77. I do have to leave at [indiscernible] Pool: Want me to go ahead and jump in? Mayor Adler: Go ahead. Pool: We've had item 22 -- Mayor Adler: Item what? Pool: Item 22, organics by gosh

[2:37:56 PM]

contract approval. We've had a number of contracts we have pulled down or put aside in search of a time so that we could have a policy, engage a policy conversation at the council level that could then guide our -- and make sure it aligns with our community climate plan for Austin resource recovery and I'd like to just say on item 22 I'd like to suggest that we do that as well. Perhaps we could engage an ad

hoc group on council, which I'd be happy to serve on, to kind of dig into the policy issues that have been identified by our staff and our council staff, try to get that policy direction figured out so that we could then -- rather than approving or denying a contract that may place a medicare in a place we don't -- Mayor Adler: Let's ask that question. Is staff here on that issue? Is there a reason why this contract shouldn't now be handled the same way the other contracts are being handled? Which -- we said we would take a look at the anti-lobbying, generally, and the policy issues associated with resource recovery. >> Mayor, councilmembers, James Scarborough, purchasing. Yes, we do think and agree that there needs to be a larger policy discussion so we can have some more clarity with regard to council direction on a number of items that touch these particular items. This particular item was solicited last summer and halves been deck, ready to councilmember tovo council for several months. So it was a process -- or it was a -- Mayor Adler: It's fine if it's here. The question is, is there any reason why this shouldn't be postponed to be handle with the larger group? >> So, mayor, councilmember, Austin resource recovery. The contract that currently -- we currently have, started June 2014 and expires June 2017. We do have, I believe, three

[2:39:59 PM]

extensions. You know, we you haven't discussed that with the current contractor to see if they can work with us to extend it or not. Mayor Adler: Would you check on that? >> Absolutely. Mayor Adler: Certainly what councilmember pool raises if it's all involving same or similar people, all involving same or similar policy issues, we can -- we put officer several contracts last week. At some level it would seem to make sense to handle them all because they have similar issues. >> Absolutely. Mayor Adler: If you can send a memo or email to us once you've checked in case we're not going to handle this we could let the community know. >> Okay. Mayor Adler: That it might be pulled so that they can schedule accordingly. >> We can certainly do that. Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything further discussion on this item 22? Great. Thank you very much. Item number 25, manufacturing. >> L Flanagan. Tovo: Could I make a 52nd announcement? I have an item on the agenda and I don't have it in front of me, but it's the item regarding the butler shores clarification of naming. I wanted to alert my colleagues to the fact we are making a slight adjustment to the resolution and those changes will be done and uploaded tomorrow afternoon. I just want to call your attention to it. It would have clarified the naming of butler park as well as butler shores and in doing more historical research the butler shores piece needs additional work so it will remove that piece from the resolution. Mayor Adler: Do I understand correctly -- Tovo: Maybe 2020 something like that. It's in -- maybe 2020 in that general range of numbers. Mayor Adler: The issue is we have a name for the park but it doesn't tell us which [indiscernible] It is so now we're specifying as to be clear what the original intent was. Tovo: Exactly. Mayor Adler: Is there anybody on the other side of this issue? Tovo: Not who I have heard from. I would say I believe there were some -- let me step back. There were individuals who had

[2:41:59 PM]

concerns back in 2007 when butler park was named butler park and I have heard concerns from them again. Pool: Item 36. Tovo: But that is -- those are the concerns I've heard to this point. Mayor Adler: Great. Anything else on this item? All right. What number was that? 36. Could I be added as a cosponsor. Looks like you have a spot. Tovo: I believe I do. I would love to have you on board if we still have room on that. Pool: Thank you. Mayor Adler: 76 and you wanted to pull up. They're different items. So let's hit the ones that were timely put on, 77, Ms. Kitchen, do you want to -- Mayor Adler: And also 38. Kitchen: Let's go with 771st. Mayor Adler: Okay. Kitchen: I think there were others that had questions about that too. I just had a few questions. I believe you presented information about this to us

at a previous work session, so my question really relates to tias in particular. And let me -- on page 4 -- no, maybe you should start by reminding people what this is about and then I'll ask my question. Should we do that real quickly? Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Councilmember Robert Spillar, director of transportation. I'm joined by Eric and man did I who can answer the detailed stuff. This proposed ordinance change codifies our [indiscernible] Defined by state law, of course. It allows for them to get mitigation, collection of mitigation with or without a transportation impact analysis and that is a major change. Then it also addresses the desired volumes on collector streets and other streets and

[2:44:04 PM]

allows the director some leeway in determining whether to move forward with the development or not if the development demand, traffic demand, is adequately mitigated on those conditions where the traffic is already above the desirable rate. Rate. Eric, can you answer? >> So in terms of tias -- Kitchen: Let me be specific about my question. >> Sure. Kitchen: I'm sorry. In terms of tias, I'm looking on page 4, and under D, really my question probably is addressed in some other ordinance, but that is what's the scope of the tia? In other words, how do we determine how broadly geographically a tia looks at impacts? And, again, that may be something that's in another ordinance. I'm just -- I'm really wanting to know is there as that in an ordinance somewhere or discretionary? Does that depend on the project? Does that make sense. >> Right, Eric bol lock, Austin transportation. Generally they depend on the type of development. I guess a good rule of thumb, obviously the bigger impact in terms of street network we would study, we do have guidelines, tia guidelines at the administrative level that speak to and kind of guide the scope of the tia, but it's not proposed in this code or is an existing code. Kitchen: They're in administrative guidelines? Could you point me to those or send me a link to them or something just so it will help me understand. As I'm understanding the administrative guidelines give you some guidance on what -- you know, what kinds of -- what size of properties and -- >> Gives some guidelines. Generally, you know, go to maybe -- if it's near a freeway, capture intersections along the freeway or next major anterior

[2:46:04 PM]

tial to frame what we'd be looking at as staff in terms of scope. >> If I may add, the generally concept is to trace the traffic generated by the development to where we can no longer distinguish it from the rest of the traffic. As Eric said, freeways are good examples, where we lose the ability to track specific trips because they get on to the freeway system and bleed out if you will into the community. Kitchen: Okay. >> So the idea is you chase that traffic for mitigation as far as you can reasonably trace the traffic. Kitchen: Identify where the traffic came from. >> Exactly. Kitchen: Thank you. That was my question. Mayor Adler: Okay. Any other questions? Yes, Ms. Pool. Pool: So on the other side of that question, if it's administratively determined or you look as far as you can chase the traffic, are there limits to that? Is there council approval? When we get to some of the more complicated projects and the elements of a tia are actually making it difficult for council to get some of the community benefits they're looking for because the decision is made at the staff level, is there any redress for that or does this address that at all? >> Generally, it's -- we -- cometo a pretty good back and forth dialogue with the applicant. I know that might not answer your question about council level but in terms of what needs to be studied, sometimes the developer proposes fewer intersections, sometimes they propose more. We feel like, well, like rob was saying, maybe we've traced those trips a little too far. So with every case we review it, we scope it, and then the tia is submitted after that. Pool: So it's certainly within the authority of the staff to determine the parameters of the tia that then further down the road affects what the outcomes of, for example, a planned use development would be at the council level? I think it would be really

[2:48:06 PM]

helpful if we could have a conversation here about maybe having some input from council on that. We've had a number of examples in the last year and a half where the tia elements have ended up making it difficult for council to make some of the policy optional decisions. Because we don't have the information and then we end up not being able to get it if an applicant says I won't do that. But if that negotiation at the staff level had been more in the form of for the city's best interests, I think that would help here. So that we don't end up feeling like, well, maybe it was negotiated away at the staff level and then council can't do anything to bring it back. I have some serious concerns about that. That would be great to engage that conversation. Mayor Adler: Okay, yes, ms. ality. Alter: I'm sorry I missed the presentation. I managed to go through some of it on the sheet. Can you explain a little bit? I've heard this is kind of a stepping stone to get to somewhere else, and I understand that we're talking about here for those situations primarily where we don't have a tia required at this point in order to be able to get some mitigation in those -- in those instances where they tend to be slightly smaller developments, we have tended to have developments cut off at a certain point, which may or may not be the optimal number of units, simply to avoid kind of this process, so it should help on that level as well. Help me understand this notion of that this is a stepping stone to something else as opposed to the thing that we're going for. That would be my first question. >> Councilmember, as you may know, we are working towards development impacts, fees. That is a process that we have to go through that may take

[2:50:08 PM]

another 18, 24 months. You know, even after -- my understanding is even after council adopts a program it's still there's a state-mandated period of time, about a year that it takes to get all your systems in order. We are working on that, but in the meantime, as you know, Austin is growing quickly and certainly what we've interpreted from council's incident that development should pay its fair share of the impacts and a major area where I think we have been lacking in ability to collect more than the boundary street type of improvements are on those developments under the 2000-trip limit, where -- above which tia -- transportation impact analysis, tias are required. And so this does reach down and starts to establish the concept that, you know, every development has an incremental impact on the system, and that collectively if everyone is helping to mitigate that, then that should reduce the load, if you will, on the city, in terms of future bonding or future transportation improvements. It is an in between because I think, again, because it will take 18 to 24 mos get to the new regime, if you will, of how we collect mitigation, this allows us to more quickly put in a process that allows us to reach down into those smaller developments and ask them to pay their fair share. Alter: Thank you, that was helpful. Part of what I'm struggling with is not so much how this impacts those cases that don't have tias right now but trying to understand some of the implications for this process for the cases that we do have the tias. And the questions arising for me is because we have the pro rata versus the rough proportionality and while I can see that you are going up from the currently

[2:52:09 PM]

allowed, you seem to be stopping at the pro rata even though there's quite a big leap between that and the rough proportionality and I'm not aware we've ever set it as a policy. Ta pro rata is sufficient, it's just practice. And so I'm trying to understand. >> So, councilmember, we still have to show that there's a nexus between improvements being asked of the development and the cost of the developments. The rough proportionality, which is state law, is supposed to be an upward check, if you will, and so if you

can imagine a development along one of our future smart corridors or in downtown, where much of the mobility infrastructure is already constructed, downtown is a good example, it's hard to imagine that we'd be widening streets or doing major capacity improvements. I-35 is an outlier but those types of facilities aren't usually associated with development mitigation. So you would expect that if you had the same 2000-trip generator in that location versus somewhere let's say out in a suburban community, the downtown one, you would expect the fees to be lower because there's less mobility improvements that can be drawn -- new mobility improvements that can be created to mitigate that traffic. You're sort of putting it into an existing pipeline that exists that theoretically can handle it. Whereas the same development out in the suburbs or you can imagine even outty edge of our city limits where there's very little infrastructure might have a larger impact to the surrounding transportation, they may have to add additional lanes or signals or capacity-related things. I think that's the other important element of this, is that mitigation is required with regards to new capacity. You know, new capacity that's needed to manage the new development. Correct. Yes. And so simply -- and this will be true, by the way, when we go

