

City Council Budget Adoption Reading Transcript – 09/12/2017

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 9/12/2017 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 9/12/2017

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[9:44:08 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Guys, we ready to go ahead and gear this up? Okay. September 13th, we're in the city council chambers. It's the continuation of our budget hearings. September 13th, 2017 --

>> It's the 12th.

>> Mayor Adler: It's the 12th, not the 13th yet. It's better than saying the 11th. It is the 12th of September. 9:44. So for process today, I think we have folks that are coming down to gather. My recommendation would be that we set an agenda so that we can actually start making some decisions and move forward. So I would recommend that generally speaking we spend going to handle the kitchen issues that came up so we can get a discussion of those.

[9:46:20 AM]

Hopefully we'll be able to move through those. Then I would suggest that we talk about a general five and a half-million-dollar budget and see if we can end the day with a general feel for that, recognizing that votes we take can be massaged as we make decisions so a vote on a number can be revisited as we get other numbers, but generally that. That we have a conversation then on Wednesday with respect to hot, is it 8.6 or is it more? And is there money from that 8.6 that we can designate either for historical or to offset general fund if we get additional money in the budget? And then we would know what our discussions were the day before in case anything didn't make it. And over the course of today and tomorrow, I think we could identify those things that we wanted to address as we did budget amendments. We got an amendment -- we could do budget amendments in the short future either because we were able to progress on hot tax discussion either by additional general fund spending that

we can't identify today or tomorrow or we resolve a public safety contract and that gives us additional money in the budget. So that we don't feel like we have to make all the decisions on all items today. Ms. Kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Just a thought. My thought would be -- that framework sounds good to me. I have one suggestion. I think with regard to one aspect of the hot tax related to the -- related to the list of potential dollars -- list of potential projects that could be funded. I think that may be something that we could address relatively -- I hate to say quickly, but relatively straightforward later this afternoon. And I think it would be helpful because it will help me at least with regard to understanding what we're going to do with that and understanding what we might -- it will help me with the five million.

[9:48:31 AM]

At this point I'm not prepared to vote on that without having some understanding of how we're going to treat that. And I know you're trying to move things quickly, but I think if we -- I think we could do that in an expeditious way this afternoon.

>> Mayor Adler: Right. And I'm fine this afternoon touching base and seeing where we are on the hot tax, but to be clear I'm not recommending that we vote on a five-million-dollar budget today, just that we have conversations and we narrow it down.

>> Kitchen: All right.

>> Mayor Adler: We don't take votes on finalizing any of the budgets until we get to the very end tomorrow because we'll be learning things over the course of that period of time that could change that. But I do see us as a group trying to make some decisions or get some indications of where people are by taking votes, recognizing that if there's additional money we could change things.

>> Kitchen: Yeah. I'm not certain that -- well, I don't want to spend a lot of time speculating. I'm just signaling that at this point my ability to get us down to five million is dependent on my understanding what we're going to do with the hot tax.

>> Mayor Adler: Understand. Mayor pro tem?

>> Tovo: I do agree with Ms. Kitchen. I do feel some urgency about getting at least some preliminary decisions made and I would be very comfortable on voting on some initial -- on an initial list of that five million with the absolute agreement that we would revisit it tomorrow or before we pass a final budget. I also just want to note I didn't have an opportunity yesterday to ask some of the questions of staff that to know if there are other places that we might have funding. So I wanted to signal, mayor, at the appropriate time pretty early if I could ask -- I have asked some questions of staff and we haven't been able to circle around on one of them. I have a second about the second street if I haven't been able to

close the loop on. I want to talk about some of the expenditures out of the budget stabilization reserve and see if any of those are not critical. And I would also like to talk about some increases that are proposed for mayor and council budgets.

[9:50:33 AM]

Likewise I have a question about the police travel. I've been looking over some of the travel budgets and I want an answer from APD about why their travel budget is -- and ctm's are on the high end of that. So if we could -- I think we did this one previous year where we kind of signaled to staff -- those are going to be very quick discussions but it will take some preparation so if you could give me a sense of when we might have time for me to fly through some of those questions that would be helpful and we can give the staff a head's up.

>> Mayor Adler: I would be fine with flying through those pretty quickly if they're going to go fast, right through after we go through Anne Clark's things.

-- Ann kitchen's things. But I've handed out slightly revised, a worksheet of things that were listed by multiple people. I've highlighted in yellow some of the things that I think we ought to talk about because they're big ticket items in terms of approach. How we make decisions, how do we deal with what are poem's thoughts to homelessness, homeless services, pay for success, the senior exemption is also an issue. Aisd or school support services. The HHS contracts, the quality of life initiatives and then public safety issues. I think some we can defer, but I think if we hit those big issues, kind of a discussion on the dais, that will help us focus down and figure out where we are as a group to narrow us down. I would like to get to those conversations as quickly as we could as well. I think that will give us all direction. In addition to telescoping down on small issues which -- is an easier thing for us to do and where we go so easily. So if that's okay, then we'll proceed that way. Ann, do you want to bring up issues --

>> Houston: At some point I would like to have a brief conversation with folks from the parks and recreation department from the carver museum.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

[9:52:33 AM]

>> Alter: Mayor, I wanted to mention that I still have on the table radios for --

>> Mayor Adler: Radios for police?

>> Alter: No, this is the animal radios. For 400 some thousand dollars, whether we could postpone those.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ms. Kitchen, do you want to go through yours. We'll do hers and then we'll do those issues. Go ahead.

>> Kitchen: Okay. I passed these out yesterday. The first one relates to the development services budget. Would you like me to make the motion or just lay it out and discuss --

>> Mayor Adler: Why don't you lay it out and then we'll have staff respond to it.

>> Kitchen: Okay. We talked about this at work session and then I passed out information before. This has to do with the line item increase. And I want to emphasize it's an increase from last year. There's a line item increase in funding for temporary employees to meet customer demand and maintain service levels. That's how it's styled. The concern I was raising is it was a -- if I have my facts correct, it's a 1.3-million-dollar increase from last year along with 51 additional ftes. So from my perspective in the information we've gotten from the department, this amount was arrived at by speaking -- by determining historical funding. So in other words, I take that to mean that they were looking at the needs from the last time. And the needs from the last time in terms of what they needed for temporary employees. So from my perspective, I think that given fact that we were talking about 51 additional ftes that an increase of that level in temporary employees is not something that I can support in the environment that we're in right now with the other pressing needs that we have.

[9:54:39 AM]

I think that we are taking care of the Zucker report with some level of additional ftes, and I -- the amount that's requested in the 51 is significant. So my proposal is going to be to cut back the amount of the temporary and either to cut it out entirely or to cut one million out of it. So -- now, I also want to speak to -- well, I'll just leave it at that and then we'll see --

>> Mayor Adler: Let's hit that one first. Is staff here to respond to this?

>> Garza: Mayor? One of mine is kind of in line with the same thing and I'm not sure. Mine is the same concern about the fees going up. So it's kind of the same thing but I didn't have a number. I was just opposed to the fees going up. And we received some emails in the last couple of days from the folks who build that have significant differences in what development services is telling us what fees go up and what they're saying fees will look like for some of them projects and it's significant. It's going from about 2,000 to 12,000 in some instances. So anyway, if we could talk about all that together.

>> Kitchen: Yes, that's fine. I would be supportive of using some level of dollars to get fees. I am also looking for dollars that we can use for other sources too. So I would be open to --

>> Mayor Adler: Other things within development services.

>> Kitchen: No. I'm looking for some dollars to be used for other things outside of development services. I understand the concern about fees and I would like to have a discussion about that, but my understanding is that the development services department gets some funds from our general fund. And so that we could use some of the savings outside of dsd without -- without running afoul of the laws with regard to fees.

[9:56:54 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: So I think there are two discrete questions. One is the savings we could take and if we get the savings do we use it to reduce development services fees or do we try to create a general fund savings of it. I think those are the two questions presented. Rodney?

>> I would suggest letting Rodney respond with regards to the actual reduction and what the complications or consequences of that might would be, but in regards to the fees we are confined by state law in terms of what we can do with the fees that we charge. There has to be a nexus between what we're charging and the service that's being provided. And that's one of the tasks Rodney has taken to heart and one of the recommendations in the Zucker report would be to move the department to full cost recovery, to fully recover everything that's related to development application through the development fees, which is what we're currently doing. And so how see how this could landfill be a general fund source of revenue to the department, to the development activities at least would need to come with a co-measure of reduction in the fees since we're at the full cost recovery level. The department does have about three and a half million dollars of funding in its budget that's not being recovered by fees. But that's associated with fee waivers for a variety of housing programs, smart housing, for example, and also the urban forestry program. The reduction of those programs could result in a general fund savings, but reductions to anything having to do with permitting, plan review, inspections, would need to come with a commiserate reduction in fees.

>> Kitchen: I have a follow-up question related to that. Help me understand. So my understanding of -- just bear with me a little bit. My understanding of how we establish the fees -- and this was from a transferring that we had in work session. Is we established the fees based on an understanding of how much time it would take to perform certain functions.

[9:59:00 AM]

So -- and then a dollar amount is associated to that time. I assume that that dollar amount is associated with the staffing that you need to do that and how much you pay the staff and that sort of thing. So the question I have is that exercise in terms of setting the fees was not the same exercise as setting budget. So you're setting the fees based on the cost for that particular item but you're not setting the fees directly related to the budget. So that's a piece of information that I need to understand. So the other thing that I'm understanding about the law is as long as your fees don't translate into charging someone more than the cost, if I'm understanding correctly, Lela, as long as your fees are -- someone is not paying more than the cost, then they don't -- then you're within the law. So with that in mind -- so is what you're telling me -- how do you arrive at the budget in such a way that it's directly connected to the fees?

>> Well, they hired a consultant, matrix consulting, to do a cost of service study so matrix in doing their work is looking at the total cost of delivering those activities. Maybe Rodney can help me. I believe this year they did it in a prospective fashion. They're looking at the total budget or costs related to those functions and then they're determining what the fee per unit would need to be based upon the volume that's being projected. So the bottom line is we are attempting to set fees and it's always a bit of a best guess, our best estimate because we're attempting to set fees in a way that we generate revenues in a line with expenditures. There are a lot of variables with that. That's how we budget it. If you take away that three and a half million dollars that we talked about, the remaining expenses are exactly offset by the revenues we're projecting to get from those activities.

[10:01:04 AM]

And so as soon as we reduce the expenditures we would have a budget where we're now projecting that we'll get revenues in excess of what the lawfully allocated costs are.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So then the activities that occur within that budget, taking the 3.5 million away. The activities that occur in that budget are only activities related directly to the fee.

>> That's right.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So you're not doing anything else other than reviewing applications for people.

>> It's not just the staffing costs, though. It's administrative costs. It's facility rental costs. It's cost of computers, cost of vehicle replacements. Everything that we can lawfully recover through those fees that's related to doing that work we're recovering.

>> Including the -- so you said facilities, rent?

>> Facilities, rent, administrative overhead, utility costs, it's all in the model.

>> Kitchen: All of those are allocated into the fee structure?

>> Even corporate hr functions, corporate financial functions that are allocated, a portion of those costs are allocated to that cost center to be recovered through the fees.

>> Kitchen: Okay. So let me ask you about the 3.5 million. What are those services for?

>> I think the two big buckets are the urban forestry program and then a variety of fee waivers. I know one of the fee waivers had to do with Google fiber and kind of getting to the end of my rope on my memory there.

>> Rodry Gonzalez, director of development services. The delta is 2.5 million and it's primarily fee waivers primarily through the smart housing growth initiative. The other piece is related to telecom permitting. You may recall that Google had selected Austin as its second Google fiber city. And there is some associated telecom permitting with that, but not just with Google, but with also our internal utilities as well. So it's primarily those functions that we're covering through the 21 because we can't recoup a fee for those functions.

[10:03:13 AM]

>> Kitchen: How does it break down? I didn't quite understand. Did you say it was 3.5 or 5.2.

>> It's 5.2. You may recall the presentation that we gave to council back in August, we had that delta. I'll bring up the presentation right now. What we're going to see you is a slide from our presentation back in August.

>> Kitchen: Yeah. What I'm looking for is a breakdown of the 5.2.

>> Yes. A breakdown of the 5.2, I know I have it, but maybe Meredith will have it who is on our staff, but we can certainly give you the break down of the 5.2?

>> Tovo: May I ask a question. You're talking about the 5.2 from general fund?

>> Kitchen: That's right.

>> Tovo: I'm certain that we asked for that as a Q and a and I'm not finding it in the Q and a. Do you know if it is in the formal Q and a process?

>> I don't recall if it is in the formal Q and a, but the broke down I have in front of me. We have the --

>> Tovo: Let me just note for next year I think we were asking questions in the budget Q and a sessions and didn't necessarily follow up with form mall submissions. So some of the questions that I have been looking for answers to in the Q and a just aren't there because one of us didn't follow up with a written question. I think we thought that it was going to be bumped up.