[2:54:09 PM]

to impact fees, is that we still have to correlate an impact fee -- calculate an impact fee that's proportionate to the impact being created by the development. So that's why there's a difference in the two calculations. You know, we're all governed, all municipalities in the state are governed by rough proportionality. We use pro rata share as a method to calculate what the nexus improvements might be, and what we find is on smaller developments that might be being built in infill, we get closer often to the rough proportionality with the pro rata calculation, larger developments, there might be a bigger gap between rough proportionality and pro rata share, but obviously larger developments are typically paying in a larger amount of mitigation. But percentage-wise or closeness to those two coming together, smaller developments because of land prices, if there's real estate that needs to be donated for right-of-way, get closer to that limit. Alter: Okay, I guess rough proportionality takes into consideration system-wide impacts. And the pro rata is only just around the development? Is that correct? So according to the state, we would be allowed to account to some degree for system-wide impacts of new traffic? Is that correct? But we are not accounting for that in our calculations? So legally we have an option of charging more, but we're limiting ourselves to the pro rata? >> So my -- and this might be a question to address to the city attorney in an appropriate environment, because I understand -- I think what you're talking about is impact fees allow us to charge a mitigation fee to the overall system, and that will certainly be incorporated in the upcoming process. Alter: Okay. >> But our current process, both the pro rata calculation and the

[2:56:13 PM]

rough proportionality cap, which applies whether we have development fees or not, are based on a nexus between the improvements that are being asked and the development itself. Alter: Right. But according to rough proportionality, you could still have a relationship between the development and the larger system that would not be accounted for simply by looking at what's effectively just the border streets and places around. >> Yes. Alter: Yeah. So you can have that so we are allowed to go above the pro rata. My concern is as we're making this transition, if we are to prove this -- approve this, this should not imply we are holding our hands and tying our hands that we cannot ask for more. I understand we want to be very clear this is this rule to ask for more, but I -- I'm very uncomfortable, given that we can by state law factor in those systems -- and there may cases where we want to do that -- that we would be tying our hands in this way. I understand we're in this transition. I'm just trying to understand how

what you're proposing to solve this problem that we have where we do not have a tia, how that then has implications for how we yet the tia. >> So I don't think it changes that with the tia. I don't think that what we're contemplating with the smaller developments changes how we evaluate developments with tias and that is always a negotiations process. So ... Alter: But it does seem to make this typically pro rata the policy rather than the practice. >> Until we change it with development fees, yes. Yeah. >> Brent Lloyd, assistant city attorney. I just want to offer a few just clarifying comments. This is a very complicated, technical subject, and it's ripe

[2:58:14 PM]

with potential for confusion in terminology, and the term "Rough proportionality" is really a constitutional concept that means when the city requires land or money from a developer as a condition to approval it has to be proportionate, there has to be a nexus in the amount of the -- and the amount of the ask has to be reasonably proportionate to the impacts of the project. We've -- state law requires a process, cities have to follow a process in making those determinations. It doesn't actually dictate the particular engineering methodology that has to be used. And the two sort of different approaches that are -- have been discussed today are both different attempts at rough proportionality. Pro rata, which the traditional method that we refer to, generally -- and I don't think in all cases, but generally produces kind of smaller numbers in terms of what can be required. The newer model that is -- the city developed with Kim Lee horn, we refer to that generically as rough proportionality, but, again, rough proportionality really is a constitutional concept. The newer model we've started to just call "Rough proportionality" really focuses on the overall demand that a product -- a project generates, and it tends to result in a lot higher numbers in terms of what can be required from a development. Now, we have advised staff that in terms of how they apply the ordinances and that includes their recommendations to council on zoning cases, as well as the work that they do administratively, that because pro rata has been such an established part of how codes have been applied over time, that the new ordinance that will be in front of council later

[3:00:16 PM]

this week, on Thursday is. Would be a pats San Jose of that -- would be a passage of that ordinance or a good beginning terms of starting to apply what we call rough proportionality on a larger scale. Now, certainly there's no requirement in code or anywhere else that prevents council from beginning now to start looking at what we call the rough proportionality model, but again, and I guess this will be my final comment, because pro rata is so established in the city's system W we've advised staff to be measured and somewhat cautious in terms of rolling out the newer, more robust model that has been discussed captures a much wider range of impacts. >> Kitchen: Mayor? So let me make sure that I think I'm understanding this. Basically the criteria is rough proportionatety. That's the same criteria. It's a constitutional criteria. There are different ways to calculate it. Pro rata is just the traditional way that we have calculated it in the past. We are moving towards a new way of calculating, which is the transportation impact fee. So we're in transition in terms of how we calculate. But pro rata is not -- I'm not saying it right. Pro rata is not anything any different in terms of the general concept than rough po, it's just how we've traditionally calculated it, and we're moving towards changing it. Is that right? >> I think that's all a very accurate characterization. >> Kitchen: All right. So to answer what councilmember alter is asking, right now pro rata, the way that we've traditionally calculated it in the past, we don't have to continue that. We could ask for more because it doesn't bump up against the cap.

[3:02:17 PM]

And we're in transition. Okay. Thank you. >> Alter: And it seems like the policy, though, allows you to bump it up more. And I guess I'm trying to understand when you bump it up more. I would like you to bump it up more because we have a lot of traffic problems that are not being solved. And when we confine our traffic impacts to this tiny, tiny area, we are missing the system implications. And pro rata is necessarily confining us to a very small area and so I want to understand, you know, how will you bump it up? Obviously you're not always going to go up to the higher amount, but what is the criteria? Because every developer is going to come in and say, well, we have to stick with pro rata. >> Well, I would tell you that even when we go to development fees, development impact fees, have to have a geography associated with calculating what the fee is. In terms of measuring how far out does that development have an influence on the transportation system. >> Kitchen: Could I ask --? So once we finally arrive at the end of the day on what our calculation is going to be, that's not any different than the constitutional rough proportionality unless we choose to make it less. If I'm understanding correctly, rough proportionality doesn't dictate as you just said how you actually calculate it. It is a standard, a constitutional standard, so you have to have some reasonable way to calculate that standard. The goal for us, or at least my goal will be as a council, at the end of the day is to make sure that our policy matches the match -- matches the maximum unless for some reason we decide to make it less. Right? >> Yeah. I want to restate a couple of points and I apologize if it I'm redundant with what I said earlier. Rough proportionality is a

[3:04:19 PM]

constitutional concept. Neither state law or city codes dictate a particular death dog, but the -- methodology. But the newer methodology that produces kind of the larger impact analysis that's been discussed, the model that we're referring to generically is just rough proportionality. Produces very high numbers in a number of projects in terms of what can be required. Most cities that use this model -- there are a lot of cities around the country that have started to move to this model for the reason you all have touched on. It captures a wider range of impacts, especially for larger projects, but most cities that are using this model have some predictable, somewhat predictable criteria for how close to that maximum threshold that you will reach in a given case, so that every time a development application comes before council or before administrative staff, there's some predictability as to how close to that maximum threshold you will get. And we've advised that when the new ordinance is adopted and sort of sets in place a framework that staff can start to develop some procedures for their own use as well as for recommendations to council in zoning matters or that will provide some measure of predictability, whenever each case is sort of individually negotiated without some sort of clear criteria, that definitely raises some concerns. But as a general matter, councilmember kitchen, yes, the council has full authority to look to the new model rough proportionality and how you analyze zoning cases. >> Houston: Thank you. Thank you all for being here in my life on the council and I have forgotten it.

[3:06:19 PM]

How long has rough proportionality been state law? >> Councilmember Houston, I can't give you a precise year, but -- precise year, but I want to say somewhere in the mid 2000s. The state passed a law that what the state law does is again it doesn't dictate a particular engineering methodology, but it just really sets up a process. It requires that the city make proportionality determinations in individual cases using engineering staff. And both atd and dsd have staff that are available to implement that process. It sets up appeals and it includes some other just very basic procedural provisions for how a city goes about making and documenting its determinations. But it doesn't get into the level of technical detail

that we're talking about with respect to pro rata versus this larger type of analysis that we're referring to, for lack of a better word, as just generically rough proportionality. >> Houston: So could you tell me why it's taken about 17 years for us to even start this process? >> I cannot, but I can say that I think even though the city hasn't updated its ordinance for awhile, the city's actual on the ground practices in terms of how it documents its decisions have, for a considerable period of time, complied with state law. I think that there are sort of two big purposes behind this ordinance. One is that it codifies a process that complies with the procedures that state law requires. And then secondly, it recognizes that the city has authority to get mitigation even when a tia isn't required. One of the things that

[3:08:22 PM]

current code is sort of not explicitly clear on is whether you can get mitigation requirements even for smaller scale projects that don't trigger a tia. And there's nothing legally that will prevent a city from getting off site mitigation contributions for traffic improvements on those smaller scale projects that don't rise to the 2000 trip a day threshold. But the city has historically applied its ordinances in a way that it's not required. So one of the things this ordinance would do is recognize the city's authority to get improvements for smaller scale projects and also put some limitations on it. So obviously the developer who is doing a project that doesn't trigger a tia is not going to be asked to provide the same degree of improvements as a tia project. And this ordinance fleshes it out and gives it some criteria. So that's one of the major purposes behind this ordinance. >> Houston: And I really appreciate that because I remember when I first became a member of this council I was talking about how developers know how many units will generate a transportation impact analysis so they're always under it and how we only look project by project rather than a cumulative effect. It would have been helpful two years ago if somebody says, but we're working on something. We're working on rough proportionality which will help us -- help mitigate some of those traffic trips a day because we would have everybody buying into that and we would be looking at ways to make what people say in the community growth pay for itself. But I'm glad we're at that point now and I look forward to passing an ordinance so that we can begin to implement a process to make growth pay for itself. >> Pool: I know when we all started this morning two years ago with the growth must pay for itself concept,

[3:10:23 PM]

it was part of our learning to try to figure out how do we in fact inshift or ensure or take the hard votes with development to say if you're going to have X amount of impact on a given area then you have to put in the dollars. And then we have to make sure the improvements are made. And I remember learning under pro rata there was never really enough money put into a fund in order to pay for intersection improvements, for example. And I remember to my serious consternation one of our first cases -- and I don't remember. I think councilmember kitchen, it was in your district and it was over the aquifer and we weren't able to get -- do you remember what it is, councilmember Garza? >> Garza: I thought it was the Garza tract. >> Pool: It might have been the Garza tract, not related to you. [Laughter]. Right. And then we spent a whole lot of time talking about traffic improvements and we were going to get them funded and later we found out that that six percent that we were going to get in funding, which seemed like a lot of money, wasn't anywhere near going to pay for the improvements that were going to be needed. And eventually that money would go back to the applicant or the developer or whomever because we would never be able to spend it in a specific period of time, hence some of these changes I think is the history of this coming forward to us. So the city of Austin is never going to be in a financial position to fund traffic improvements without a realistic and a serious contribution by developers who are in fact causing a lot of the need to have traffic improvements. And

so our traffic impact analyses are key to getting solid information on, okay, a range of fees, low end being how we've interpreted

[3:12:23 PM]

pro rata, high end being how the calculation will be made under rough proportionality. I'm wondering maybe councilmember kitchen, we could have an amendment, something in here, maybe going to kill me. I've been volunteering all over the place today to help. But I'm thinking if council could even have a report on what the scope of the fees would be, the low end and the high end, that we would have some criteria that we could -- so that a required report so that council would have a range of the fees and the cost to the developer, some specific geographic circumscribed area around especially the larger developments that can't be negotiated down. So it's a half mile in every direction. Nobody except council can say it's just that street adjacent. Something where we can reasonably rely -- I don't mean to address you directly, but I'm trying to get to a place whereby the time we get the cases, we've got sufficient information developed that we can use responsibly that our negotiating ability has not been given away so it is not on the table and I have serious concerns that in a number of instances in the last year and a half that we haven't been able to hold our line to get the money we need to make traffic improvements because we haven't gotten the information to us. So I don't know how to insert criteria or requirements or reporting such that staff could let us know where they're using their professional input to make some decisions that we may not be agreeing with or that may be harming our need to get development to pay for it. >> Councilmember, just a point of clarification, and

[3:14:24 PM]

because this is kind of technical and lengthy, I don't want to get this wrong. Somebody will step in here and correct me if I'm wrong. This ordinance doesn't address the criteria for tias and so forth so that's being taken care of in codenext. So that might be an appropriate place to address it or even in a separate item from council saying they would give us directions. I would leave it up to the city attorney again to decide whether that be germane or not. But this doesn't change the requirements of the tia. Per se. Does that make sense? >> Pool: Yes, it does. My concern doesn't go away, but it shifts maybe to a different conversation in a different document. What I'm saying is does that make sense to y'all about how sometimes when we get the decisions coming out of dsd or atd by the time we get them we D't have some maneuverability. It just isn't available to us. I would love it if the staff would help us to have that when we make -- >> Mayor Adler: One more comment on this one, Ms. Kitchen? >> Kitchen: I would say that we have two major, major processes we have underway. One is the asnp which will end up with the strategic mobility plan, which will end up with the transportation impact fee coming back to us, which will have a great deal of detail in it and a lot of decisions that we need to make as a council. So that's one avenue. The other avenue again is codenext. So I think that those are the appropriate places to really capture the kinds of changes that we're talking about. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Alter, did you have something you wanted to close us out with? Okay. Let's go on to the next item then. That was 77. We skipped 38. >> Kitchen: Let's go back to 38.

[3:16:24 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: This is Thornton road. >> Kitchen: Do you have to leave at a certain -- very, very fast because -- okay. I'll be very fast. On item number 38, this is Thornton road. This is not the zoning case. This is the -- as you all may remember, we passed -- we agreed to provide direction to staff to work with the neighborhood on developing a vision and you all remember Thornton road is -- it's in the south

Lamar neighborhood. It's an area that's having tremendous redevelopment and has -- doesn't have a neighborhood or a small area plan. And experience lots of challenges with flooding, limited transportation and safety improvements and those kinds of issues. And so what we did back in December is we directed the staff to work with the property owners and the neighborhood to come forward with a vision for the area. It was really kind of like a small area neighborhood plan without the formality and also smaller. So what is in front of you with item 38 is a resolution that recognizes what was done by that working group so it recognizes the vision and the recommendations and the other information that came out of that working group. The resolution lists the language that is exactly out of what the working group agreed to. So it's a recognition of that and then it's also a recognition that this vision should be something that is considered as part of codenext. This does not -- this is not an attempt to down-zone. This does not impede any of the existing rights that property owners have in

[3:18:24 PM]

their existing zoning. This is simply a recognition of the vision and the recommendations for what would work on that property -- what could work on that property, understanding that there are trade-offs because this is an area where there is no perfect solution. So it speaks in terms of compatible land uses, diversity of use, matching to existing scale, infrastructure priorities, all within the understanding that there are trade-offs that have to be made. So the purpose of doing this was we've been dealing with one-off zoning requests or changes for the different properties along that road. And every time they come to us the neighborhood has to think through and talk about what might work on that road and the developers have to do the same, which takes a lot of time. So the purpose of this is to save everybody's time, to capture the vision that everyone has for that road and to put it in place as guidance, as guidance for our staff, as guidance for us, as guidance for those that the property owners and as guidance for the neighborhood. So that's what this is and I can appreciate understanding if anybody has any questions about it or any concerns about it or if there's any changes that anyone feels like they might want to propose. And by the way, let me thank Mike Trimble and the team that he put together. This was a very quick turnaround for our staff. And I have to thank our staff -- this was staffs from multiple departments I might add, because that's the problem with this area. It's not one issue. So we had planning, we had watershed, we had transportation, we had economic development. And I also wanted to thank the neighbors and the property owners for participating. So... >> Casar: I didn't anticipate work session would go so long so my computer is out of

[3:20:25 PM]

batteries. >> Kitchen: Do you need to look at it? >> Casar: No. I guess I want to -- from my scheme of it when it was posted, I might have some concrete discussion suggestions, but I wanted to sort of raise what my questions were while we were here in work session to not take up time on Thursday. I understand that there's not a neighborhood plan in the area and we've been here for the zoning cases and I recognize the stress and change on that redevelopment pressure and that area in particular. But with a lot of neighborhood planning processes and small area planning processes that have more time and don't have to be done so quickly there's the sort of local neighborhood interest taken into account, but also the citywide needs that are balanced during that process. Since this is a different process, I want to better understand and maybe it's clarified or best to clarify the difference between this and the more formal process that other folks go through where there is -- while I know staff was involved in this way, where there is a linking up of this work as a small part of a bigger plan. And so for me I think that if this is clear that it is sort of equivalent to any other neighborhoods' input into the codenext process as opposed to a guiding document for zoning and planning for that area in the interim. I guess that's what

would make me more comfortable instead of us then having to potentially have to work with our own neighbors and neighborhood groups to sort of come up -- does that make sense. This is different. I'm trying to say this is different than what I've said before and I recognize the initiative of those neighbors and our offices work and the different zoning cases that have sprung up on that street. I understand and recognize that. Before we do something new like this, I want to make sure it's not precedent setting. That we are in our own

[3:22:26 PM]

neighborhoods working with neighbors to create sort of semi neighborhood plans without going sort of the thorough process that those have to go through to be -- to have immediate sort of planning repercussions on what our staff recommends and does it recommend on those streets. >> Kitchen: Let me explain the difference. A neighborhood plan has some authority that this doesn't have. A neighborhood plan has authority in terms of a structure that goes along with it, a process for a contact team, the authority for contact teams to actually weigh in on development. This doesn't have any of that. What this has is guidance, but it's a recognition and it captures the discussions that happen. I would not want to negate the work that they did by saying that we weren't going to recognize what they did. We said back in December when we set out on this process that we were going to use this in this way, so I appreciate your question about, you know, the planning process, but this does not have the weight or authority that the neighborhood plan does. >> Casar: And I guess what I want to best understand is if it doesn't have the authority of ordinance or of forcing staff recommendations in its guidance, but it's something we want to recognize where on the spectrum of authority does it have this and it has nothing to do with the street in particular or the neighbors in particular who have been very communicative and great with my office, the bigger question is if this is setting up some level of authority because we wouldn't be passing it if we didn't want to do something beyond symbolic, what that level of -- I would want to understand what that level of authority is because then it would raise all sorts of questions

[3:24:26 PM]

about where else should we do this and how else should it be done. And it's not to pick on this thing in particular. It's the first time we've done it and I think it's important for everyone to understand. >> Kitchen: Let me explain just to answer your question. What it does is it sets up criteria for consideration. Again the key word is consideration. Of current and future planning and zoning activities associated with this area. So it's guidance. And so what it is saying to our staff is that if something comes to them, then they read this and they use it as guidance to consider how they might respond to the zoning. That's all it means. But I think it's very important that we move forward with this. And if you have suggested language changes, I don't want to hear them on Thursday. I think we need to understand them now because -- and the reason I'm reacting that way is because we had this conversation in December and we went down this road with these folks with the understanding that this was how we were going to use it. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan. >> Flannigan: I'm a big supporter of citizen led efforts. I've used them to great effect in my own district. I think the part that hangs me up is in the second be it further resolved where it says that we're directing the city manager to incorporate the criteria recommendations. So I think that maybe goes one step beyond consider this in an advisory way and it directing the city manager to just go and do it. I think if that was just even more repetitive of the previous be it further resolved, it would make total sense to me. >> Kitchen: Okay. I think the -- could I speak to that? I'm sorry. So what this is just saying is again, it's guidance for the codenext process, mapping process. So -- I think we can talk about language.