>> Mayor Adler: We ought to finish every one of those sessions where if you could publish the questions or just record the questions on each day, then you have come away with that need to be answered, then somebody who asked a question who didn't see it on the list would know it wasn't caught.

>> Tovo: Or we just had an expectation that it's not a place where questions will be captured. Again, there may be several missing. Thanks.

>> I will say that that is our process to listen carefully to what council is talking about at work session and try to answer questions, but we will not post them unless we get confirmation from the council office that we captured it correctly if there was any nuances to it.

[10:05:24 AM]

Typically what we do is we will capture the questions that we have, we'll send to the council office seeking verification do you want these posts. We may well have missed that question.

>> Mayor Adler: The problem there is if someone else on the dais asked the question, we wouldn't know that it hasn't been processed. If you go back to the person who asked the question, then the rest of the dais didn't know that it hasn't been confirmed as a question to be asked. But if you sent the questions out to everyone at that point then everybody would be able to know.

>> I think we can tighten that process up to achieve those goals.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's say where we are just we need to move through and we're drilling down here pretty far.

>> Kitchen: Thank you for putting this. On so that we can get through it expeditiously. I'm going to focus us. So what I'm seeing in -- can you put that back up, please? Okay. I'm seeing a net of 5.2 million out of the general fund. And I'm seeing a number of items that just from my perspective it appears to me there might be some room for some savings. And then one last related question. The temporary employees, so Mr. Van eenoo, are the temporary employees, are they connected to the fee?

>> They are.

>> Kitchen: All right. So in the spirit of what we talked about yesterday, I would not want to -- I would not want to make the decision for you for your department on where you would want to move money around. So the motion that I intend to make is to reduce the budget by a million, and the reason I'm suggesting that is because you have 5.2 million here. And we can have a discussion. I'm laying that out as the motion. And in fact, to move us along I'm just going to make a motion that we reduce the dsd budget by one million to take it out of the general fund and then I'm open to some conversation about that.

[10:07:32 AM]

But in looking at the dollars that are available here -- and that motion is, let me back up, I'm making a motion that we take one million dollars in savings out of the net general fund that is contributed to dsd and that we -- and that we just leave it to the staff to determine where those dollars come from.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm confused. The dollars that --

owe.>> Kitchen: Can I make my motion first and then we can talk about it?

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen recommends reducing the dsd budget by one million dollars out of general fund monies brought into the department, which I guess go to that 5.2-million-dollar bucket. So Ms. Kitchen moves to take one million dollars out of the \$5.2 million going into the dsd budget. Is there a second to that? Mayor pro tem seconds that.

>> Kitchen: Okay. For purposes of discussion, because from my perspective I think there are a number of items on here that could be reduced and you would also have the ability to move some things around. So that's where I'm at.

>> Mayor Adler: What does that mean? If you lost a million dollars out of the \$5.2 million, what -- what would get cut?

>> What that would mean is what we would cut through staff action are the positions associated with telecom permitting and there's an impact to service delivery with regard to that. The urban forestry program, there are permanent positions there and that's the bulk of the program. There are hardly any dollars for commodities associated with that. And so that would affect permanent positions in that program. The remaining piece is the fee waivers but those are adopted fee I can't council ordinance so it would take a council amendment to that ordinance whereby we would cap the total amount of the fee waivers provided through dsd.

[10:09:37 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: So from where I sit, from me I'm going to vote no on this because I am really uncomfortable with us on the dais making a 20% cut to programs that we haven't seen. If we want to handle something like that outside of the budget and we want to take a look at those programs and had a longer or better time -- just again this feels like the wrong thing for us to be doing in budget process.

>> Kitchen: Mr. Mayor, I have a question. This sheet doesn't name any of those programs. It's got -- it's got 2.2 for one-time costs related to vehicles, computers and furnishings. It has 7.3 related to staffing. It

has .8 related to city cost drivers, which I assume is what you mean by the staffing. So there are a number of items on here that don't correlate to what you just said in terms of staffing.

>> If I could draw your attention to the note at the bottom that references the 5.2 million. Those are the net general fund costs for non-recoverable items such as fee waivers, telecom permitting and urban forestry program. Those are the programs I had mentioned.

>> Kitchen: Yes, but I'm looking at the items that are on this list.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem?

>> Tovo: So I think it would help if we could see what is within the 5.2. Exactly what is within the 5.2 by allocation. And I did a search on development services, but there are also options for development services in planning, development services in various combinations. I haven't had a chance to figure out if it's in there. If we could see if it's in there that would help us make an informed decision about this. So I would assume based on your asterisked information down there that furniture for new employees is recoverable?

>> Yes.

>> Tovo: What about the one-time cost, vehicles, computers, furnishings, recoverable?

>> Yes. There is an amount that the general fund does contribute towards the vehicles. There's also an amount that's contributed by dsd.

[10:11:37 AM]

>> Tovo: Okay. So I would like to know what the amount contributed by the general fund is again, I think as.

>> Kitchen: Was highlighting -- as councilmember kitchen was highlighting, we did a very long, in-depth strategic planning process. It identified some critical community needs that we want to help fund. You know, I'm probably going to vote to put more money to homelessness and less money to vehicles, but I'm going to offer you an opportunity to talk about why that funding is necessary, but to begin with I think I would like to see what the general fund contribution is for those vehicles and then provide you with an opportunity -- and it doesn't need to be right now if we want to revisit this issue in a minute. Or in a few minutes when everybody has got the information we're -- that I think would help us make an efficient and kind of quickish decision. Telecom permitting, as I understood your response back to councilmember kitchen, it would slow things down if you were able to hire fewer staff. I'm not -- let me say I'm not interested in cuts to the urban forestry program and I would stipulate that if this motion passes. But telecom permitting, as I understand it, is to help comply with a new state provisions and we will do our best to accommodate that. But if it moves more slowly, then it moves more slowly because

we have other critical community priorities in my opinion. And I would like to see whether it's contained in the fee waivers and if any of those are optional or what the nature of the fee waivers are.

>> Kitchen: And I'd agree with --

>> Mayor Adler: Do we want to wait to get the additional detail?

>> Kitchen: That's fine. We can leave this on the table. Okay.

>> Garza: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, councilmember Garza?

>> Garza: I don't know about the fees in general, how it affects what you're trying to do. I don't think it does because yours is just general fund.

>> Mayor Adler: Those are two separate questions. She was funding on the general fund component of it and had not --

>> Garza: Are you moving on from dsd?

>> Kitchen: No. I think if you want to take up your item now in terms of reductions within the fees --

[10:13:43 AM]

>> Garza: So since my concerns that were expressed last week, I've gotten -- and I think you've all gotten emails from small builders with concerns about the fees going up. I have received the information from Mr. Gonzalez about what his understanding of the impact of the fees, but I feel that we should hold off on raising these fees and adding 51 ftes until we have a further understanding of what the impact of these fees are. Because just the information that I've gotten and I'm not going to pretend to be an expert in this, but I've gotten several emails that say their project would go from about 1,000-dollar fee to \$12,000. And if the -- could you put up that thing I handed you? This was another email with a couple of different scenarios that would go from 2,000 to 15,000, 2,000 to 12,000, 1600 to 14,000. And I think that these are significant increases even if they're special anecdotal cases. Any Adu project is probably very specific and anecdotal in the increase in fees. I understand that construction costs are high and there's already a barrier for families to build an Adu, but people are doing it and this would create a significant barrier for somebody who has a very limited budget to go from a \$3,000 to 15,000. So what I would suggest is that we hold off on increasing these fees, adding 51 people until we further understand the impact of all these fees because it's my understanding that many of the people, the boots on the ground who get these permits, who pay these fees, are very concerned and so am I. I don't know if other councilmembers have similar concerns.

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan?

>> Flannigan: I want so concur that I have similar concerns. And I feel it seems possible that we might dig into this, even delaying it a month, because this is kind of encapsulated into its own department.

[10:15:43 AM]

We could make these changes later. It doesn't affect the base tax rate out of this five million and change. I would appreciate more time digging into the fee schedule. It's a very long list of fees and better understanding it, but I don't know that we have to make that decision outside of not formalizing changes. We can still do that later.

>> Mayor Adler: So Ed, if we wanted to have a conversation about the fee in this department, as part of this budget process we would be approving the fee for the department, which would be based on those costs. Can we either delay that for a more in-depth look at the department and its fees for a month or can we adopt a fee now and then change that fee in a month since it's not the tax rate, but it would be a fee that would be going in? How does that work? What's the timing on that?

>> I think my off the cuff response would be if you really want to dig into this and likely make changes to it, would be to not adopt a change now that would affect the entire fee schedule and possibly come back in 60 days with another major change to the fee schedule and you have community people out there trying to keep track of these fees. I would just recommend that you defer the whole action now and come back at some point in the future where you determine -- and we can always amend the budget and add staff and amend the fee schedule at that time, whether that be October or November. You know, one thought on that too, I think that the -- that the phasing plan for this was seven months of funding so we're already not anticipating getting all these positions on board until February so there may be an opportunity to say -- for council to tell staff that you want us to come back in October or forever with a more lengthy work session just on dsd, the fee schedule, the staffing needs, et cetera, and we could easily amend the budget then. I'm just thinking off the cuff. Rodney may agree with me.

>> Sure. If I may draw your attention to that same slide with regard to how the fees are developed. All of those amounts go into the fee computation.

[10:17:46 AM]

When you look at the line for staffing enhancements and related office space equipment, the 51 positions is 3.8 million of that 7.3 million. So I'm not certain if you're talking about deferring the entire list or deferring the 51 positions. By deferring the entire list then you have a general fund -- during the utility fee impact. As you know, we're trying to reduce that transfer into the department and charge the

applicant instead. We've got citywide cost drivers that apply to our department just like they do to other departments. There are some annualization of fiscal year 2017 costs as well. So I'm not certain whether or not the conversation is deferring the entire budgetary increase. Many of those which are citywide or if you're talking about the 51 positions themselves.

>> Mayor Adler: I don't think it's being specific. I think what they're saying is -- I think if the council were to move that way, what the council would be saying is what can you do to reduce the development services fees? And then the hope would be that you would come back with that fee that you charge ultimately and then come back and give us proposals. Or come back and tell us you can't. Or come back and tell us this is the impact of doing that. But I don't think that people are prescribing any one thing.

>> Garza: Mayor?

>> And I think the point I wanted to make is that some of these are connected to city decisions that you're making outside of the fee schedule.

>> Mayor Adler: They would then become givens for you. Councilmember Garza.

>> Garza: My suggestion was to hold off on the fees, period, until we understand -- until we have a better understanding of the impact of those fees. So that -- so I was not aware that it was not only included 51 positions and other things, but if that's the case, I -- the main concern is the fee increase. And so if that's the concern, let's not do that increase until we have a better understanding. And as -- and an effect of that is not hiring those 51 people because if we choose not to -- when we understand the impact and we choose not to raise those fees we don't want to have to lay off 51 people.

[10:20:00 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Flannigan and then councilmember pool.

>> Flannigan: I would be interested in knowing for this discussion what the impact of the drain fee looks like and -- drainage fee looks like and how that was accounted for in cost recovery, if it were possible to save that piece of it, I would be interested in doing that.

>> Sure. We would probably need a member of watershed protection to speak to that. I don't want to speak out of turn.

>> Assistant city manager Joe Pan Tallian: While the watershed protection staff is coming in, I think it's a matter of the direction given to watershed protection in terms of whether or not to increase the fee to cover this cost or to actually reduce their capital funding, their capital program because as the fees for review and inspection services that are now being paid by the customers in development services and no longer being paid by the drainage utility customers that amount was applied to their capital budget.

What you would see is either a reduction in their capital program so funding of fewer projects or a commensurate increase in the teenage drainage fee to cover that 5.7 million.

>> Flannigan: So if it were possible to know which of the proposed dsd fees were changed to account for that or what the related drainage impact fee would be for doing it. I think my preference is to keep the drainage fee low. And if I can raise one or two fees in dsd to cover that over the next 12 months that would be great and leave the rest of the debate until after we adopt the budget.

>> Sure. I think it may take some time to come up with those numbers but I think we can do that possibly. I don't want to put our financial staff under undue stress, but hopefully we can bring some information back.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: Thanks. I'm fine with having more extended conversation about the fees and everything, and I also have the question we've been talking for the last two plus years about the Zucker report and the elements contained in it and one of the major drivers was to ensure that development services became an enterprise fund.

[10:22:18 AM]

And the way that happens, I guess we don't have many ways to raise those funds other than fees, is that right? Are there other ways we can have development services become -- what other sources of revenue might be available to development services in order to ensure that the policy direction that we adopted from the Zucker report, which was to make you an enterprise fund, were able to be successful?

>> Fees are by far the best source of revenue to do that. Up until this point two years ago the department was subsidized by 40% from the general fund. That subsidy through this budget goes away. And so two years ago those amounted to millions of dollars in general resources going to the department.

>> Pool: So I think I would be happy to see the additional information on the fees and it may be that we are too quickly achieving that -- closing that 40% gap, but I don't want us to abandon our efforts to move in that direction because that does signify -- that does indicate a significant shifting away from a policy direction that this panel adopted in our first -- I think in our first year that was a significant piece of hard news that we had to accommodate. And the very fact that we have the setup with the departments is related with the way the departments are set up right now is related to elements of the Zucker report, is that right?

>> Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember kitchen and then the mayor pro tem?

>> Kitchen: A couple of things. A couple of things. First off, I don't know that I'm completely following the relationship with watershed, but I do -- I would not be in favor of reducing the capital projects that watershed can address. There's been -- there's a long list of capital projects that are needed to address flooding in this city. And we've been behind in terms of what needs to happen.

[10:24:25 AM]

So I hear what councilmember Flannigan is saying in terms of the drainage fee and I respect that, but I would not want that to cause our watershed department to reduce their ability to address these projects. And I might also add that these projects that we did have a task force process, flood mitigation task force with a long list of recommendations, and our watershed staff is trying to carry out those recommendations and that's where we see what's being required in the capital budget. So that's my caution with regard to that. The second thing I would say is just I appreciate what councilmember pool is saying. I have a little different perspective. I don't know that we actually adopted creating an enterprise fund. I don't think that's a consideration for today, though. I'm just simply saying that we need to recognize the extent to which we create -- the extent to which we create more and more enterprise funds, we are siloing what we do in the city and reducing our ability, significantly reducing our ability to fund things like parks and health and human services which people in our community -- everyone in our community benefits from and people who build in our community benefit from that. So that's an aside. I just wanted to say that. That's not for today's discussion, but I personally am not a fan of going down the road of putting everything in an enterprise fund because of the silos that creates.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem and then Mr. Flannigan.

>> Tovo: Maybe it would be more appropriate to wait until there was a motion, but I want to be very clear that -- I don't know if this is what you were referring to, councilmember pool, but it was our council that made a policy choice to capture 100% of the costs within our fees. And I think that is consistent with our Austin energy practice and the Austin water practice, and I think we should be consistent here too. And I'm teaspoon have that conversation about whether we need to develop a different kind of program for low income homeowners who want to do an Adu.

[10:26:34 AM]

I think that would be an appropriate way to handle it. If this is too much to sort out here on the dais, then I'm very supportive of backing out the fee increases as they're related to the staff positions, but only if we don't move forward with the staff positions because I can't support adding elements to the

budget that aren't going to be covered by the fees because that's contrary to the policy decision that we've made earlier.

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan.

>> Tovo: Can I say one more thing? As I understand the direction of this conversation, we would also be looking to assess the watershed fee now so that it doesn't impact your capital program and I want to be sure we do that part.

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan and then Mr. Renteria.

>> Flannigan: I don't want to reduce the capital budget of watershed either. What I said is if we delayed the conversation on dsd, I would like to lock in the transfer to watershed now, even if we have the dsd. That's what I was saying. >> Ayor Adler: Mr. Renteria.

>> Renteria: Hearing this discussion, a lot of the problems with these increasing fees, the policies that we have made. We've got the heritage trees, we have -- we want people to pay for the sidewalks on their sidewalks -- on their -- in front of their house. There's a lot of costs that we see in -- accessibility is one of the other ones. You have to put doors that are so wide on your house, install them. You have to meet all these requirements that we set. It wasn't other people that set these policies. We decided those policies. And over the years they have gone up and increased, increased. And then the citizens were saying, hey, that's enough. We're tired of paying for it. Let development pay for itself. And that's what we decided that the development was going to pay for itself. And I have people coming back and saying I have a big old pecan tree and I can't build a secondary unit at my house and I have to pay this outrageous fees.

[10:28:40 AM]

And I say don't cut it down because your fine will be about \$24,000. So those are the kind of things that we decided. If we want to do away with those kind of fees, then we have to change those policies.

>> Houston: Thank you. I agree with what councilmember Renteria says, but I also agree with mayor pro tem tovo. That if we're concerned and what councilmember Garza started with, if we're concerned about the inability for the people we're trying to cyst, low-income, elderly folks who want to be able to build an accessory dwelling unit to be able to pay for their property taxes, if we want to look at how we do that then I'm willing to work on that. But I feel that the community has said development must pay for itself so we need to be able to move out that piece of that and make sure that the development is paying for itself because people are tired of paying for the development that goes on in town

>> Mayor Adler: Ed, do you have a suggestion for us here? This is a great conversation, and --

>> Can I make a motion, mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Make on one second, I'd like to ask my question first just a sound because I want to know what the options are for us from your perspective. This is a pretty broad thing. How do we hit the broad issues.

>> Can y'all see the slide on the screen? What I'm hearing is this first line item, this change in how we handle the watershed protection costs and moving those from the drainage utility fees over to the development application fees and creating that additional 5.7 million that can go to C.I.P. And watershed, all currently in the budget, you want to keep that is what I'm hearing. The \$800,000 below that would need to stay in the budget regardless as for wages and benefits and just built-in cost driver increases that are citywide. Two items down that, 2.2 million, I think we'd have to peel the onion on that.

[10:30:44 AM]

Some of those costs are related to the 51 new positions that are being proposed but some of those are just replacing old equipment, old failing equipment that just needs to be replaced as part of maintaining the current operations. So we'd have to look into that. Obviously, the authorization of fy'17 costs these are things council already approved in the budget and now we're experiencing full-year cost associated with those items. Finally the 3.4, again, we'd have to peel the onion to see which of that is related to new things versus just existing things, maybe contractual increases, et cetera. We'd need to go through the full list and tell council how much of it, if we were to look at delaying the 51 positions, what needs to stay and then we would need to change our fees to address that. Now, if you wanted to come back later to look at the staffing needs and the idea of adding -- adding more staff, we could come back -- the caveat, within a 2-month period you'd be changing the fee schedule twice, significant change to the fee schedule, you know, right during this budget to ask and two or three months down the road we'd have to amend all the fees again. We can make that happen. We have the consultant to do that work. But that's what we'd need to do. I think we could give you that number sometime today or tomorrow. And we're already prepared presumably on Wednesday when you get to the fee schedule to sync the fee schedule up to the budget actions that you take. So just are from what I'm hearing that might be a way you would want to consider.

>> Kitchen: Mr. Mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: I'll recognize Ms. Garza for a motion and then we'll come back. We've laid on the table the initial motion that was made so we don't have a motion on the table right now.

>> Kitchen: Yes. But I want Mr. Van eenoo to say what councilmember Garza's proposal is not instead of the one that I brought forward and the questions that mayor pro tem had, it's in addition. So I just want to make cha clear.

[10:32:47 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: That was -- make that clear.

>> Kitchen: The questions mayor pro tem laid out with regard to what's involved in here for the -- goes to my motion and so I just want to make sure that we're getting answers to those questions.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. Two separate things. First one was a million dollars out of the 5.2, general fund contribution. We've laid that on the table until we get more information from you. The second one is the motion that I anticipate councilmember Garza is going to make with respect to -- well, councilmember Garza, why don't you make your motion.

>> Garza: Thank you. It's essentially what Mr. Van eenoo just said, that we hold off on the fee increases and 51 employees but that not include -- so we don't stop any flood mitigation and the drainage fee reduction, but we do hold off on fee increases and the 51 positions. If I get a second I'll speak briefly because we've had a lot of discussion about it.

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan seconds it. You can speak to it.

>> Garza: I'm trying to get to a place where it feels -- from -- all the stakeholders have expressed it's a regressive fee schedule for people who are -- I understand development needs to pay for itself. I'm not talking about the big builders. This could affect them. I'm specifically trying to carve out families who are trying to stay in place, families who have enough equity in their home to take out an equity loan but a fee schedule from 2000 to 12,000 will make that option not available for them as part of this discussion in finding out what the impact in fees are for everyone involved, small builders, people out with ads, I will start drafting a resolution for our next council meeting that figures out how we change these regulations. I understand that these are -- you're just putting fees on regulations that council has put in place so we need to change those regulations so it does not affect small builders the way it is affecting them. Again, my goal is development to continue paying for itself but we have policies in place that help our families build -- use the equity in their home and that we don't have a fee schedule that could make that option not an option.

[10:35:04 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar.

>> Casar: I'd like to ask the -- councilmember Garza and other folks that support the motion whether or not their motion includes some of the things that Mr. Van eenoo mentioned, like the authorization of last year's costs and things that we've already paid for and upgrading computers of that nothing to do

with expanding the size of the department, which I guess we could discuss later but just things that are -- are also routine or whether or not -- or whether this motion would end that or not. Just a question.

>> Kitchen: I --

>> Casar: Sounds like what Mr. Van eenoo is little further than the motion and I want to know what the difference is there.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm confused.

>> Garza: I don't know if we take out watershed -- flood mitigation and if we take out drainage what's left. I don't know.

>> Casar: Mr. Van eenoo I think laid out self of those things, authorization of last year's cost of staff. We have to pay for because we've hired them.

>> Mayor Adler: I understood Mr. Van eenoo went through that list and said these are the things that could possibly be in play. What was in play was 7.3 associated with the 51 people and then it was whatever the increases were and the other lines that were associated with those 51 people but he didn't know what those were. That would have to be unpeeled.

>> Casar: That's what I'm asking, whether or not councilmember Garza's motion covers that or not, it's a question for the makers of the motion to know the difference between what Mr. Van eenoo said and what the motion is.

>> Mayor Adler: I heard Ms. Garza's motion to not authorize the filling of the 51 positions and to see what the fee reduction would be associated with that money not being included and these other items going down for those 51 people and then coming back, having development services come back within a month or two to say this is what I need and if we decided we wanted to fill those positions then we would do it at that time and there would be a second fee change. Is that not right, Ed.

>> I think that's right. I wanted to clarify in regards to the fee aspect I think what my plan was -- and I didn't get to this last part, but we can go through this pretty quickly and say instead of a \$20.9 million increase in the dsd budget what would be a revised increase to reflect kind of the minimal costs based on the conversations we were having.

[10:37:20 AM]

What we were planning on doing this year when we get to the fee schedule, instead of coming up on a very, very, very short turnaround with a very long list of strikeouts and underlines in the fee schedule 2, we checked at the attorney's office and we would be fine to adopt a fee schedule as proposed and reflecting any changes that were approved by council during the adoption of the budget, that that way

we can say, okay, we've adopted the cutting and we've adopted a fee schedules that going to be amended to reflect that budget but there's no way we could turn around the flexibility we're talking about and say here's for the dozens and dozens of dsd fees, here's how they would off-change by tomorrow. What I would be proposing is we could tell you how this budget would change and we would adopt the fee schedule with the understanding we're going to indicate fees to reflect the budgetary changes but it may be two weeks before we can work with the consultant to say here's now the strikeout version of their fee schedule. The model is very complicated, dozens of fees they can charge. There's no feasible way we can turn that around by tomorrow.

>> Casar: I understand that. I wanted to make sure that everybody's understanding of the motion is --

>> Yes, I understand. It was to the mayor's comment mentioned something about coming back and saying here's how the fees were changed. I understand that's some of the concerns, these thousand dollar fees going up to 12 thundercloud. I can tell you the fee increases would be less. I just can't tell you exactly what those -- we won't be able to by tomorrow tell you all those dozens of fees, how much they're going to be different.

>> Mayor Adler: Hang on, hang on.

>> Casar: I understand that there is still the outstanding non-fee revenue question, which is a separate question.

>> Mayor Adler: Right.

>> Casar: I just want to understand whether or not the motion is specifically where the expansion of new employees and the associated costs there or if it's more expansive.

>> Garza: I think it is more expansive. It's like -- it's very complicated.

[10:39:22 AM]

I can't tell you exactly which fees. I know from the slide that fees are going up significantly so I don't know which fee is doing that and which fee affects this and which fee -- it's D the 51 positions -- it's definitely the 51 positions and might be more but I don't know what that is. I'm trying to minimize the increase in fees as much as possible while keeping flood mitigation, keeping the drainage fee decreases.

>> Mayor Adler: My sense is that's the bigger question, and my sense is that it's -- relates to the resolution that you said you were going to bring but I think we can just from the dais say that we want the director to come back and look at how he can reduce fees. How he would reduce fees. He could come back with options that spoke to the charges that were made or the fees that were made. You could either prescribe it or you can say from a policy standpoint we want to know if we can reduce fees especially as to the small builders. And then he can come back with a recommendation. I don't think

we're going to be able to fashion that as we sit on the dais, to be able to know how to do that or what the cost is other than to say for the 51 positions that's something that they could quantify, we could say we're going to abate that decision and make that decision as part of the larger conversation. So there were two questions. One is what's the action to be taken N the budget and then what is the broader question that we would be discussing in a month or two when the department had a chance to take a look at it and I'm not sure those two things are necessarily covering the same thing because I don't know that we could from the dais come up with what all those other things might be or to debate through what all those other things mated be.