[3:26:26 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: I think that language is the thing that, I think, that apparently some of us have the same issue on. This is a tough one. And quite frankly, I think that I voted with the neighborhood on each one of these that have come up thus far. And this is a tricky one and I really appreciate everybody being engaged to work through it. And I also encouraged the neighborhood to get together to give us guidance like this. And in that respect when neighborhoods come forward and give us guidance I hope we always take that guidance from the neighborhoods. But as far as preferential value, presidential value or something that the codenext next has to take into account the way they would an area plan or neighborhood plan, this is different than that because it hasn't gone through that same kind of process. Is that correct? >> Kitchen: Well, look, I mean, we could have tried to do a small area plan, but this is a very unique area. It's a small geographic area. And we could have tried to do a small area plan and if this ends up not being given, I consider the respect that these folks have earned then maybe eventually we would do a small area plan. Given the time frame that we had to deal with and the unique conditions of that road, I think that this was the most effective way that we could proceed. So in terms of codenext, I think this is the same way that they would be considering anything else. The mapping process for codenext is not a directive process anyway for anything. And so I think -- but I do think it's appropriate to say to the -- for the codenext mapping that this vision should be considered

[3:28:27 PM]

as part of the mapping process. So I don't know why we wouldn't want to do that. >> Mayor Adler: I think they are -- I think codenext is following the neighborhood plans. I think they're incorporating those. So then what would be helpful for me then to understand is what was the process that we went through here relative to a small area plan. In terms of the participation or the invitation. Is it functionally the same thing where it has the same kinds of input and the same kind -- in essence is it the same process with the same input would be helpful information? >> Kitchen: My interpretation of that would be -- let me just tell you the details. The neighbors that live on that road were included. The neighborhood neighborhood associations were included. And -- and the property owners. So I don't know what else you would have done in terms of a small area plan in terms of inclusion. So -- so in that sense, yes. Now, it was faster. It was definitely faster. But I am not seeing this as different. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar? >> Casar: I guess the place that is different for me and I want to respect the work that was done. And in my quick skim, good detailed work, is just the definition of the word guidance, so I just need to understand what that is. That's what I'll try to understand because I know we have other items to get to is what sort of guidance means. So if it's like other neighborhoods or other folks have worked hard to say, we really want these industrial uses to move and for it to be really residential or we really want this creek to be unearthened. And for a sidewalk to be there. And I do think our staff and codenext consultants should understand that and should take that into consideration as hard work neighbors did to explain what they want in their

[3:30:28 PM]

area. This work about retraining creative spaces and fixing traffic issues should all be considered. I think it's important for our staff to hear and consider the hard work that folks have done, especially when you're bringing together diverse stakeholders. So I agree insofar as that goes. I'm just wondering how far beyond that this goes. And and maybe that's something best not hashed out here, but for me to read it, understand it and maybe put on the message board any suggested language edits or might be in my

reading of it, I will have no -- [indiscernible]. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan. >> Flannigan: I think for me it's important for codenext and how many little small areas in Austin might look at the map in April and then bam, put this together and then point back to this and say, no, you have to do the thing my little neighbor has decided because you did it for Thornton. So consider it great. I'm on board with consider. For me it reads this is a requirement to incorporate. I think this is where I get hung up. And it is more about it is not commentary on the work for the neighbors on Thornton or those folks. >> Kitchen: I would respond that I understand the concerns. I would respond that this is a very unique part of town. And, you know, it required a unique approach to address it. And if we can't do anything because we're concerned about precedent, then that just leaves this neighborhood stuck. So I think that what we

[3:32:29 PM]

designed for this process is very appropriate and it was one that fit the neighborhood and it was not just a few people -- it was really representative of that street and that neighborhood. And this area has been dealing with these -- this neighborhood association and these neighbors have been dealing with these issues for quite some time. So I think it was a well planned, good executed and good participation process. So I'll consider what you're suggesting, councilmember Flannigan, and I would just ask -- ask you, councilmember Casar, to please don't -- I don't want to be-- we've done a lot of work on this and I have a lot of people that I want to work with. I'm not going to be able to respond on Thursday. So if there are other concerns, please let me know before then. And you will have to put it on the message board because I can't -- because of quorum usage. >> Mayor Adler: Anything else before we move on? Thank you. That's item 38. >> Alter: Can we do 76 because I still have a few minutes. >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Alter: Item 76 is the Austin oaks pud. And first of all I want to thank the rest of council for their patience with the postponements to now being this Thursday for this item. Very much appreciate that opportunity to have a little bit more time. I want to flag that I would like to request a time certain of 6:30, given the number of items and the other discussion items, I don't think we will be speaking about it much before then. But I do want to flag that for the neighbors who want to come out for Austin oaks that we will be asking for a time certain of 6:30. >> Mayor Adler: Could I ask a question about that real fast? When we've had some big cases like this in the past, we've done kind of a hybrid. We said we won't take any action before 6:30 and we will call it for public hearing and everybody who wants to show up after work can do that. But there are some people on big cases who can't show up

[3:34:29 PM]

after work and they prefer to come in in the afternoon. What we've done is sometimes we've opened it up in the afternoon for people who are present to be able to speak and then we just -- we recess, in essence, the public hearing, they've spoken, and then we reconvene it no sooner than 6:30 at night and we continue on. And I've had requests to do that both on this case and the saltillo case. I mention if we say 6:30 then no one can testify in the afternoon. >> Alter: I am comfortable if there are people who need to testify before 6:30, but I do think that since we're not really going to get to the case until 6:30 that for those people who want to be there for the whole time that we would really be taking it up after 6:30. But if there's a way to allow people who want to testify earlier, I think it's very important that whoever wants to testify has that option. I'm not sure what the motion is and maybe legal or somebody can tell me what the appropriate motion is. So if I'm understanding what time would people potentially be able to speak if they can't be there? >> Mayor Adler: Probably what we've done in the past is we would say that -- we would set it for no sooner than 2:00 or 3:00, so that people who came there wanting to testify could. But the understanding would be that we would not take any action, we would recess at that point the public testimony, and then we would reconvene the public testimony at some

time no sooner than 6:30 and then there wouldn't be obviously any action taken by the council until the public hearing is over. So there would be no action. In those instances there hasn't been any action from the dais either, we've just accommodated people who want to speak. >> Alter: So for those people who are trying to figure out what was said, this was my understanding is for the Austin oaks pud we are going to take this issue up after 6:30, but if someone needs to come before that period of time we will have some period between

[3:36:29 PM]

2:00 and whenever we break for dinner that we will allow an opportunity for public comment on Austin oaks. Which is always a possibility. >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Alter: So I want to speak to puds and I will probably repeat a little of this on Thursday, but I think it's important for where I'm going on this. A planned unit development, the developers get extraordinary entitlements and variances and part of that process and the reason you do a pud is because you can also achieve community benefits. I think it's really important that when we think about what those community benefits are, that some attention is paid to what the community that's nearby cares most about. In its Casey of the Austin oaks pud, at this time without a doubt the thing that every single person agrees with, and it's not always easy in this case, is traffic is by far the most critical priority. And this pud is not superior. It is barely adequate with respect to traffic. We have just received surveys back that said 13 percent of the city is satisfied with planning for growth and I have to tell you I'm not responsible for that. I've only been here since January. 10 percent are satisfied with the traffic flow. So there is something to that concern. It was an issue in my election. I won 2-1. People are very concerned about traffic. I have been out in the district with the election. I've been out in the district talking to people. The lack of accounting for traffic costs and most importantly the lack of trying to find solutions as we grow is of paramount importance to the people in my district. I suspect people elsewhere in the city also care about that. And for that reason I want to be clear on some motions that I will be putting

[3:38:29 PM]

forward, which will increase the amount of traffic mitigation. We just spent a long time talking about the difference between pro rata and rough proportionality. In this case just to give you some numbers the tia, this case had a tia, calls for about 685,000 of pro rata and the rough proportionality number is five million and there's only two million that are required according to their tia. So there's a very far difference from that 6:85, and in fact we're at 805, to that two million and to that five million. So we can do better. If you look at the February 14th, I think, Q and a, that was published, there were about nine items that were on that in terms of traffic improvements that we worked with the transportation department to identify as the next steps of what ought to happen there. So I will be asking for funding for those and we have placed those in particular order of priority. In addition, it's been identified that the key traffic improvement for which they are paying the whole amount of spicewood springs and hart lane is not fully funded by the amount they've put in there of the \$420,000 so we will be asking for additional money to cover that. I wanted to share that because I think that it's really important that we move forward on these puds, that we move away from a practice that we got into last year on puds, which was throwing amendments in at the last minute. Now, because puds because the last item on the agenda they're often taken up very late at night when we're very tired. If you take a look at what happened on December 15th with the grove, you look at all of the amendments and you talk about confusion among the public, something we want to avoid with changing our agenda process, this is item number 1. So in an effort to avoid some of that, I wanted to foreshadow something that I was owe

foreshadow something that I was pushing. We also have an agreement on trees that the developer has agreed to. In that vein I would like to ask some of my colleagues who I hear have some

[3:40:30 PM]

amendments they are proposing that have been shared with the developer, but because we have this crazy system that I can only talk to four others, I don't actually know what you're planning and neither do my constituents because I can't way it to them. So I would like to ask the mayor and councilmember Casar and councilmember Garza who is not here, I've heard you have some significant amendment that change dramatically what this ordinance is about and I think my constituents deserve to know before 2:00 in the morning what those are. I think in order for us to be working together to solve this problem of growth and planning for it, we need to work together to share information and not get up to the dais and not be presenting things. I think it's a similar sentiment that councilmember kitchen is sharing. We are working together and if we work together, we can solve the problems. If we decide to work with the developer and the developers is our client and not our constituents, not the city as a whole, we are not going to get good development. So I would appreciate hearing and so that you can share with my constituents so that they have an opportunity when they come up for the public hearing to speak to the issues that are most salient to them. >> Mayor Adler: For me I have no amendments and the only amendments to the development that I have heard have really come from the property owners -- not the property owners, the neighborhood. I think the same people that you may have heard of as well that talked about taking and increasing some of the residential and moving things over to the east side of the site. But I don't have any amendments. Mr. Casar? >> Casar: Mayor, that's why I printed amendment sheets just like at the grove and on other cases. When we are rushed with time and we try to share these things in work session and that's exactly what I planned on doing.