>> Garza: I agree, but I think it's an assumption to say we can't do it. Mr. Van eenoo said we can, it's going to take us a while, we can do this, this is complicated, we can present a fee schedule tomorrow we'll have to go through and that might include more than 51 positions but I think the understanding of the direction is to -- as little increase in fees as possible, especially the 51 positions, but whatever else you can do.

[10:41:30 AM]

If you go look at the fees tonight and can't do anything else and it's the 51 and that's what you bring back tomorrow, that's fine, but it doesn't sound like it was said this is the only way we can do this. It was it's gonna be hard but my concern is raising them and then bringing them back down. It's going to confuse the people who work on these projects, some of these Adu projects are just your average person trying to do it themselves because they don't want to hire a consultant and pay that additional fee. So that's my direction.

>> Mayor Adler: So one of the big fees is the 51 positions. If what you're trying to say is we don't want a fee schedule 2 that changes we have to make a long-term decision with respect to those decisions. We can have a conversation about whether we want to cut off 51 positions or 20 positions or 30 positions positions and we could set that and then we wouldn't have a conversation and we would have a fee at least on that point. I'm just not sure I feel comfortable making that kind of position choice. I'm not sure we can -- I mean --

>> Garza: To get consensus and move from this if it's just the 51, that's five. Just the 51 and further resolution we could play out how we make it less regressive for small builders, families trying to stay in place I'm fine with that but I think we need to make some decision today at least about those 51 positions and that fee increase.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem.

>> Tovo: I thought what we were contemplating was withdrawing the 51 and not making fee changes today with the exception of the watershed piece, if they can sort that out. Am I -- I didn't want to make

decisions about how many people. I am not going to support probably most of the suggestions to change regulations. I mean, we had an extensive, extensive conversation about visibility.

[10:43:34 AM]

I know you mentioned that as one of the regulations that we added, that adds costs. I just think it's critically important as we heard from so many advocates that they be able to access housing in this community with a no-step entrance. I'm not -- I don't want to make decisions about regulations and I'm probably not going to support most changes -- suggestions to change regulations. I don't want to support today. I'm certainly not supporting providing subsidies to for-profit developers to build ads and some of the scenarios I'm seeing are coming from those and they're much more complicated than they would be on the surface based on what I know about some of the lots where they're trying to build them. I think that's a much longer discussion. Is the motion on the table, which is what I thought it was, to not authorize the expenditure of the -- for the 51 positions, to leave the fees the same, with the exception of the watershed piece?

>> Garza: Yes.

>> Tovo: You were suggesting tearing, was it this, was it that --

>> Mayor Adler: I was suggesting that but as part of that I was asking development services to come back in a month or two and tell us -- in other words I'm not comfortable cutting 51 positions today.

>> Tovo: We're not cutting them. We're not cutting anything. We're just not authorizing hiring 51 people.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm not comfortable on the last day of budget saying that the anticipated 51 positions you have planned we're not going to authorize. It may be it should be 15 positions or 20 or 30 positions or 51 positions. We can have a long conversation, bring up dsd people and talk about what their plan is for the department. That to me is also a much longer conversation.

>> Tovo: Me too.

>> Mayor Adler: I was trying to take the final decision about how many of the 51 positions we do or don't do and put it to a context where we could have a broader conversation that if people wanted to also have conversation about all the regulations that you said you weren't going to support that could be part of the conversation too but it is a much broader conversation than we could ever do on this dais.

[10:45:35 AM]

I'm just trying to get us to tomorrow.

>> Tovo: I agree. Completely agree. I think that's the best plan. I think we should have all those discussions, we could look at the org chart which is now posted and have that conversation fully if that's what we're going to do.

>> Mayor Adler: The question is if we decide today to not do the 51 we are probably making a decision to have a fee change that happens now with the budget that we pass and then in two months when we have the conversation or a month or whenever it is, however quickly development services can get back to oust, if we then say, no, we want to fund all 51 or fund 26 of the 51, then there's going to be a second fee change in the two months. Those things necessarily happen. We either get to decide everything today, which I don't think we can, or we approve what is proposed and then we don't have another fee change, or we say we're not going to make the final decision on that, in which case we're going to have a second fee change in two months. Of those three things -- well, I think those are the choices presented to us. Mr. Casar and then Rodney.

>> Casar: There's going to be a fee change. I just want to remind everybody because the bird has flown the coop on some of this, we can't fire -- I don't think the dais is going to have a majority of people that want to fire people that we already hired that we have to annualize. I don't think the dais will support not doing the 2.5% cost of living increase for dsd and approve it for everyone else. I think the makers of the motion support that. My initial question which I feel like kind of blue some of this up we've been saying no fee increase but I think the supports of the motion would want some level of fee increase because I know you and we want to do authorization of last year's cost and benefits. So no matter what there's going to be some level of increase, not just drainage, but some level of fee increase to cover the other stuff.

[10:47:36 AM]

>> Kitchen: This 5.2 is in general fund. This is not out of fees.

>> Casar: It is out of fees, councilmember.

>> Mayor Adler: This 5.2 is something else.

>> Casar: The city cost drivers, my understanding, again, not speaking for -- is that the -- the city cost drivers are paid for -- it says general fund.

>> Kitchen: It says general fund. That was the discussion we just had was these were the items out of general fund.

>> Casar: Exactly. Let me try to explain it in council language the way that we talk. General -- the development services department is a general fund department. But these things are paid -- we are

trying to fund homeless services, trying to fund things with nondevelopment services fees. So the city cost drivers, .8 million, is not paid for by money we can pay for for health and human services. It's paid for by general fund development services fees. So this is not the 5.2 million. If you add these numbers up, they don't add up to 5.2 million because there's a 7.3 million line for staffing enhancements. This is not a spreadsheet that just adds up to 5.2 at the bottom.

>> Kitchen: I didn't -- to shorthand it I didn't mean that. I think I understand what this says. I appreciate you trying to explain it, but my point is that there are items on here that are out of the general fund that we can decide to reduce and we can identify as savings.

>> Mayor Adler: And I think --

>> Casar: That's a separate question.

>> Mayor Adler: See the 37.5 number at the top? Wouldn't most of the general fund stuff be in the 37.5 number at the top?

>> If I could go through the spreadsheet. So the 37.5 million is where we start with our current year budget. All of those drivers, all those line items add up to approximately 19.9 million, bringing our budget to 58.4 million. By state law, however, we cannot, through fees, account for 5.2 million of that. And those are described at the bottom, which are the fee waivers, telecomm permitting and urban forestry.

[10:49:41 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: My question is are fee waivers, telecomm permitting and urban forestry in the 37.5 number or in the other numbers?

>> So they are in the 58.4 million total, but of the 58.4 million since we can't charge a fee for those amounts, then the general fund makes up that 5.2 million.

>> Mayor Adler: Got that. Is there any fee waivers or telecomm or urban forestry in the 5.7 number? The transfer in from watershed protection?

>> No.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there any of that in the .8 cost drivers.

>> No. Yes, it would be 37.5.

>> Mayor Adler: General fund, it's on there, but you can't see it as a line item because it's in the 37.5 and that's what we've asked them to give us during the break when it was tabled.

>> Kitchen: That's right.

>> Mayor Adler: So we're asking them to pull out of the 37.5 those things that are attributable to the 5.2.

>> Kitchen: Yeah, that's what I was saying and that's what I understood we were doing. I just don't want us to lose sight of that. I understand that councilmember Casar is moving towards perhaps the things that we can move forward with, but I think that the general -- my understanding of the motion is simply that we at this shouldn't use the word yet, we are not approving the 51. I could go with that if we were clear about when we were gonna come back because I do have to say that I do think that it is important to include additional ftes in the dsd budget. The problem is that we don't have the information in front of us right now about relationship between that and the fees.

>> Mayor Adler: So, Rodney, would you talk about the impact to you and department of not giving the authorization for the 51 positions now but coming back and doing that in a month or two.

>> Sure. The impact of course is that the volume continues to increase.

[10:51:43 AM]

We're trying to not keep behind in terms of inspections and plan review. I think I've mentioned this at previous settings with city council. This is all about service delivery. Two years ago we were highlighted by the Zucker analysis that service delivery wasn't there. We've done our very best with resources allocated to increase our performance. The positions that we have brought to you, the 51, it's not just 51, it's temporaries, it's increasing our third party, all to meet the service delivery expectations that city council had asked us to look at two years ago. There was a resolution directing us to implement an action plan that implemented all of the Zucker recommendations.

>> Mayor Adler: I understand that. Are the 51 positions starting midyear or starting on -- beginning of the year?

>> We plan to hire them January and March.

>> Mayor Adler: So my question is if we're hiring them January or March, what's the impact on you if the final authorization comes in a month or two as opposed to now?

>> There should be no impact because we didn't plan to hire them in January and month March. We did ask for an increase in temporaries so that way we can continue meeting demand through temporaries, which we're doing currently. So to the extent that we don't have those 51 positions we've been supplementing those with temporaries.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So is -- so is -- councilmember Garza, your motion, is it to not authorize the 51 permanent positions until there can be further discussion of those, keep the temporary positions so that you're continuing to run, the only question will be whether we hire the permanent positions, come back in a month or two and talk to us about that issue as well as any other issues that you think might raise that would help us lower the fees and tell us what those trade-offs would be given the conversation that we had. That means, Ed, that you'll set a fee initially that does not include the 51 and then we make a decision sometime between now and January to add those additional people or look at other changes to the fee schedule -- to the matter.

[10:53:50 AM]

We could then incorporate that and it would be then a second fee schedule and issues at that point. Councilmember Garza.

>> Garza: I think that's the most important point, is that this does -- this motion does nothing different because if we come back in two months with some kind of new change in regulations it does not affect your ability to hire. It's very possible that it will not affect your ability to get those 51 positions if at that point there's been stakeholder conversation, we understand the impact better. All I'm asking is time to understand the impact of raising fees, hiring 51 people if in fact we decide that that's not the direction we want to go in.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. That's the motion. It's been seconded. Is there any further discussion? Ms. Kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Just a quick question. Can we put a time on when it's coming -- would it be possible -- we've been talking about a budget amendment process in six weeks or so. I'm reluctant to leave it open-ended about when it would come back to us or do you think that's complicating it too much.

>> Mayor Adler: I would say come back as quickly as you can and I think the department realizes it doesn't have the other 51 positions until it comes back so everyone has to get this done as quickly as we can. It's been moved and seconded. Further discussion? Councilmember Alter.

>> Alter: I want to point out we're going to have multiple budget amendments at the rate that we're going because the public safety contracts we just got a memo yesterday that police will not be back within a 6-week time frame it doesn't sound like. Just so we're prepared that we will have multiple budget amendments as we move forward with this. I just want to clarify that.

>> Mayor Adler: We'll certainly have that opportunity. Moved and seconded. Any further discussion? Everybody understand? Mr. Casar.

>> Casar: To clarify it's also associated costs with 51 employees. People keep saying 51 but --

>> Mayor Adler: 51 and associate fees is what we're doing now to fix the budget and the fees but come back to us on the broad issues raised from the dais as soon as you're able to do that.

[10:56:00 AM]

Yes, Ms. Troxclair.

>> Troxclair: Does that include a discussion of the regulations that are driving all of the fees?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. That's not what we're voting on today. We're asking him when he comes back in a month or two.

>> Troxclair: I want to make sure that the information that's going to be provided when they come back for us to make the decision will include additional information [no audio]

>> Mayor Adler: Those in favor please raise your hand. Those opposed. It's everybody on the dais. But we didn't quite blow through that one, did we?

[Laughter] Go ahead, manager.

>> On the 5.2 million on that slide that was left up that was the fee waivers and urban forestry, there's a program called community tree preservation in the development services department and the total proposed budget for '18 is 3.2 million and I assume that's the urban forestry program?

>> Yes.

>> So 3.2 million of the 5.2 is for urban forestry.

>> If I could clarify, the urban forestry is a component of the tree preservation. The other part -- [no audio] -- Which cannot be funded through fees.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ms. Pool.

>> Pool: I just wanted to remind everybody that we have plans to use some of that \$3 million that's in the urban forestry fund, it's on our budget concept menu and I think it's on the rollup addendum here, and that's the tree protection education piece for 75 thundercloud. These are monies that have been paid into that, that fund by developers when they have -- when they are -- and it goes to whether they take down trees or replace them. So I don't -- I hope that -- and I think the mayor pro tem indicated she has no interest in reducing the amount that's in our urban forestry fund and I absolutely agree with that, too.

[10:58:07 AM]

That money is there for a particular purpose --

>> Mayor Adler: Let's hold off and discuss the -- that is part of the 5.2 but we're not having that conversation yet. That's been laid on the table.

>> Pool: Thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Ms. Kitchen.

>> Kitchen: The last two items I'm not going to pursue and then the second two relate to the police department, I'm not going to pursue them right now. I'm hoping that we asked some questions, we have additional questions so I'm a representative here from the police department -- not to answer from the dais. I'm going to ask my staff to come back and talk to you. We may be able to clear up our questions just by asking you a few questions if that's okay with you. Then, Mr. Mayor, if our questions -- I may or may not bring it forward after we have those questions cleared up.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Kitchen: Then with regard to.

>> Mayor Adler: My hope is and we can discuss this later when we get to it that we hit public safety issues not necessarily today but we hit public safety --

>> Kitchen: That's an option too, that's an option too. I want to say I'm reserving the right to bring them back. Then the development services item, Ed, do you have an idea about when you'll have the answers to the questions that the mayor pro tem -- will that be later today or will we be looking at that for tomorrow?

>> I know staff is currently working on it. We have a draft response but there's questions about the draft response so I fully expect it to be today.

>> Kitchen: Okay. We'll just lay that on the table until --

>> Mayor Adler: It's already been laid on the table. It's been laid on the table.

>> Kitchen: Okay. I'm done.

>> If I can quickly clarify though the urban forestry replenishment fund dollars won't be part of that discussion. That's a completely separate fund.

>> Kitchen: We're not asking for the urban forestry.

>> I understand. Somebody mentioned it was part of the 5.2 million and it's not. It's completely separate.

>> Mayor Adler: Got it. I misspoke then. Ms. Houston.

>> Houston: Councilmember kitchen, could you give us the number of the ones you're not doing today?

>> Kitchen: The document I passed out.

>> Houston: Just give us the number.

[11:00:08 AM]

>> Kitchen: Four and five. One is the one that's laid on the table. Two and three my staff is going to talk to the police department right now and four and five I'm not pursuing.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Then let's go on then to councilmember alter. And then we'll get to the big things on the concepts.

>> Alter: So I would appreciate some clarification from staff on an item that was allocated from the reserve, budget stabilization reserve. It's an amount of \$446,100. It says radios for animal services. All the information that I have with respect to the justification is the animal service radios are scheduled to be replaced in fiscal year 2017-18 because the current radios are past their useful or serviceable life. These radios are necessary to ensure continued operations of the animal shelter functions of the department. I guess I'm kind of wondering, you know, what a delay would mean and what those are for. We haven't -- since I've been on the council had many animal services issues so I'd like more information on what the purpose of those radios and why now.

>> Sara Hensley, interim assistant city manager. They have a meeting that they had to run to from animal services, but this is exactly what you said, councilmember alter, these are antiquated radios they've been using that are communication and technology management department informed them would no longer be able to be serviced and maintained in a proper manner by their department. In addition, they are not included in the police budget -- you know, how the police officers and their budget is for replacement of radios. This is separate from that so these are our animal service officers and our shelter staff and that's how they communicate not only in vehicles out in the community when they are dealing with animals, rescues and/or, unfortunately, vicious animals, but they're also communicating with the police department for sometimes the issue related to behavior dogs or other animals and then of course they also use those radios in the shelter setting.

[11:02:17 AM]

That's the only way they have -- they have a -- sort of a speaker system in the shelter but it goes only indoors so when they're outdoors and trying to communicate about an issue with an animal they're

using those radios. They are past their prime. And they have been past their prime for quite sometime and this was a request that came through ctm that it was time to replace those and you, animal services, need to budget for that and that's what that is.

>> Alter: And how many radios do we get with that amount?

>> There's a total of 80 but some are in actually hand radios and others are in the vehicles and it is for the staff not only the officers that are using them but the field staff, but it's also those in the shelter who are communicating in, like, front desk area. We have an animal that needs to be picked up or whatever to the back -- to vet techs and so forth.

>> Alter: What is the ratio of the field operations versus the --

>> I'll have to get that information. I do not know that depth of information but I can tell you that, you know, I did ask staff that, you know, is this something we absolutely have to do, and the answer their prime.

>> Alter: How old are the current radios?

>> Ctm was supposed to be there we go.

>> Hi. Stephen Elkins, chief information officer. So I don't know what the -- I'll have to get you that answer. Typically we get a five-year notice when the radios reach end of life and we start to put them on a refresh cycle. I think the numbers you're asking about is we were look at doing 24 in vehicle, 24 handheld devices this year but, again, we were notified about five years ago these would be end of life when we don't -- if we don't replace the vehicles. We can repair the radios ourselves but we're at a point now where there's no more spare parts or opportunity to repair the radios themselves and the vendors no longer support because they have newer radios out.

[11:04:29 AM]

We could use them until they die but that's not ideal position we want to be in.

>> Alter: We recently went to a co process. Is that an option for these radios?

>> These radios are \$5,600 apiece and our practice is to have a minimum per cost of \$10,000 for a capital item. I would add even if they were beyond \$10,000 we have really been trying to avoid using debt to finance recurring replacement cost. If you do that you just end up paying interest plus the principal cost associated with those types of services so we really try to use debt when there's a need to spread the high costs over a number of generations, kind of generational equity in regards to a big capital computer or to help us smooth some spikes in our budgetary budgeting, but kind of for routine replacements we don't recommend debt and it would be against our financial policies.

>> Alter: Thank you for that clarification. But at 443,000, 80 radios is 5500 appear, is that -- a piece.

>> 5625 per radio.

>> I would be curious what my colleagues would perhaps have more experience with animal services, what your thought might be.

>> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston.

>> Houston: Ms. Hensley, can you tell me how many animal services offices we have on the -- officers we have on the streets?

>> I will get that information. I do not have the exact numbers on the street at the same time. Not all of them are on the street at the same time. I'll be honest with you there's certainly not enough to go around and they are on shift. Right now they're covering the mega shelter and other places but I'll have to get you the actual number on the street.

[11:06:30 AM]

>> Houston: Right. The number of ftes because it's much smaller than 24. I mean, we don't have that many cars.

>> That's correct.

>> Houston: So I'm just -- I'm curious about why it is we need the vehicle ones because we don't have that many vehicles in animal services.

>> It's animal officers. It's also staff that are out in the community, educational staff that are doing -- volunteers working with volunteers.

>> Houston: Would that be in their vehicles as well?

>> Some of them use their own personal vehicles as well.

>> Houston: That would be the handhelds. I'm trying to separate the handheld from the ones we're going to be buying for the vehicles.

>> Okay. There's some that will go into the vehicles and then there's some that will go -- and those officers of that them in the vehicles are many times not in their vehicles when they're dealing with those animals. They're called to a site where they're out of the vehicle, in some cases going after an animal, have their handhelds with them. At some times there's one in the vehicle that's in the radio system and one in their hand as they are -- just like, quite frankly, with our officers and police, so they have those.

And then we have the staff at the shelters who are communicating with the veterinarians, vet techs and shelter staff.

>> Houston: Yes, ma'am. If you could just give me --

>> I will.

>> Houston: -- For the number of people who are in the cars and need dual in-car and on-person and then the ones that you would be using in the shelter and how many those are.

>> I'll get that for you.

>> Mayor Adler: You asked my view on that is I wouldn't reach down into an individual budget like this on that level. If we wanted to pull animal services to something that we talked about and could give policy direction or changes, if we wanted to say something about how they were doing their services or the goals we wanted to reach or the metrics we wanted to reach, I would keep our involvement at that level but whether or not they have radios or how many radios they have, I would say is a call that I would ask those professionals to make in Pruitt pursuit of whatever it was the goals we set for that department to make.

[11:08:40 AM]

I wouldn't reach down.

>> Houston: We just spent a lot of time reaching down very deep into a department.

>> Mayor Adler: But at the end we went back to the department and said come back to us with an overarching view. And I would be okay asking animal services if that was the department we wanted to look at, for them to come back for a discussion as well. But you asked. I would not support making a change.

>> Alter: I would like to see the data on how many officers and where -- where they are so that we can have the information that we need for that. You know, giving money is policy direction. We have not had an opportunity to vote on this capital expense. It's in there and something that hasn't come forward to us as I understand it in a contract so we haven't had an opportunity to provide that kind of guidance at this point on it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any further discussion on this item? Mayor pro tem.

>> Tovo: Thanks. So we can just start there. I wanted to just look at the one-time expenditures really quickly. I'm struggling to get -- I got distracted by the rifle class fund and I couldn't -- I missed -- okay. So on page 771 of volume 2, the general fund budget stabilization, I was looking at the one-time funds also, the expenditures from the one-time fund account, as councilmember alter was. I wanted to ask exactly

what is the -- so the \$1 million of strategic outcome initiatives is the 1 million we are talking about within our five. Can you help me understand the codenext land development code revision? This would be an additional payment in addition to what we've already spent?

>> Yes. The answer to that is yes. And I -- Greg Guernsey is probably back in the bullpen and could maybe come over and provide more information about what they'd be doing.

[11:10:47 AM]

That's a planning and zoning capital improvement budget increase for the codenext program.

>> Tovo: We're certain that it's going to be necessary beyond what we've already paid is.

>> I think I'd like to defer until Greg gets here but that's certainly my understanding is that it's a necessary expense to meet all of council's expectations for that.

>> Tovo: Okay. Here is Mr. Guernsey. I was going to move on to my next question. Mr. Guernsey, I was just asking about the projected additional codenext expense listed in our budget stabilization as an expense out of our budget stabilization reserve.

>> Yes, Greg Guernsey, planning and zoning. This would be the funding of the costs to pay for the consultant services through spring of next year. It wouldn't cover costs of creating additional drafts, spending time here at the city of Austin presenting to commissions and council. There is a portion of that that's also in my operating that would cover cost notification and some temporary staff --

>> Tovo: I remember seeing that in your operating budget. I was really wondering about this piece because I will just speak for myself, I've sort of lost track of -- I mean, we've approved several contract amendments and additional expenditures to consultants and I was hoping our last one would kind of ride us through the end, but this suggests otherwise.

>> Right. This contract would hopefully take us to the end of codenext as far as the consultant services are concerned.

>> Tovo: Where are we in terms of our spending on this? Is it 13 million already and then this would bring it up to 15? Or was it nine and this --

>> I don't believe it's that high. I can get you the specific figure. I think it's closer to probably around seven or eight.

>> Tovo: Yeah, that would be helpful to know.

[11:12:47 AM]

That is a question I get asked with some frequency, and I think with this additional expenditure that will come up again. Okay, thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Anything else?

>> Tovo: I have some questions -- I asked some questions of staff yesterday about different funds and I got a response to this one but I apologize I didn't completely -- I couldn't completely understand the answer. So last year we transferred some -- we transfer in general fund money to the second street tif by, as I understand it -- I don't know, regulations set up when that tif was created. Last year, I've forgotten exactly what we did but it's somewhere in our budget amendment list, we transferred back a portion of that general fund revenue, and I think it was -- my memory is 70,000 or something in that range. Can you remind me of that particular budget amendment?

>> Yes. That budget amendment, there was some surplus funds that we moved from that tif to the the -- back to the general fund. And I recall it was around 130,000, but it could have been less than that. But I think in the actual budget sheet, the tif line item sheet, it shows that as a reduction.

>> Tovo: Right.

>> So that is correct. And I believe the conversation at the -- the question was to staff at that time was how would we be going forward into the future? Because we had been rolling forward a carry forward at that time and effectively that transfer back to the general fund would in a sense reduce or mitigate that cushion. So for the fy17, for this fy18, what our proposed budget is is 179,300.

[11:14:52 AM]

That would leave a fund balance of about 14,000. So in effect we are saying to staff that we're going to be making due with our contractual obligations for this year. However, what -- part of our obligation is -- I'm probably telling you more information than you want to know.

>> Tovo: No, you're not, actually. This is exactly the information I was trying to find but couldn't.

>> Yes. So \$100,000 is what we by our tif agreement and by contract with csc silicon labs back in -- that we agreed in 2000 was that we would spend \$100,000 for our obligations for monetizing the second street district. Our contractual obligations over time since that time exceed that hundred thousand. We are over time kind of ratchetting that back in but in order to maintain the same level of service and to manage our obligations under contract, we're basically at cost or at budget this year.

>> Tovo: So I think you've answered my question. Last year we had some extra funding in there that we were able to utilize in other ways. It sounds as if this year we do not.

>> Yes, correct.

>> Tovo: And the 100,000 is something we're obligated by the regulations of the tif to do so it wouldn't be an option, it sounds like, to say this year we don't necessarily want to spend as much on those projects, we want to pull that hundred thousand back out?

>> It would be -- right. It would be also documented in the csc -- the csc master development agreement as well.

>> Tovo: Okay. Thank you. Thanks for that information, from everyone who sent it. I appreciate it. I have a couple questions, but I think we're going to try to work them out with help -- I may be able to reduce a couple things on my list based on some conversations with staff, but I'll fill -- I'll get back on that later.