[3:42:31 PM]

So we've done our best to be transparent and give copies to anybody that we have under the law that has asked for them and obviously it's a work in process and we're just getting around to this case. I also when I lay this part out, I do want to make clear that certainly we've met with the applicants on this case, but also worked heavily with staff and are just trying to get options on the table for potential amendments and have plans to meet with nearby folks and also citywide constituencies around these amendments. So I just don't want -- I want to make sure that it's very clear that these are amendments that my staff have worked on very hard to try to promote in particular affordable housing in pods because this is one of the few opportunities where we can really require and achieve affordable housing especially in places like this site west of mopac. And that's very clearly what it is, the work that it is that we're doing. So in no way do I think that the applicant is the person that my office or my staff has worked for. Indeed, it's for the important citywide vision of making sure that these pods are meeting the kinds of superiority and the levels of expectations that each of our offices have and those values and priorities are of course diverse and different, which is part of the reason the system got set up, and it's our job to wade through some of the differences, as you said, as a team when we agree and disagree. So that's why I've had this folder sitting in front of me since kicked off the work session. So if everybody wants a copy of one... And you can even see that there's some scribble on it because we've been working with the staff to make sure it's as accurate as possible. And to make sure that we're negotiating as hard as we can for what we care about. I'm going to pop this up over on the projector. >> Pool: Mayor, could I ask a question while councilmember Casar is setting that up? I'd like to entertain when

[3:44:32 PM]

we really have this conversation, we need to look at the context of Austin oaks. This is an area of town that actually is pretty saturated with apartments and a lot of them are lower income because they're older stock. And when I say saturated, I mean along hart lane and wood holily there's a lot of student housing over there too. So one of the reasons that I think the neighbors were not going after more housing really in this pud as opposed to the grove, for example, is because there actually is quite a lot. And I think maybe staff from councilmember alter's office has a map that shows -- because this map that councilmember Casar has for us excludes the developments that are off to the south and then to the north on the other side of spicewood springs road. And I guess also to the west. So when we talk about needing more housing at lower cost, I want us to be really aware that new housing is going to change the market in that part of the city. And some of the median rents for two and three bedrooms are 1100 a month. How close am I on that number, councilmember alter? >> Alter: In my head I have the one bedroom as being under a thousand or around that, but I would have to double-check the figures. >> Pool: And the two and three bedrooms would be slightly more than that. So what I hope doesn't happen, because I think an unintended consequence of us pushing for more units here in this case is that we may end up affecting the market that's currently on the ground and those families who have lower incomes who

[3:46:33 PM]

are living there now may actually end up having to move. And then that stock will be turned over and there will be new and higher buildings as a consequence. >> Casar: Sure. And I think that there's a good conversation to be had about if those other residential sites will or won't redevelop based on what we do and how we do this pud. So -- but from my perspective just to frame this, I think that developing income restricted for 40 years affordable housing, especially west of mopac, that we do not have enough of that. That's my position and stance. And if others want to have a different position or stance on that, I will respect that position. But my position is that there is not enough income restricted housing, especially at 60% mfi, west of mopac. And in many parts of the city. And so I wanted to work together with in particular my council office to find ways to increase the amount of income restricted affordable housing on the site and there are some changes that I think are not very significant changes that more than double the amount of income restricted affordable housing we get on the site. So what you can see on the graph -- I won't go through all of it, but on the far left side is our current expectation of how many affordable units and total residential units we will get if we just pass this as it stands. The total number of affordable units we anticipate would be around 20, 10% of a 200 apartment building. And the first change that I recommend or as one option that we make, is to increase the amount of affordable housing by 25%. We can do that by just adding one floor to the existing residential building, increasing that -- the amount of affordable units by five and therefore by 25%, by going to a 250

[3:48:35 PM]

unit residential building. Those are 60% mfi units and there is no change to the trip count, no change to the office. One way that we can almost double, we can increase the amount of affordable housing by 90%, is by changing one of the office buildings out for a residential building, so that adds about 170 unit building. We've checked in with the environmental office and that would not impact the nearby springs and trees or the park. So we could essentially swap that office building out for a residential building and increase the number of affordable units by 90% while increasing the amount of general housing stock there as well, which I think would be a good thing. That would have -- that would have a couple of impacts to add to that residential building. In order to preserve the amount of office existing on the site,

we wouldn't increase the amount of office, but to preserve the amount of office on the site we would have to do a few things, but I don't think any of them are really that significant of a change. If you look at the map, the new residential building would go -- would go here where the office building previously was. This is the building that is closest to many of the single-family residences and this building would actually be shorter. The new residential building would actually be smaller than the office building that's currently proposed there. We would move that office that we were moved from this site and place it in lieu of the hotel building and that hotel tract, of course because of the beautiful environmental features on the site probably wouldn't hold all of the office we would move over. So we would add the remaining bit of office with one story down here on building 3. And in order to accommodate office being on the hotel site and office being on building 3 it would require

[3:50:35 PM]

adding extra parking on the parking garage here on mopac as well as turning the surface parking lots at the restaurants into structured parking. By doing that we almost double the affordable housing on site by adding a residential building, not increasing office, not increasing the traffic cap, and just moving the office over and spreading it out with its associated parking on the other parts of the site. If we want to increase the affordable housing by about 115%, we could combine the two options that I just laid out, we could add a story to the existing residential building and then add -- still /add/(ed) a that residential building I spoke about and move the office over. At that point you're increasing affordable housing by 115% income restrict, west of mopac, and no restriction to the total amount of office. If we wanted to add more office to the site that's when you start talking about 130, 140% increases to housing. Here building 4 is the lowest building on the slope along mopac. And if we add a story to that building that generates enough in lieu funds to increase affordable housing by about 15%, and if we add another story you get another 10 to 15%. Those numbers are verified by our own city staff and actually to councilmember alter's point in our initial discussions with the developer we thought we were going to get fewer units as we negotiated this, and in bringing it to the city staff in verification according to current market rates anticipated in this area we're actually getting more. So that's sort of the range of options. I'm not westside to any particular option -- wed to any particular option, but I think with pud's that we have an opportunity to get

[3:52:37 PM]

income restricted affordable housing and in this area that's such a good area, what I hear from my area is traffic wows around they, but also options in other parts of town. So with this rare opportunity I think it's incumbent for us to weigh affordable housing with the other opportunities on that site and I think that we can easily double the affordable housing here and get it even up to 130 or 140% more without impacting the trip count limitation and by largely adding a residential building and/or a little bit of additional height on mopac on the buildings that are lower levels, lower occupancy levels. I think that my office will distribute this spreadsheet to anybody to take a look and I would love to know if we made any typos or got anything wrong, but I'm happy to discuss it with y'all. I would support this case, but only if we're probably doubling or more the amount of affordable housing on the site. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool? >> Pool: I think the offering by councilmember Casar further under scores the importance of us looking at how much we're going to be requiring of the developer with regard to the improvements of traffic because all of these also had -- I see it has impact trip indication down below that, none, none. I don't know about that, I don't know if it's accurate, but what this tells me is anything that we do beyond the land use plan that we looked at with first reading, we have to be looking at the upper end of the amount of money that we

[3:54:41 PM]

collect for traffic improvements because we have to make them. We cannot pretend they cannot happen and hope it doesn't happen and then it happens. And the city doesn't have the resources to pay for the traffic improvements that this development change will require. And I thank you, councilmember Casar, for this because it just adds the emphasis to the fact that we have to collect full freight on the costs from the development for traffic improvements. >> Casar: And I want to make clear when I put none there I mean in my own potential amendment or ones I would offer other councilmembers to make, I would not change the trip count limitation. So we would keep it the same in the motion. >> Pool: I would have my staff to then know that if you increase -- all of the heights and the numbers and change around office residential, can you do it without changing the count limitation? >> Casar: That is what we've asked for them to do because we've understood how important the traffic issues are on this site. We've said that we want that additional residential and they will have to utilize less intense uses to stay under that trip count. I would move any of these options, but I would not increase the trip limitation with respect to the fact that staff has worked to figure out what the appropriate levels of mitigation are. I would make these motions, but I would not increase the associated trip count. >> Pool: Thanks for that. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Alter. >> Alter: Thank you, councilmember Casar. It's good to see these so that we can begin to communicate these with people in the district who can be concerned for many, many moons about traffic, height and trees. And this just goes right in the direction of raising the height, which has been a concern. And there are no buildings this high on mopac anywhere near it, all the way down to San Marcos. So increasing the height for this particular parcel creates precedent that requires I think a much larger conversation. I'm wondering, though, why we can't just ask for more

[3:56:42 PM]

housing and more affordable housing as a consequence without giving them more height. >> Casar: I'm happy to answer that. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar. >> Casar: I think we can. On any pud case we can just - we can require whatever level of affordable housing that we want. So legally we could say we want the housing to be more expensive. We could do two percent affordable housing or we could ask for it to be 99% of the units affordable. We could very well do whatever it is we want on -- as a council on puds as far as requiring affordable housing, which is one of the great things about a pud. The challenge is we are essentially having to put in what it is that we think will guarantee us the level of affordable housing that we want and I'm -- I'm not an expert in this and I know that we all struggle with what the appropriate amount of affordable housing is. And since it's a voluntary program, who will participate in the deal. So if my conscience and my work is to push us as close as we can to that line of an appropriate amount of community benefit, be it environmental, traffic, and affordable housing, all of which are included in this deal. And to use our best judgment. So I'm not here to tell -- in my best judgment this is something -- getting to a place where the applicant and the staff and my staff all feel like it's a good enough deal and we've pushed it far enough where somebody has said yes, we will do that, that's usually -- and we have to buy it or not or we can push it further. But frankly, you're right, we could put in -- we could ask for four times as much affordable housing, half the price, and hope that it happens. And if I thought that it would, then I would vote for it. And in this case this is something that -- where we've said we didn't want to increase the traffic. We reduced the height on the building closest to single-family residences, height increases mostly happen on mopac, with your

[3:58:42 PM]

points well taken, and so that's where we feel comfortable. So I hope that answers the -- >> Alter: I think for my constituents right now, the key priority is traffic. And staff has said that a more appropriate amount is more like 1.5 million. Are you prepared to support staff in saying that? >> Casar: I would love to hear from that part of the communication from our -- >> Alter: We can hear from them, but they have identified that those would be the next things, the traffic mitigation says two million. They're giving 800,000 right now. >> Casar: And for me, again -- >> Alter: Again, my community is the one that is most affected by this and I'm happy to have more affordable housing, but when we come back to this, and this is a pud, what I've been hearing from the developer, is we get affordable housing or we get traffic. And this is only an either or discussion if you and I make it an either/or discussion. And if it's either/or I will go with the traffic because lots of people living there have to do and there's 2,000 units of affordable housing right next door which happens to be part of the context, which if you don't know the area, you don't know. And those are renting at 1,000, 1100 a month, which is relatively reasonable for this city. >> Casar: So a few things, one, I don't know the area as well as you do. The vast of those are not income restricted -- [speaker interrupted -- multiple voices] >> I'm just trying to finish what I'm saying. >> Alter: Sorry. >> Kitchen: That's okay. I know it's important to you, I know it's important to your district, so I respect that. Those units can be redeveloped regardless of what we do on this vote and producing income restricted affordable housing [indiscernible] Is a priority for me. If it were -- you asked the question, if it were a question about whether or not we are approving a development that seriously impedes the safety of folks and we aren't getting adequate mitigation for