[11:17:05 AM]

Could we talk really briefly by the pay for success notion? Not notion but the proposal I had made to fund that out of our budget stabilization reserve as a one-time cost. I think there would be two concerns, as I understand it from doing that. One would be that it's not a one-time cost, it's an ongoing expense for the next five years. And let me say I understand and I know we've all received some communication about this. I understand we're not at the place where we are ready to sign a contract. When we get to talking about the budget expenditure I'll give my rational for proceeding on forward any way, but my question to the financial staff was what would it do if we took it out of the budget stabilization reserve and that would drop us to as I understand it from Mr. Van eenoo 11.9% from our 12% standard? I have followed up with the question of when we've done that before because I think we have occasionally dropped below our 12% budget stabilization reserve. I remember a conversation our council had because we were spending out of our obligations -- I mean, we were using some funds and it created some concern among council for those expenditures for those individual expenditures which were child care, as I remember, at one of the -- at the women and children's shelter. So I guess I just want to ask if any -- if anyone on the council is interested in exploring that as an option and if -- and if there's not a will to do so then we'll just -- not the pay for success expenditure, but paying for the pay for success expenditure by using some of our budget stabilization reserve fund. Understanding that, one, it would drop us below 12% to 11.9 and also understanding that it's an ongoing expense that we would be funding through 1-time and we'd need to identify ongoing expenses next year. That's two threshold questions we may as well start with before we spend lots of time on it.

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar and then Ms. Kitchen.

>> Casar: I would just -- I understand and would anticipate that our finance staff would tell us not to go into the 12% but I would want to understand from finance staff what the real implications are of going to 11.9% and really knowing that one point -- .1% isn't really anything we're planning on spending this year but an important symbolic gesture we want to make if we want to keep this conversation going is my understanding.

[11:19:30 AM]

So I would want to keep the door open to having that conversation. I just want to hear from -- having been here before, I anticipate our finance staff telling us we don't want you to do that but I want to better understand what that really means if we chose to do it. So my answer to your question is I'd like to keep the door open but want to hear more. And that I would hate to designate funds -- keep us from spending money this coming fiscal year on -- to put up \$1.2 million in pay for success that we know we can't allocate which would then reduce our potential expenditures this year. I would rather -- really like to avoid that if possible.

>> Mayor Adler: Ms. Kitchen -- I'm sorry, let's hear from financial staff. Do you want to answer the question? And then we'll get to you.

>> First I wanted to confirm what come to said. We did confirm that it was an fy16 where council elected to do a midyear --

>> Mayor Adler: Can you point the microphone toward you little more, point it up a little bit.

>> Tovo: We can't hear you.

>> Mayor Adler: If you point the bend up a little bit. It's pointing down.

>> In fiscal year 16, is that better? In fiscal year 16, council did approve a budget amendment that dropped us below the 12%, dropped us to 11.9%, the same that's being talked about today. So, you know, I think that it's -- we have these financial policies to try to give us guidelines for maintaining good financial practices and making prudent decisions. That's really what they're for. It's your statement of what you feel is important for us to adhere to from a financial perspective. You know, but certainly it's your prerogative to choose in certain instances to waive those policies or to change those policies. So in terms of immediate consequences or impacts, I don't know that there would be any that I could immediately point to.

[11:21:32 AM]

You know, but I would caution council from continuing down the path of going, you know, to 11.9 and if that worked well there then we go to 11.8 and 11.7. It's just one-those slippery slopes that you'd have to decide, you know, do you want to start down that path or not.

>> Mayor Adler: Ms. Kitchen.

>> Kitchen: My question also was -- are there other options? In order I think what we're trying to accomplish is that we want to be able to point to a commitment. And I think that's important for the pay for success or the other partners and we want to be able to point to that financial commitment. So what occurs to oust is reserves -- to us is reserves. Is there another option? Is there a way to do this that we're not just -- because otherwise, as councilmember Casar said, we're taking dollars out offer our budget we know we're not going to spend them this year. Because of the way this program works we need to make a commitment. So is there -- are there other options or are we back to the take it out of general fund or the reserve?

>> I think those are the only options we have. I've had conversations with our controller about this, and, you know, the liability and how do we book that and how does it hit? We can't -- I don't think there's any way around it. You either set the fund aside in the general fund or you set them aside in the reserve. You know, someplace or another it's a \$1.2 million commitment we're making that creates a liability in our books so we need to have the fund to back it up.

>> Kitchen: This too responds to empty's question. I'm open to setting it aside in reserve. So the question you were asking is how we felt about it. I would be open to it.

>> Mayor Adler: One of the conversations I think that we need to have next if we're making buckets of conversations in terms of the five and a half now and then trying to come back relatively quickly on budget amendments will be the whole reserve question that we have as raised by other councilmembers, Ms. Houston I think raised that and councilmember Flannigan raised the question of reserves and actually trying to increase the reserves, not cutting into reserves.

[11:24:01 AM]

And an additional option to fund homelessness project I guess would be the tpid which is an avenue that would be available to fund that or to replenish the reserve by funding that. It may be that when we get together in a month or so to discuss the public safety contracts and the overall reserve balances we might be in a better position to be able to discuss whether or not that's an option that we want to leverage as well. Ms. Troxclair.

>> Troxclair: I just want to say that I think that that's the -- you know, I'm interested in the pay for success program and finding a way to further explore it, but I don't think that dipping into our reserves is the right way to go about it. I think if anything we need to be talking about how we increase our

reserves in order to prepare for an eventual downturn in order to protect the city and our employees and, you know, if it's -- if it's a program that we really think is a priority and takes precedent over other issues, then we need to find a way to prioritize it within our general fund.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem.

>> Tovo: Yeah I mean we can leave that question for a while. As we're trying to figure out whether we have 5 million or whether we really have 6.2, if we are in agreement to fund it this way, that was really why I wanted to try to get a clarity on that, on where the will of the council would be on that issue. I think there may be some others.

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah. Ms. Houston, and then Mr. Casar.

>> Houston: And I certainly support whatever we can do to find appropriate services and supports for people who are homeless. I can't support drawing down the reserve.

[11:26:01 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Casar.

>> Casar: So as to -- I think there's two potential middle sort of ground ways of dealing with this. One, I think that it -- and the other one, as councilmember kitchen brought up is an idea that I think maybe we should talk to some of the pay for success folks to see if it's possible but one way to prevent the slippery slope a little less slippery is to include some budget direction that the reason that we would do this is because we aren't actually committing those dollars this fiscal year, that we are just setting them aside. And I understand that for the purposes of a financial policy there's no difference, but for us I think there is a difference, that we are not -- if there's an economic downturn, this is not money that we will already have committed to something because we all know that we're not. So I think we could set aside the reserve funds with some budget direction that makes that really clear and that that's why we're going under this level. Another option might be for us to have some level of budget direction -- maybe put some down payment portion down that we are funding and then some other portion that we're directing the manager to have in the next year's budget. I don't know if that would -- I don't know if that would successfully send a strong enough symbol for us to recruit potential investors we would need but that's -- in looking for other options that's one solution that I've thought about and talked with some folks with but I don't think we've gotten a final answer back yet on whether or not -- and what the size of that down payment would have to be, too, to be successful. But I just want to caution that it's not like we're going down to 11.9 and actually spending that money, which is what I think makes this an exceptional case.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Yes, councilmember alter.

>> Alter: I do not support taking this money out of the reserves, though I do strongly support moving forward with the pay for success model.

[11:28:02 AM]

It's not money that we would have to pay out unless we succeed, but it is money that would allow us to leverage a lot of money from the county and central health and also to encourage them to be focusing on a priority that we have in addressing the homelessness. So I support the pay for success out of the 5 million plus pot, which I think is 5 million five at least at this point.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mr. Casar.

>> Casar: And councilmember alter may very well already -- may already understand this perfectly well but I just want to make clear that it's not -- what I mentioned is not that there's 1.2 million that we might not have to pay out if we don't succeed. It's that that contract -- so this isn't necessarily clarifying it for anybody on the dais but just to the public, that contract can't be paid out in fiscal year 17-18 so there's just no -- even if -- there's just no logistical way that it's being paid out this year.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ms. Houston.

>> Houston:

>> Houston: Based upon the memo that we received today from the law department, I'm not sure why we won't discuss this when we have something that seems like a pay for success model will be a reality rather than the email that I read this morning said that this is a non-starter at this point. So I'm not sure why we would want to even consider moving money -- I mean, identifying money in our reserve for something that's not something that we can do this next year. Because legal says we can't. So there may be other ways to do it, but the one we are looking at today is not one.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem?

>> Tovo: So maybe, I want to be respectful of how you've outlined our moving forward so I think I can address that in a little while. I cleared with city legal that this is a privileged memo so I want to be careful about what I say with regard to that, but I will say I'm going to continue to advocate for setting aside that money in our budget for the reasons that I'll explain later but I think it is important to make progress on it.

[11:30:16 AM]

I'm trying to get a threshold question on it if we can do it out of reserves. Everybody who has spoken up may have been who wanted to speak up. It's not clear to me whether a vote to be successful or not, but I think there are some significant reservations on it. I'll leave it there for now and ponder.

>> I don't think I've seen the attorney-client memo, but councilmember Houston then brings up if this is something you want to set money aside for this year for something you want to occur next year, there's no administrative ability that staff would have to carry those funds forward short of a contract and the lawful reason to carry those funds forward. So to some degree you would be setting them aside to some purpose then to have to reset them aside next year, unless I'm missing something from what you're saying.

>> Tovo: Which for me is the transect zone do it for the way we proposed out of the budget stabilization than a direct allocation. But I feel confident we could figure out one way or the other how to roll those funds over. If you could roll our office funds over, I could say. It's also kind of modeled, I guess, after the economic development reserves, how we fund those in advance. We do fund some of those things a year in advance of having to make those payments. I have every confidence you all will sort it out.

>> We can absolutely roll them forward. I'm just saying it would take council action prior to next year's budget and you could either roll them forward or set them aside at that time.

>> Tovo: Right.

>> Mayor Adler: You're saying it would take another council vote a year from now to actually do this?

>> Casar: I just want to reiterate, Mr. Van eenoo's point. You're not missing anything. We weren't doing this for any legally substantive budget reason. We are doing it because it's a symbolic step that needs to be taken in order to -- needs to be taken in order to keep this ball rolling. If you can figure out what potentially symbolic actions that could satisfy this purpose, no matter what we would have to vote in next year's budget to roll it over.

[11:32:20 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: I am strongly in support of the program because it leverages so many governmental entities' dollars focused at this problem. By having all the different entities join in this, it just creates a mass that we don't otherwise have. There were some other issues if you look -- I don't know if you've gone through your entire list, mayor pro tem?

>> Tovo: I had one more. Are you leaning toward doing another budget stable reserve or no?

>> Mayor Adler: That's something that I would consider doing, but my sense is that now -- I would rather have the reserve question in a month when we knew how much money was coming back or we had a better indication of funds coming back potentially from the public safety contracts and when we will

probably have greater certainty on the hot tax revenues and the monies that will roll up then too. So it's something really important to me, but I'm not sure we'll have all those options available to us right now to have to lose something else that we don't want to lose.

>> Tovo: So it sounds to me as if there may not be a support on the dais for budget stabilization reserve measure so I'm going to proceed and just talk about it later when we talk about direct allocations. And I do have a couple more things.

>> Mayor Adler: We're going to take a break at noon and my hope is we might be able to hit the same way we just talked about the big issue of the pay for success model and we want to be able to daylight some of the other questions like homeless services generally, the senior exemption, the aid, health and human services contracts, quality of life contracts and public safety. I'd like to get us on the dais and talk about those big issues too so we can get a feel for where people are in the priorities as well. But did you have a couple more things you wanted to raise?

>> Tovo: I think I have one more --

>> Houston: Before you go off that, other people on the dais may know this, but could that money be set aside in your strike fund, mayor, just to be a placeholder?

[11:34:25 AM]

I don't know where the strike fund is at this point?

>> Mayor Adler: That's pretty much a housing conservancy issue and they're raising money to make direct investments into workforce housing that's on the market.

>> Houston: Okay. So homelessness is not a part of that.

>> Mayor Adler: No.

>> Alter: I believe they've already raised a million dollars of private money that would need to be part of this and that would be a contribution to the pay for success process, but that they need to have a million-two commitment to move forward with something that would allow us to leverage the money and allow us to innovate with a new process that we would only be paying ultimately if we provided the permanent supportive housing. So I think that there are a lot of issues. I don't think it's bad if we have an extra million-two setting in our reserves for the year. I'm a proponent of one of the councilmembers who has proposed having extra reserves and I think this is why we have both the extra reserves in there and the commitment to this process moving forward.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mayor pro tem?

>> Tovo: Okay. And then I have at the moment just one last thing I wanted to ask about under the mayor and council budget on 202. I needed some clarity on a couple of the increases. One of them is a line called mayor and council admin costs. And since we're looking at everyone's budgets, at increases, I just feel I need to do it for this one too. City manager, could you help me explain what is contained within mayor and council admin costs? And why that is increasing or proposed to increase from 167,697 almost by 100,000 to 264.

[11:36:26 AM]

I can't read the last three numbers, 698. Sorry. Volume II, page 202. And I'm sorry that I didn't ask this in the Q and a, but I am only -- it only jumped out at me a few days ago. And if you need to get back to us, that's fine. I just want to understand what -- again, what exactly is contained in the mayor and council admin costs? Whether that's staffing, whether that's costs associated with having our meetings, and again why that is proposed to increase by 90,000ish dollars?