[4:00:43 PM]

that, I do believe there needs to be some mitigation in the immediate area. However people all across the city, whether pud or not, face traffic safety, not having adequate [indiscernible] And affordable housing. If the developer was going to chip in \$300,000 more, my preference at this point would be for it to go to housing. The majority of council may disagree. If we can find the place, where even if I'm in disagreement with it some, we get lots more affordable housing, there's money for transportation and I would prefer for it to be housing but the majority of council would prefer something else, I respect that decision. But in the end, for me, from reading staff's recommendation, the developer has done -- done some he -- you know, some amount, perhaps not enough in your view, on traffic mitigation and I wanted to push as I could to increase the affordable housing component. That's all that is. I agree and understand those market rate units south of that project and in particular or south of this project in particular provide people an important housing option, I'm afraid that we are going to start seeing units like that disappear all over the city, not just by demolition but remodeling. Creating new income restricted units in some way is just keeping up. >> The highest building all the way to San Marcos of -- I'm just trying to -- mopac doesn't go to San Marcos, how many stories is St. David's, which is further away, off of mopac. Is that less than -- isn't the highest tower eight stories in this proposal? >> Seven right now. >> Garza: How many stories is St. David's which is actually further from

[4:02:44 PM]

downtown? >> I believe it's -- >> [Indiscernible]. >> Garza: I thought there was also a development right across from Steck. >> Also the national instruments building, heading north, kind of across from the domain, also I think eight or nine stories based on zooming in on Google. >> It's not the first of this height off of mopac. >>> From there south. >> Mayor Adler: Okay, okay. Anybody hasn't had a chance to speak yet that wants to? Ms. Kitchen? >> Kitchen: I just wanted to say a few words about the traffic mitigation. I think we have to be careful, I think that's what we are trying to do here is find that sweet spot, so to speak, because affordable housing is of course important to all of us. So is traffic. Traffic is a

safety issue, it's an affordability issue, it's an infrastructure issue. It's not just a nice to have. If we end up not managing that piece of our growth, then, you know, people aren't going to be able to get around. And that includes buses aren't going to be able to get around. We're not going to have transit for the people in affordable units, we're going to have all of those kinds of problems. We have to think about how do we -- we have to do these things together. We have to think in terms of our -- of our housing infrastructure in our -- in our traffic -- and our traffic infrastructure and our transportation, all of that together. So I think that that's -- it's a challenge, it's a big challenge. But it's important so we -- when we look at these, we have to look at the impact on all of those pieces. And so I appreciate the proposal being brought forward on affordable housing because, again, that's a priority for me as it is for -- for everyone else. And we just have to figure out a way to do that, that is still -- still takes into account the other impacts on growth, I think. Because, you know, it's got to be like this. Because when we get like this, we don't get what

[4:04:44 PM]

we're trying to get. With the housing. So ... >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Obviously this will be a robust conversation on Thursday as well. >> Casar: I'll be really brief. In summary, councilmember kitchen I think hearing you speak clarifies why I feel passionate about moving the dial on this. I feel like it's like this the other way. In almost every development given the regime that we once we change our rules around to get traffic impact moneys on projects with less than 2,000 trips, there are so many projects where we can generate funds for transportation, still not enough, but it's just so rare for us to be able to do income restricted units and taking advantage of pud opportunities to do that is really important to me. That's -- it's -- that's where trying to level the balance, which is on some projects you have opportunities for one and it's not to say there shouldn't be any traffic mitigation in the least. And that's a critical part of why the proposal and not saying that we should increase the trip count in doing this. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Alter? >> Kitchen: Can I please -- I think we're saying the same thing. The point that I was just trying to make is, you know, the people that live in the affordable housing units need transportation, too. You know so we have to think about the traffic impact and I think we're saying the same thing. I think it's necessary to think about the traffic impact. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Alter, do you want to close? >> Yes, thank you. I really appreciate having this. I will look at it, I will look at it also with the context that I have being that it's my district in terms of where we're potentially plopping this down. I do want to throw out there that if you are going to the affordable housing where you have to have income verification, there are a lot of hoops that you have to go through to get your thousand dollar amount. If right next door you can rent an apartment for \$1,100

[4:06:46 PM]

that's just what the market is offering, you're going to prefer to do that. And if we put in brand new spanking apartments right next to where we have this older stock, we're essentially encouraging all of those apartments to be renovated and become unaffordable. There are over 2,000 apartments just literally next door to this whole area. And that's where there are a lot of students that live there, there are a lot of refugees that live there. There are a lot of low income people who live there. Just people who are trying to get by on their first job, that's where they have chosen to live. They have found that the market is providing lower income, lower levels of affordability, apartments, excuse me, it's getting late. We have been here a long time, my words are scrambling. If the market can provide it there, we are introducing potentially a new variable that will impact that market. I'm not going to go into the school details here, you're going to hear a lot of that from the constituents. But let's just say even if we build a new school, we have over capacity we were told the other day of 900 students of the feeders

that are around that area. If you build a new school, that takes out 500 and doesn't account for adding any new students. So there are a lot of pieces here with our policies that we have to coordinate that have impacts on people who will be going into affordable housing just as councilmember kitchen said with respect to transit. It's incumbent upon us to look at the whole picture for everyone and use the pud to get the most communities benefits. I will look at this. I will see if there are ways that I think we can get more affordable housing. For one if we hold them to the 250 number that we've been told for a long time has been the number in the 25 units that's listed at one point in there that gets you more units. So we do have to be careful as how we look at this. We need to keep the context and we have to also respect that there's been a process that's been going on for a very long time with this,

[4:08:47 PM]

that has been very clear about the heights being a very key issue going back to a prior version of this Charette. I would ask that my colleagues also respect that the neighbors have been working very hard on this and I would say that 80 percent of the neighborhood doesn't want this pud at all. They would be very happy if it failed. I'm working hard to make it so that we do get something of community benefits, if we move forward, with this pud. But, you know, threw the election, through -- through the election, through surveys that we have seen, there are not all that many people who are in favor of it. Even people who do favor it, if they can get it they want more traffic and they want to keep the height down and they want to save more trees. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Casar: I have to respond. >> Mayor Adler: Real quick. >> Casar: To two key points. One is from the process perspective the challenge is again this comes before us as a city-wide council [indiscernible] Key process. Then second as far as introduction of expensive units, I don't see this as that. Because my question would be how much do those homes nearby rent for. At this current time. The houses nearby, you know,. >> The apartments or the houses? >> Casar: Homes. >> Alter: There's, you know, there's the single family homes we have a median price of 685,000 and apartments that are representing for 1,000 right next to each another. >> Casar: I don't see us introducing more expensive product. What we are seeing is the expensive product that is existing is driving end make, that's why you see these apartments coming up. I understand that you disagree. That's fine. I'm just laying out what it is that I think, which is that if you have places where the home is 600, \$700,000, that means the rent is way more significant than you have those apartments, you have redevelopment pressures and whether we approve this pud or not, I believe those redevelopment pressures are coming because I see them occurring across the city and getting income-restricted units on the ground is the only way that I know to mitigate that

[4:10:47 PM]

in this situation. I do think that we are not introducing -- that there is already very expensive housing product in that area. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ready to move on? Ms. Pool? >> Pool: The difference is those homes aren't necessarily for sale. And the people have lived in them probably for decades. Which means when they bought them, they were much less than 600,000. So it really isn't the same. Now the turnover at apartments tend to be a lot more frequent. And I think it's -- it's important to recognition that there are 2,000 units, affordable housingably affordable housing -- priced apartments, just drive over there, drive over to spicewood springs and drive around the area, over by the jewish community center, there's a lot of students housing over there and then south of this there's quite a bit. So I just -- I take some issue with your using the cost of a single family home that has probably increased over time, but it wasn't that price when people actually bought it and frankly most of the people who live there now couldn't afford to buy that house at that price. They might like to sell it at that price to get the big realization on their equity, but most people say these days that if they were to buy their home, that they

are living in now, today, they wouldn't have been able to move to that part of the city. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's move on. Next item we have -- you had a contract item? Do you need to talk about that here or is that a budget question that you can ask, 25? >> The security services I think? >> Mayor Adler: Yes, it is. >> If I'm reading this correctly. >> Mayor Adler: Champion national security. I think the mayor pro tem also had questions on this, I'm sure at some point she will talk to staff. I was reviewing the most

[4:12:49 PM]

recent backup PDF emailed to us which really had great detail in it, I want to thank you for providing it. My question really is when you get down into the details and it breaks out the annual estimated expenditures for security staff, versus for security-contracted staff. There's a fairly significant amount for Austin water. It's not entirely clear to me why that should be contracted and not staff. Water infrastructure doesn't move around, it doesn't appear suddenly like events at the convention center and then what all other departments means, I -- I always struggle when I see things charted out and the other category is the biggest category. So you just -- can you just provide some better detail on that for me, thank you. >> Okay. Anna [indiscernible] Austin water, chief support services officer. So this contract will provide our security guard staffing, which we do contract out for our security guards, they are in fixed posts around our system. We also have an in-house staff that designs our security systems and oversees upgrades and oversees the contracted staff. We have used this approach because it provides us the best combination of pricing and flexibility to respond to changing needs. So under the contract, we have fixed post, but we also have the ability to bring on the additional staff within 24 hours notice and we have the ability to remove those fixed posts with 24 hours notice. >> And I do appreciate that combining all of the contracted security staff under one umbrella, it's a great way to go. I think we're just harping out some of the details to

[4:14:49 PM]

make sure that the community fully understands when we are going to staff, when we are going to contract. Can you help me understand where Austin water has variable security needs? >> Okay. The majority of this contract does provide fixed staffing. We vary that according to operational needs. Sometimes we have hot spots where we might have additional contract staff coming for large construction projects. In those cases we're going to need more staff on site as we bring in on site contractors to our sites. Sometimes we have hot spots where we have security instances, such as vandalism, theft of our assets or other types of personnel situations where we need to staff up. But our model is majority fixed staffing. We do like to maintain the flexibility within that model and we do adjust that staff as needed within our operation. I would like to point out this contract provides coverage in 17 fixed posts, but it also provides coverage as needed in about 45 additional sites around the city. So we are utilizing post but we are also utilizing mobile patrol that visit those sites. >> Okay. And can you help me understand what other includes? It's a pretty big number compared to the other numbers. >> Councilmember, we agree. [Laughter]. We wish that we had a different answer. When we had the discussion at the last council meeting, and we went back to the departments and to our buyers and started analyzing what the -- to have a better feel for what the city's consumption of the security guard services was, we -- in asking the question how many security guards do we have, it turns out it was a much