>> I'm going to assume that that's the increase due to the allocation of the social services -- the support services funds where we take all of the support services, finance, hr and it's part of the cost allocation that goes to every department, but I'll have to follow up on staff to confirm that, but I think that's what it is.

>> Tovo: So that would just be the allocation that's assigned to mayor and council just in the way it's assigned to all other departments? It just seems like a more substantial increase than previous years. The previous year was about a 7,000-dollar increase. The year before that was a substantial jump, but that was the year that we changed from a district base -- from an at-large to a district base. So there was a big jump then and then a much smaller increase from 2015 to 2016, from 2016 to '17. And then a small jump. So if you could get back to us on that.

>> I will.

>> I can speak. Roughly off the cuff I can speak that about 30,000 of that was for the food and ice because we do have more council meetings, more staff at these meetings and more lunches and dinners.

[11:38:26 AM]

So we did put a 30,000-dollar increase for that. And I think we would have to get back to you. I think the city manager is right, another portion of the increase would be related to the cost allocation plans.

>> Tovo: I think it would be helpful to see that breakdown if it's possible to get it.

>> It's not a problem.

>> Tovo: That would be great. And I need to also ask awkwardly, I see that our council budgets are increasing by about \$14,000, and I think it's appropriate to have modest increases in those, but the increase for the mayor's budget as I calculate it is about 67,815. And typically the increases for the council and the mayor are more similar. And so I wondered, city manager, if you could address that differential in increase, please? And if you need to get back to me, that would be fine.

>> A piece of it was additional travel cost, 6,000 for each councilmember office and 10,000 for the mayor's office. I don't know what the remainder of the cost increases are. They would have increased for all the citywide cost drivers, health benefits and the like. So the remainder would have been the travel.

>> Tovo: That's not helping me understand the differential increase, so again, if you need to get back to us after lunch that would be helpful, but I need to -- we have increased our office budgets and from time to time I do get asked about that, but I also get asked about the increasing differential between a council office budget and a mayoral budget office. So with all due respect to my colleagues across the office, including you mayor, I think we need to be able to account to the public for why the mayor's office budget is now more than twice our council budgets because that has been steadily increasing.

>> We are going to have to get back to you in regards to that, and that won't be a problem either in terms of the specific line items that are going up in these different budgets and why percentagewise it does appear that it's higher in the mayor's budget.

[11:40:35 AM]

So we can get back to you on that. Going back to the admin costs, the other change is we started budgeting this year \$50,000 for terminal pay which isn't as terrible as it sounds. It's funding for when somebody terminates from the city. So what happens is in your council budgets you might have hired an aide who has 20 years of experience with the city and if they terminate from the city while they're in your office you could have a very large terminal pay, which would be a big impact to your budget, and when that's happened in the past we've never had a way to deal with it. So what we think we need to do to better manage our offices and mayor and council's office is to have an amount set for terminal pay so if you have people terminate from the city and they're owed as part of that from separating from the city we will have a source of funding to pay for it. It's something we could never anticipate. It wouldn't make sense on an individual because we never know know who will retire and for what reasons and when. So this gives us a way to help manage that function that we've never had a way to really deal with before. We're always trying to deal with it on the fly and figure it out as it occurs. That's what happens

with the admin budget. We'll get back to you after lunch toward to the office budgets ant the mayor's budget.

>> Garza: With regards to the council budgets, I think it's good that they're all equal, but my question is for -- we all pay our staff at different rates. So when a council office pays maybe a higher wage and then the three percent addition, it almost hits those council offices harder because it's three percent of a higher amount for each person -- so has there been discussion on -- on a separate fund that accounts for that?

[11:42:36 AM]

Because I would think it wouldn't be fair to just add more to a single council office, but I think it is a concern that -- I think you understand what I'm saying and you're ready to address it.

>> Yeah, I am ready to respond. There's always been a desire, at least since I've been at the city, to keep the council office budgets at the same levels even though what they actually spend in any given year may be different. And even though given your discretion as councilmembers some of you may choose to hire more people or to hire people at higher salaries or to use temporaries so you had different personnel costs. So I think when the city does a three percent wage increase those putting more of their budget towards personnel kind of get shorted, and that's true. So there are really three options and what we've been doing in recent years has been to say we'll look at it on average. Some people may need a 5,000-dollar increase for pages and other people might need a 7,000-dollar increase for wages. The average is 6,000. We'll give everybody 6,000. That's one way to handle it. That has been the way we've been handling it. Another way to handle it, which is what we're doing in this year's budget, is to look at it as some people need 5,000, some people need 7,000 so let's budget everybody at the 7,000 so that nobody is caught short. That's what we've switched to in doing the fy18 budget. And the third option would be to just move away from the ideal that every council budget office has to be exactly the same and just budget 5,000 for those who had a 5,000-dollar increase in their budget as a result of wages and 7,000. That's never been staff's recommendation or the desire of council. So if we're going to keep them the same, those are the options, you either budget for the highest or you budget for the average. We've been doing the average, but starting in fy18 we've been budgeting for the highest.

>> Garza: Okay. And I also had questions about the difference in the council increase and again, all due respect to the mayor, the mayor budget as well. I think it was our first year we had a discussion about increasing staff for each office and there was an ask for more in the mayor office and there was compromise to a little bit lower.

[11:44:44 AM]

And I'm just curious to see what that is. Is that another fte? And if that is, why are we not having that discussion as a council?

>> Mayor Adler: I'd be interested in seeing what it is. I've asked for no additional fte, I've asked for no additional anything. So the fact that -- I don't know what that increase is either, but as far as I know, there's no increase that would affect the -- fte or otherwise that would affect the proportionality. I hear -- so I haven't asked for anything and as far as I know I haven't gotten anything that's disproportionate.

>> Garza: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay? Anything else? Councilmember troxclair?

>> Troxclair: One more question. Manager, did you say that the -- that there was a 6,000-dollar increase this year in all of our offices for travel?

>> I believe that's correct. Ed will confirm when he brings the details back.

>> That's correct, but we'll include it in the details.

>> Troxclair: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: I will tell you that most of the travel that I do, and I do a lot representing this city, is dollars that I pay for personally, and quite frankly, I think that's a really bad policy for the city to have because the next mayor after me probably won't -- or may not be able to pay for that personally. But I think that the travel is real important. Okay. Anything else? Let's hit some of these other big issues just to see where people are on the dais. We're going to break in 15 minutes for lunch. I'm sorry, what?

>> [Inaudible].

>> Mayor Adler: Let's hit some of the big issues here that are highlighted on this page, worksheet, to see where people are. We just addressed homelessness on the pay for success.

[11:46:47 AM]

This is kind of the worksheet, which sought to pull into one page many of the things or most of the things, hopefully most all the things that were showing up on multiple, as best we could, recognizing that they were coming in. I'm sure I didn't catch everything, but what I've highlighted in yellow are the big pieces, the big movers, the big levers. And I thought we would be able to just touch base and see where the council was on these big, big levers. So I would recommend we just go through the list and recognize them. Starting at the bottom of the list, the unfunded officer question.

>> Kitchen: Did you finish the homeless? I had to step out for a minute.

>> Mayor Adler: No. We just got to it. I was just starting at the bottom and working my way up.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: My recommendation would be that we don't address the police officer staffing until we've gone through the contract negotiations. So that we would hold that in abeyance, that's what I would recommend.

>> Renteria: Where are you at?

>> Mayor Adler: Those were quality of life items. So I just put the X on there. You see in the top of the blue there I have Q of L which meant quality of life. The won above that were the quality of life initiatives. That was the amount that was shown in the budget I think is where that came from, the 2017 budget items. Does anybody want to address quality of life generally? To me that's a priority for me. We've talked about this. Again, I would love for us to come up with a different system for next year. I know we kind of tried, but didn't quite make it this year. I put a posting on the board which basically contain suggestions that came to me from various quality of life commissions.

[11:48:53 AM]

And what I was proposing for that from the quality of life folks is that we make the additional investment into the equity office so as to increase its capacity and use that office to help facilitate a process and those quality of life commissions. Number one so that we do that equity office, which was I think a 200,000-dollar expenditure. And that we try to put money into the quality of life and fund items as recurring expenses, not one time expenses so that we build in a recurring stream. We talked about trying to set up a system for next year where we had different bucket where we were funding quality of life organizations above 75,000, 25 to 75,000 and then smaller ones as well as capacity building, trying to use a process similar to what happens with the cultural arts funding where we have both a peer and professional working through that. I would like to see us do that long-term. Short-term there were items that were mentioned on various people's budgets that seemed to have a lot of support. The millennium center improvements had support. We have several here that are marked on here, the asian-american resource center master plan. There were several of those that are marked here. Immigrant legal services was a request. The prep program, affordable care act enrollment showed up in quality of life as well as a couple of members' priorities. But I would like to see us have a significant sum devoted that way from a policy perspective that's something we can do at a council level and a budget year.

[11:50:59 AM]

Cool?

>> Pool:

>> Thanks, mayor. I red your message board posting and thought that was a good way to proceed this year and have sent it off to at least one, if not a couple of my quality of life commissioners on the various different boards. And if we are able to bring them into the effort to help us kind of draft a way to manage ensuring that the different efforts are funded properly, I think that would be good. I don't know if we need to go as far as how we do for cultural arts. That's pretty intense and it's also very staff intensive but relying on our quality of life commissions like we've done the past two or three years has seemed to work pretty well. I appreciated the thought that you put into the message board posting.

>> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston?

>> Houston: Thank you, mayor. Thank you for trying to organize this for us. I think it's important to understand that some of the things that I rolled up from the African-American quality of life into larger buckets I'm not sure that there's enough money in those buckets to be able to do all that, for example, job training is one of the areas. The other thing is educational opportunities. So those -- even though you roll those specific programs -- not programs, but initiatives up into a category, the category is still very small as far as people who are legacy contractors with the city and those who want to get into providing services for their particular community from these contracts. So I see that may be the problem with the funding.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. And to that end, councilmember Houston, I think it's a really good point. We did put on here, and you're right it was mentioned quality of life reports, but I didn't X it. Job training is in that first column.

[11:53:01 AM]

I didn't identify any particular provider, but said let's put money against job training. Apparently that was dollars that could be spent out across departments without impacting budgets is what our staff told us. But I think we probably should do a budget ride we are that that would describe what our expectations would be or criteria would be for job training programs that we would -- for staff.

>> Houston: Because after many years now we do have some performance metrics for -- matrix for people who have received funding for several years now and some of those performance matrix are not that good. So I think we need to take a look at those too. Some of them the goal is at 90% and they're only functioning at 50, 65%. I have to get my notes. So there are some things that I think we need to be able to adjust.

>> Mayor Adler: I understand. Further discussion on the dais? Councilmember Garza.

>> Garza: With regard to the quality of life, was your recommendation that this money be set aside, but it would be an rfp process so we wouldn't be naming specific organizations? Which I am -- I support.

>> Mayor Adler: I'd like us to get to that. There may be a couple of items that the councilmembers are going to want to name specifically, but I think we need to get to a place where we have a process that's set up where we're not naming particular vendors. So however closer we can get to that every time, I support.

>> Garza: Okay. And did you -- the highlights ones, are we going to -- I'm sorry, I kind of zoned out.

>> Mayor Adler: I just highlighted ones that I thought were big levers that it would be good to get a feel of the dais kind of like what we did on the pay for success model, the mayor pro tem raised that, just to gauge people's interest generally because I thought that might help us this afternoon if we were trying to craft a five and a half-million-dollar budget which I think we ought to try to do as a way to organize ourselves.

[11:55:16 AM]

Obviously you can't do all these. And some of these -- I think we all support most all of these, if not all of these. And we're going to have to move some either to the next round when we do the first budget amendment or -- or -- obviously we'll have to adjust. When you add these up it's significantly more than five and a half million dollars.

>> Garza: Do you want us to comment on it or go to lunch and come back.

>> Mayor Adler: I was hoping to dig into some of the big items on here.

>> Garza: If I can talk about the big increase on the health and human services contracts. You know, it should have been about a six-million-dollar increase and my office reached out to public health and asked at the minimum what would a three percent be. And this was a number, so I feel this is a good compromise from a six-million ask to 840,000. It's my understanding that they could -- what my initial ask was going to be was a million, and that there be an fte included in that at about 80,000-dollar fte would be included in that, but at a minimum I think we should honor some of our previous commitments to increasing contracts, and some of those increases will actually increase some of these other -- some of these on here are public health contracts, so by increasing three percent we are increasing some of these contracts, including some of the homelessness initiatives. So if we do a flat three percent we increase everybody's contract and then on top of that we could add more, but I just want to point that out that this would mean that every single -- my understanding is we would build capacity by three percent for all these contracts. So we're affecting a lot of people by doing that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ms. Houston?