[4:16:51 PM]

more complicated answer than we anticipated. Security guard in itself is a position that provides 100% security services. But then add to that you have security guard lead, you have a security guard supervisor, you have a security coordinator, we have a -- we have an other ancillary positions that provide other services with an element -- but an element of their work is security related. So it was hard for us to get a complete number. So we provided the best number that we had on Friday to include with the item. We actually have more details as of today and we have another version of the memo in development right now. >> Excellent, thank you, Ed. Really why I pulled this for work session was more so -- my expectation is that we generally have a policy that says bring people on to staff. If you're going to work for the citizens of Austin, we want to make sure that you have benefits, that you are safe in your families, that this is why we provide benefits. If these -- especially these Austin water positions where they are fixed posts, should this not fall under a policy matter where we're saying we want staff, we acknowledge that it can be more expensive, but because these are the people who in this case protect our community, we want to make sure that they are being treated as employees the way we treat a lot of our staff. These -- the flip side to that conversation is if we are deciding that, you know, we need to be as fiscally responsible as we can with security services, then why are we not contracting more? Why are we not pulling staff down and making a contract? If the cost savings are as dramatic as I have seen elsewhere in this memo, I feel like we are going halfway to a solution that's just not making sense to me. It's why I wanted to bring it up today because I wanted all of us on the council,

[4:18:53 PM]

empty seats notwithstanding, to be able to hear this and hear me say it. I can see an argument that said go for more contracted security staff. There's some reasoning around why that's significantly more affordable to the taxpayers. I also see the argument who said we want people who are protecting our cities, assets, resources to have the good benefits that we provide the rest of our staff. But this half measure seems to go neither way. Now, that doesn't include the convention center ones where obviously you've got an event that goes way up, then goes way down. But some of these visions are clearly -- positions are clearly staff level positions. I think you all have done a good job. I'm looking take murder to a new memo but I think this is where it becomes a policy question, we are either doing the staff or contracting, I don't understand the half measure. >> Mayor Adler: Is it also part of that policy conversation to contract that out but require [indiscernible] That meets whatever standards there are? I don't know. Anybody else wants to speak to this issue? Okay. Then we'll go to the next one. Item no. 27. I understand that the this is the m/w.b.e. item. I understand that staff is going to be requesting a postponement. On this item. Is that right? >> Yes. Council, Veronica [indiscernible] Director of the small minority business resources department. We will be putting the postponement on changes and corrections for Thursday. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. So as you're pulling it down and taking another look at it, the questions that you need to answer now because it will be part of the conversation. I know that we set certain goals to increase what the minimum targets were. In these contracting this seems to work the other way on those, with respect to

[4:20:54 PM]

those numbers. There was some questions about how we reached those percentages, if we are properly picking up both the universe of qualified entities and are we picking up the right number of non-qualified or just the universe people. You know, the kind of the numerator and denominator discussions. Some questions about the denominator issue with -- with respect to that. Then I think it also brings up the question that Ms. Houston was asking, where we have a lot of whether it's a primary contractor, positions where we don't have goals being able to be established and some questions about whether or

not there's something we can be doing in that area. All of those questions as you take a look at them. If you have answers to them, you can give -- >> I don't have all of the answers today. But that was one of the reasons why we're postponing it, as council is aware, we brought this to you at the end of the year last year. We postponed it at that time so that I could meet with the businesses concerned about the disparity study. I have since had a series of meetings, several questions have been raised and I'm working to address those questions. I want to make sure that we address those questions before bringing it back to you. If we have not done that in two weeks, we will postpone that and bring that back to you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Thank you. Anything else on this item? Thank you very much. Item no. 31. This was the park issue. Mr. Flannigan you pulled this one. >> Flannigan: I was curious to staff to help me understand better the zoning properties to the public designation, but at what point does parkland become subject to the can't change the use unless the voters approve it issue? Then there's a policy question after that. But I want to understand this better before I ask the policy question. >> Councilmember, Ricardo Soliz with the parks and recreation department. We have five ways where

[4:22:56 PM]

parkland is dedicated. One is really looking at the source of funding. So in particular onion creek metro park was a parks bond, so we -- we bought that land back in early 2000s with a park bond. Another way is dedication by deed. Council action is another method. A gift, dedicating it by a donor. Dedication by plat, which we review those plats and it's parkland dedication requirement that we have. So those are the methods as to how it gets dedicated as parkland. >> So in this case, the [indiscernible] Metro park, it's parkland because -- >> We purchased that. >> Onion creek greenbelt same thing. >> Same thing. >> Flannigan: All right. I have no other questions then. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Okay. Those were all of the pulled items that we had. We also had this briefing on -- on -- on Austin -- the mobility bond issue. And it's an opportunity, just a briefing, so it's an opportunity to air this out. It's 4:25 now. I hate to put this off and pick it up at the end of the month, because there's like a two-week delay at this point. At the same time we're late in the day. When does the next mobility committee meet? >> Tomorrow. >> Mayor Adler: Huh? >> Kitchen: Tomorrow. >> Mayor Adler: Is it possible to have this briefing done there tomorrow. >> Kitchen: I think so. It's not a -- >> Mayor Adler: It's not posted, we couldn't do it tomorrow. >> Kitchen: Well -- it's not posted. I'm trying to think if there's anything broad enough -- probably not.

[4:24:59 PM]

Then the next one after -- well, no, because our next work session is -- well, this is a pretty detailed, we really need to dig into this. You know. So it's a briefing, but it's also something that you all are bringing back to us in terms of what the priorities are and in the different areas. Not the corridor improvements, but the other areas. >> Mayor Adler: Let's talk then, Robert. And rob in terms of suggestions. It's obviously late in the day. You are missing a lot of the councilmembers on the dais. >> Kitchen: Yeah. >> Mayor Adler: So we're trying to weigh timeliness versus completeness. There certainly is a book that people could spend a lot of time going through that. If we push this off and then set it for a briefing when we next come back after spring break, does that -- does that throw us off on timing. >> Robert good, assistant city manager. I see two or three alternatives. For one we try to do the presentation, there's not a lot of speaking notes. It's pretty comprehensive just the way you see it. You're going to hear me say what's on the slides that you can read, there's not a lot more that we're going to give Ya. So one -- one potential way we're marching along is you can give us questions on what you see, as councilmember. Flannigan gaveme one. We are sit again for April for the mobility committee for the quarterly report. We could do the whole thing in April and invite whoever council wants to come as well.

One alternative. Second alternative is schedule it begin for after spring break, we can come back and do that same thing or third, just give us any questions that you have, we are marching along and will bring things back to you on-- if you look on slide 93 to 97, those are all of our next steps. You can see clearly when council is involved, things that we are doing in the

[4:27:00 PM]

next six months, that really kind of gives you an idea about when you are going to see items, councilmember kitchen is right, we're going to start in June, sidewalk items that are in the report, a whole list of the sidewalks that we are doing are in the report. We truly recommend letting us go do that. Then the next phase of sidewalk projects we're going to be working with your offices to try to get some better -- more feedback, because right, wrong or different there's a lot of sidewalk needs and we can work with you to fix some sidewalks in your district that you might think are more appropriate than the ones that are listed in the next phase. Again, there's not a whole lot that we are launching in the next few weeks. We're not going to start, we're going to keep marching along in those next steps that start on slide 93. >> Kitchen: I have a quick question that relates to what you just said. You are going to move ahead with the particular projects that are in here, right? So that's -- that's what I thought was very important for the council to have the ability to weigh in on. I don't know that makes a difference in the next month. But the point being is that I do have some feedback on the sidewalks. I mean, I have some concerns that district 5 is only showing under this criteria some -- amazingly small number of sidewalks. I need to understand why that is, I may have some concerns about that. So -- so I want to make sure that we have this conversation in time for councilmembers to weigh in on it. I also want to understand where -- where along the way were we voting on things? I know we were supposed to be voting on the corridor before any of the corridors are implemented. But these other items thinking that we were going to have the list of projects so that we could weigh in on them before they started. >> We've -- in one section of the presentation, there's

[4:29:00 PM]

a council oversight. That explains the existing process and also explains some of the enhancements that we recommend that you all look at. Typically, on a bucket program like that, you wouldn't vote on every single sidewalk that staff implements. >> Kitchen: Right. >> So we don't have that in our next step to bring a sidewalk list to you that says here are the 150 sidewalks we're launching in the next two months. [Indiscernible] Implementation phase for the city manager, council sends the boll >> Kitchen: But the oversight process, remember the resolution said that in 90 days that you all would bring back a proposed oversight process for us to vote on. Yes. It says for us to approve in the resolution. So that's in here, right. I don't know that a month makes a difference in terms of us reviewing it, but I don't want to lose sight of the things that council is supposed to weigh in on. So we could sew owe. >> Mayor Adler: With the issues here that are moving forward in terms of next steps that relate to the things that the council would be weighing in, seems to be that initial list of sidewalks. >> It's that the idiq contract, that's the contractor on board. There's no official documentation, no official action that council says those -- that's the list of sidewalks you go build. We included in the report just so you can give us feedback on we'd rather you have -- to be frank with you, that's the list we'd like to just launch. We want early out projects. There are three years' worth of sidewalks and there are 590 miles of sidewalks we're trying to build with 60 miles' worth of funding. So there's a lot of give and take we can work with you in the next months and years to come. Let us go get some stuff on the ground. That's the -- >> Mayor Adler: Let's say

[4:31:01 PM]

this, then. Everybody needs to take a look at the sidewalks that are listed on the go list and if anybody has any problem with the go list, communicate it on the message board. In the absence of comments on the message board that raise the issue, red flag where we need to meet on it, then you could go on that list, but I think there will at least be a further and more in-depth conversation as you get to that second group of sidewalks right after that. >> That's right. >> Kitchen: So I don't think we answered. We still need to have either the next mobility committee or the next work session. We need to -- you know, I'm happy to do this in mobility committee. It depends on what the rest of the council wants, but we need to dig into this in detail. >> Mayor Adler: Right. I think we're asking everybody to dig into the sidewalks right away. So if people want to chase them off of the go launch on the sidewalks, they need to register that in the bulletin board. If not they will go launch on at least that small subpart of it. >> Kitchen: But that's not instead of us rescheduling this. >> Mayor Adler: No. We need to do that as well. Mr. Casar and then Ms. Pool. >> Casar: I'm looking forward to leafing through that list. I guess I would like to clarify for the group and staff, that since we did recently approve the updates to that sidewalk master making any changes I would just want to know how that come ports with the criteria that we've laid out. And that's not saying that I would be opposed to a change, if there's a good reason for one, but I do think that the fairest way of doing this is to set up the best criteria that we can for where the sidewalks are most needed as we voted on recently. And to do our best to try sticking to that criteria as much as we can through the first traunch and then seeing how that goes. >> Yes. And I didn't mean, by wait, there's 390 miles of identified sidewalks in that master plan. We're going to be able to

[4:33:04 PM]

build 60 miles of that. So we have plenty of need. We could switch those in there's a high need. We could replace one of those if there's a high need. There's some flexibility on the sidewalks. >> Casar: But understanding there are some that extremely high need -- >> And others that are -- >> Casar: And the ones that are at the very highest level if any of those would be swapped out with anything lower than that, I would have concerns about it. Until or unless we could get explained what actually when we take into account ab and C, that's the reason that this one is ranked as high need. I understand that our criteria aren't going to be perfect, but I want to make sure that we are trying to stick to, you know, really getting the very highest need sidewalks out there, which are my understanding largely in districts 1 and 3 and that is what it is. >> Kitchen: So I have a question. A couple of things. Is there a website that has all of this that I can direct folks in the newsletter? >> We're starting that. It's part of the enhancement process. We're going to invent a whole new website that will be much more transparent. We have it in the existing website now and we'll start feeding that. You will see improvements to that pretty dramatically. >> We have plans that have a protestty proceed bust project reporting capability on the website. These materials will be up on the website as well for folks to take a look at. And I definitely would recommend digging into this and reading because a lot of the context for how we got to the priorities are in the report and the briefing materials. >> Pool: The sidewalk master plan was already addressed by councilmember Casar. So my question the quarter funds list and timeline,

[4:35:04 PM]

where is that? And how does that intersect with this. >> The quarter cent fund was established by council, previous council. And we're working on a reporting mechanism right now to come back to you all, especially because that happened before the bond program and come back with each -- into each council office and say is that still a list of projects you all want to do. Now that you know what happened

in 2016. So we're putting together some basic information and as soon as we get that done we'll be meeting with each council office because you may decide to change some of our priorities on your quarter cent funds. We'll give you a report that says this is what you told us you will do. Here's how much we've spent in your district so far. Here's how much we have left. Do you want to change anything. >> Pool: Okay. >> We'll be working with each council office on that because you remember that was allocated per council district. >> Pool: Right. And it seems like it was 100 years ago. [Laughter] So what is the time frame for that? >> We should be coming forward in the next few weeks. We're finalizing the report. The first report didn't have all the information. I think you would want to see how much is spent and so we're finalizing that and should be able to come guard in the next few weeks. >> Pool: And I would point out to my colleagues that the last tab here does have new sidewalks and the potential with the segment length, the construction constraint ratings, the district and the street names and so forth. So this is -- >> There's two lists. The first one I think has the green. That's the early out ones. And the second one is the next phase that you look at both lists, but the next phase is where we really need your input on. Is that the right sidewalk? There's another one on the high end, very high priority. >> Pool: And I think councilmember Flannigan will appreciate the choice of colors being green and blue. [Laughter] To address his -- >> We worked on this presentation to try to get it to where you could see. I'm not sure we're there yet. >> Flannigan: I love it. >> Pool: I would suggest purple because that would rope in councilmember Houston. Thank you. It's been a long day, but we

[4:37:05 PM]

are thinking we should open and close with a joke at some point. [Laughter]. >> Mayor Adler: Absolutely. That's a good idea. So this report, as we have it here now, is sufficient on its face. It is a report to both the mobility committee and the council. Beyond that we want to have it brought orally at the April meeting for the mobility committee. And if the council on the bulletin board expresses a need otherwise, then we can set this to come back to the council for a appreciation as well. And if it's going to be presented to the council in the last week of March then you could make a decision about whether or not it's necessary to bring it to the nobility as well. You may want to go into further departmentth or other issues. >> Kitchen: Can we make a decision now whether to bring it to work session or mobility? >> Mayor Adler: In April? >> Kitchen: No, in March. I'm sorry, I misunderstood. You said we bring it to mobility in April and if we also need to bring it to council. So that what you said? >> Mayor Adler: That's what I'm saying. If people want this to come back to council because they want it in front of council. If they want this report that have been issued to both mobility and to council, if they want to actually discuss it on the message board, weigh in to that and then we can set it the last week of March. Otherwise the next oral presentation of this would just be at the mobility committee at your meeting in April. >> Kitchen: And the process -- the process -- the council has to vote on the process because that is something that we put in resolution that it come back to council. So -- but that was the 90 days after there's a requirement. >> Mayor Adler: I think it said within 90 days the city manager brings forward the recommendation of council with the approval outlining a process for Canaan cover sight, a report to mobility committee, report to full council, timeline and process reporting for the citizens bond committee. Is that all contained in

[4:39:06 PM]

here? So we have not gotten the report within 90 days that tells us this. So we all need to review this. What we've said is there is a default right now to go ahead and launch the green items, absent people weighing in. And if council wants to have an oral discussion of this we could have that in March or it could go to that committee and we could certainly bring in whatever ordinances or resolutions we want

voting to adopt. And it probably wouldn't be a bad thing to D it's not required by the language as I read it because it was just a report coming back, but I would be in favor of that happening. >> Kitchen: The intention of the council was to vote on it. That's part of the language I worked on. And the intent of the council was to vote on this. >> Mayor Adler: Do you want it to be at the end of March or -- >> Kitchen: It sounds like it's not realtime sensitive. It can come at the time of the-- >> Mayor Adler: After the mobility? >> Kitchen: That's fine. >> Mayor Adler: And that's fine. >> Kitchen: I do want to say one other thing. On the sidewalks, the question that I'm going to have to you, just to give you an idea of the kind of drill down I want to do, is this says, you know, slide 37 says very high and high priority. And I'm assuming this is new sidewalks, not sidewalks -- >> Absent sidewalks. >> Kitchen: It's not sidewalk repair. >> Right. >> Kitchen: Then there's a question about whether this should be applied to new sidewalks or sidewalk repair. And that's the kind of detail that I want to dig into so I'm understanding what decisions have been made about how priorities are set. Because that -- I mean, our bond doesn't say new sidewalks versus repair on sidewalks. And I certainly respect -- I'm not saying it should be otherwise. I'm just saying that those kinds of decisions are built in to what was decided here. And you know, it could be that some sidewalks are in such disrepair that you can't use them in some

[4:41:06 PM]

districts and they might as well be -- and that makes them a very high priority. So those are -- that's the kind of drill-down that I'm going to want to ask about. I'll do my homework and read through this, but -- and that's why I'm asking questions about district 5 because it shows 15 miles. My understanding and what I know about my district in terms of the status of sidewalks, that just doesn't seem to fit. So I'm not trying to change the criteria. I know we've got criteria and the criteria needs to be applied. I just don't understand how it yields this for district 5. So that's just to tell you the kinds of questions. The other thing I think that's important to understand is what are the inherent decisions that are made? Because obviously we don't have enough money for everything. So I just think it's important for councilmembers to understand what those are. So I appreciate all this detail. This is great. >> Sure. And those are -- that's a great example of some questions that you can give to us and we can prepare for that April presentation at mobility or however we're coming back. >> Mayor Adler: This material that we're all looking at in front of us was posted as backup to this agenda today on Friday. So all of this book in it material is presently available online if anybody in the community wants to see it. Mr. Flannigan and Ms. Pool? >> Flannigan: I want to reiterate councilmember kitchen's earlier statement that all of us need to deep dive into this documentation similarly to how we've done to our budget sessions. For district 6 it's a little easier. The projects are far less frequent. So I can jump right to district 6 stuff and there's only two or three to look at. But the one sidewalk I've got it adjacent to a larger corridor so then I have questions about well, do you build the sidewalk before you build the corridor? If it's all sitting right there together. And I can imagine that in other districts those would be even more complicated conversations. And I think it's an appropriate place for councilmembers to say, my community is willing to postpone that because the other one is more important to them even though both are on the high priority list? And I think that's really a great role for us to have

[4:43:06 PM]

both to acknowledge the on the ground priorities over the next eight years of implementation compared to the corridors and the regional projects and all the other elements. >> Kitchen: Okay. Ms. Pool? >> Pool: I've got an easy one. Can you tell us the date or which week? Like the second Tuesday in April or whenever so that we can -- >> First Wednesday of the month. >> Pool: We will put it on our calendars because we might schedule over it. >> Unless we change it. Typically it's the first Wednesday.

>> Pool: 2:00 start or 3:00. >> Kitchen: 3:00. >> Pool: What we'll do is we won't have the slide, slide, slide presentation, right, because we've got that. We'll just go directly to the content, is that right? >> My hope would be I wouldn't present 100 slides to you in April. >> Pool: Good. >> And by the way, we had 130, it went up to 150. We put some in the appendix. We are frankly struggling on how much detail you all want, because we're -- we are. On the bottom. Because I can spend four hours on each one of these programs by themselves. And staff has done a tremendous amount of job, tremendous amount of work. Years worth of work in four months and I want to give a shout out to them. I've pushed and pulled and prodded and every time I've asked they've come through. So you can see the result of that a lot of detail now we're trying to figure out how much you need to be presented to you, how much you need to review and give us questions back. And please as you see that, give us more direction on how to move forward with the program. Look at the oversight part. I think that adds some enhancements to that so you can see what we're proposing and how often we communicate with you. >> Pool: Then we'll be able to make one on one appointments with you guys to -- just on our district. >> Absolutely. >> Mayor Adler: And the work being done by staff is well noticed on this, both in this and with the reports that you've given up to this point and the way you've set

[4:45:07 PM]

this forward. And I think that it's so important for us to really be able to get the community's trust and are executing that and you guys are delivering in terms of speed and tempo and detail. So thank you. Anybody else have anything? >> Kitchen: Yes, I do. Time certain? For item number 61, 4:00 P.M. >> Mayor Adler: No earlier -- what is item number 61. >> Thornton road zoning case. >> Mayor Adler: That would work with me. Okay? Then we're done. It is 4:45. And I adjourn this meeting.