>> Houston: And mayor, I appreciate that. The African-American quality of life that we rolled up into the health pot is for behavioral health outreach.

[11:57:18 AM]

And so that would be different than just health care, primary health care. That's a very different allocation.

>> Mayor Adler: Which line are you looking at, I'm sorry, Ms. Houston?

>> Houston: On the sheet that I handed out yesterday it was -- it's page 19, behavioral health. And there's nothing here -- we're talking about existing contracts and just increasing those existing contracts by three percent.

>> Mayor Adler: Got it.

>> Houston: There's no existing contract for behavioral health. For the African-American population.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Renteria: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Renteria.

>> Renteria: Yesterday I passed out on the concept menu that funding for the full-time outreach at the mac was not needed and that I made recommendations on some of the other items like montopolis doesn't have any funding for their Sam's corner. So I made a substitute that didn't make it into the quality of life concept menu and I had put in there funding for the ballet east and mexicarte for a video documentary on chicano artists, which is basically 17,500. And the continued funding of Sam's corner for one time funding of 400,476. So that program is -- montopolis really feels like they've been left out. It's a low income minority community that historically has been sort of like neglected.

[11:59:19 AM]

So I was hoping that we could offer something for that area.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mayor pro tem?

>> Tovo: Yes, I just wanted to note -- thank you for your message board post. I think there are a lot of good ideas to talk about. I hope not in the course of this day, but in the weeks ahead. And I think you identified really clearly that some of those items have bumped up to priority lists on four or five lists. So I think there are definitely some quality of life -- some quality of life recommendations that are in good position for potential funding. And I think actually I think it's gone much more smoothly. I just want to say I think the recommendations came to us and really for the most part much the form we had asked for. I am really going to probably strongly urge -- and I just -- that we do what we had talked about a couple of meetings ago, which is to -- for those individual organizations who are having events or festivals that were recommended by some of our quality of life commissions that we handle those in the way that we've talked about, which is to create a pool of funding. On my priority list you will see \$150,000 for that purpose. It's not intended to really capture any of the broader recommendations for many of those quality of life commissions. It's really an attempt to set aside some money -- again, I think my number is 150, for smaller organizations who are requesting \$20,000, 30,000, 15,000, and that we provide some direction to the staff. And I'll try to keep working on some. But that we provide some direction to the staff to set up a process where they would solicit organizations who are interested and -- in the applications and administer that in kind of a fair way. I think that's really where we need to go to.

[12:01:19 PM]

Health and human services has -- it's my understanding does that with some of its small grants through its health equity program. The cultural arts as we've talked about is really challenging for smaller organizations to access. This would be a low barriers program that we would ask staff to set up, but it would allow a kind of more objective assessment of those programs, and also I think would help those organizations build capacity. Having that kind of low barriers process and some more back and forth with its staff about how to account -- what information to capture, how to organize their expenses, how to propose -- I just think would be of help for them and for -- and would remove us from the process of picking particular events over others and particular programs over others. So it's not on your list, but I just wanted to call everyone's attention to that on mine. Again, 150 for those kinds of events that came forward as recommendations from one of the quality of life commissions.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Do you want to speak to, mayor pro tem, either you or councilmember Casar, to the aid item?

>> Casar: If you were talking about the big highlighted item, I think that we --

>> Mayor Adler: Or speak to any of the big highlighted items.

>> Casar: We haven't spoken to aisd, but I think that we shouldn't be -- I would really like to figure out ways for either us through something creative or aid to make sure that this isn't a year to year question

that parents and kids are facing about whether or not they're going to have these services and whether or not they're going to have their after school programs. It's just really hard, but if we're talking about funding new programs, I just can't -- to me I can't support anything other than making sure that existing good work that's being done goes on and those parents don't suddenly lose the child option at their school or the after school program at their school.

[12:03:27 PM]

So for me I think that has to be in the first round along with as you've listed, several of the quality of life commission recommendations that are listed with an X next to them. So things like immigrant legal services, prep, health care enrollment. That could be the good way that we cover the -- what I thought were really good useful recommendations from the quality life commissions. And if there's ways that the equity office can further support that process, I'm -- listed on my list adding staff to the equity office, the health and human services contracts, some chunk of that being, as councilmember Garza suggested in the first million. I think that covers a significant part of that 5.5. And if we can figure out the reserve option or another option for the pay for success, then that saves us from having to deal with it in the 5.5. But as the mayor pro tem indicated that may have to be a vote and it may be a close one, but we'll cross that when we get there. So for me I support finding ways to fund title I schools in other school districts. I have some portion of pflugerville ISD in my district as well, but I don't want to in this budget end programs happening at aid. Even if I would frankly like to see aisd do the really deep digging to try to figure out ways that their board can help us make sure that this is a permanent thing.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Tovo: I'll speak to both of those funding requests. And I have more information that I'll share if anyone needs this information to help make their decision. But I would also call your attention, we all got a memo from aid on July 24th, 2017 outlining both of the programs, the parent teacher specialist request as well as the after school programs. As councilmember Casar mentioned these are existing programs that we have helped fund over the last several years.

[12:05:28 PM]

If we do not identify funding in this year's budget those programs will stop. And they are taking place -- I'll just read a few of the schools, and they presented us with this information by district. So I'll read it in district order. Lbj, Andrews elementary school, Blackshear. District two, Odom, pleasant hill and Williams elementary schools. Trustee, metz, Zavala. Guerrero, Thompson, Riley. District five, sunset valley, which is on the border. None in six, seven and eight. And one in district nine, Travis heights. None

in 10. It serves approximately 2600 children at the 18 schools and again we are funding a portion of it through a competitive grant. This is the additional money, but those programs will stop for the children in those schools if we don't identify those funding sources. So that's for me a really critical priority and it's part of -- it's part of our pip with aid. I hope we can do it as an ongoing source of funding this year rather than a one time so that we can make that commitment, as councilmember Casar said, so that the parents and the families at those schools have certainty that the programs are going to continue, which for all of us, whether or not we have kids, you can imagine Austin then what that uncertainty does if you're not sure if you have an after school option for your concern, that certainly impacts your ability to work and fulfill your other responsibilities. The parent-teacher support specialist is also I believe critically important and both of these I think -- are offer much in line with our menu purpose of supporting Austin families. Let me leave it there. And these parent-teacher support specialists, half the cost is provided by aisd, half the cost being picked up by the city, or would be if we approved this budget expenditure. So these are individuals who are hired.

[12:07:30 PM]

And again would be -- would have to stop working or at least move down to halftime if we cannot fund them. The parent-teacher support specialists, I've got a list. I probably shouldn't read it, but they are in schools in districts one, two, three, four, five, seven and nine. Elementary schools, middle schools, I don't see any high schools. I think everyone here is probably familiar with the parent-teacher support specialist. I'll just leave it at that and they're very important. They're a very important, trusted individual in the lives of children who go to those schools and they not only help the children be successful in the school, but also connect those families to resources in the community that are really critical to their economic and health success. So I would again identify this as a priority for our very limited funding.

>> Mayor Adler: Anybody want to speak to any of the L items before we break for lunch?

>> Casar: Mayor, I just wanted to add two examples here in the last year with the parent support specialists. I recognize what I spoke to is mostly after school program. So in my district an entire elementary school was shut down so kids and their parents had no school to go to. And they were calling my office nervous about what they were going to do. And who they could talk to and the parent support specialists at brown and at Barrington were critical in helping families who are city of Austin constituents get through the process of moving your life to be able to send kids to reland then to the -- to Riley and then to the old Allen campus and what that looks in this case in coordinating with the city and the school district to find out what was a pretty significant change in their lives caused by some failures on the public side.

[12:09:32 PM]

And then also a child in my district was hit by a vehicle at one of my nearby elementary schools and the parent support specialist was critical there for bringing together the city and the school district and other folks to figure out how we needed to change what we could do to improve pedestrian safety and the way that those kids were walking to school and the bus stop and to bring those parents together to have a conversation about what had been a very persistent issue for some time and it had become urgent because of that very unfortunate event. That's the kind of stuff that these folks do at these schools and I think if there's going to be something in the baseline budget it's got to be figuring out how we're providing social safety net services. And I think this is part of doing that alongside the other stuff that we've already mentioned.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember troxclair, and then councilmember pool and --

>> Troxclair: This is on a different topic. I don't know if you were wanting to chime in on that same topic.

>> Mayor Adler: Different topic or same topic.

>> Same.

>> Mayor Adler: We'll come back to you.

>> Pool: I wanted to add my voice the same as I have done the last two years to mayor pro tem and councilmember Casar, it's absolutely essential that we assist in any way that we can with the education and our community and I'll remind everybody that if the Austin school district were treated the same way as all the other school districts in our region we wouldn't be having these problems, but they are specifically singled out because we are a property rich, but economically poor generally community and the school finance law doesn't really address that at all. And there are shortcomings as we know in the way the shortcomings legislation are drawn in the way that have made aisd's financing situation be unique throughout the state.

[12:11:34 PM]

And I've had ongoing conversations with pflugerville school board members and last year asked was there anything we could help them with. And there really wasn't. They approached the contact. I've talked again, put in a call and we've missed each other with the board president again this year. There isn't anything they have on their list, but they're happy to continue to have those conversations. Again, ace is on a one-off, analogous situation with the stay. And I'm glad we have support on this dais to help where we can and I think these are significant programs.

>> Mayor Adler: Ms. Kitchen?

>> Kitchen: I just wanted to add my support also. I'm very familiar with the parent teacher support specialist and for all the reasons that people have stated, they are actually a -- they're actually an excellent investment in -- both from a financial standpoint in our kids and in our community. So that one is a top priority for me.

>> Mayor Adler: Still on this topic, councilmember alter? Quality like my colleagues I see that investing in children and families is a key priority. I wanted to take a slightly different tactic in terms of how we think about this. I see not funding these programs as a cut to health, safety and quality of life, which are number of the buckets that we've been focused on. And I want to point out that if we didn't have these programs in the schools we'd be trying to find other places to have the programs and they would cost a lot more money having them in the schools. The space is free. The teachers around parents are hired to run the programs. There are existing relationships that carry over. There are no transportation costs to get the children from school to another site. If we cut the parent support specialist the families who rely on them are not going to get connected to the services that we require in our city or they're going to turn elsewhere and overturn the setup we have everywhere else.

[12:13:47 PM]

In the broader context of the federal government potentially cutting funding to those neighborhood centers which is another place in our community where we get these services I think it's really critical that we continue the parent support specialists where we have them. If we don't and Wednesday up with a cut to the neighborhood centers and cutting this, we are not going to have a mechanism for reaching out to community to provide the services that they need. It takes a valuing and the families in my district are not directly benefiting from this but these are all city children and we need to invest in these programs.

>> Mayor Adler: I've always been a big supporter of these programs and continue to be. I think they're real important. I have to still think through, though, there are other things that are on here that I'm not sure it that we're in a position to be able to do the full funding. And we had talked about that last year. It was one of the reasons why we tried to come up with creative ways like the tax swap. I noticed that some of the school board members were not support of that or -- I hope that we can continue to be creative. And to find solutions that would answer some of these questions for us. Because I think those possibilities might exist. And I will coming out of that conversation with the tax swap, I'm more concerned this year than I was last year about trying to do equity across school districts and I think there's a way for us to target this toward children that are in poverty, but to also take into account that not all the children in poverty in our city are in these districts. I'm not sure exactly how that measure would be, but there's -- that's also a concern of mine. Ms. Troxclair?

>> Troxclair: Just to comment on the senior homestead exemption real quickly.

[12:15:52 PM]

I don't know what councilmember kitchen -- I assume she had something that she's going to propose. I don't think a thousand dollars is a worthwhile place to start. So I would just hope that we would start the conversation on senior homestead exemption at something that's going to give seniors more benefit than such a small amount. But it did make me think about a question that I wish I had thought of earlier. Is it possible -- I know that we're always in a little bit of a pickle with a general homestead exemption because we have to adopt the homestead exemption legally before our budget process starts. Is it possible to -- if we wanted to, to set aside money in this budget year to apply towards general homestead exemption next year?

>> It's possible. It's just that staff is always going to advise you for kind of a recurring commitment like a homestead exemption increase that you would be well advised to do that with a recurring source of expenditure savings or revenue increase to offset the revenue loss from the homestead exemption. I'm sure that's the intent. The intent is to increase the homestead exemption this year on a one time basis and then bring it back down. If that was the intent I would say set aside some reserves to do that. But I don't think that's the intent. So I would just advise you to look for a recurring source of funding for that recurring commitment.

>> Troxclair: But we could find a recurring source of funds set aside money. It wouldn't be spent in this fiscal year. It would basically just be put aside in a pot and hopefully not touched until next year, but would that help us address? And I don't know if we could commit to what exact percentage we would do and of course we could change that percentage if we decided to adopt it when we came up against the legal deadline next spring.

[12:17:54 PM]

But that is a viable way for us to think about potentially kind of funding the homestead exemption so that we don't have the concern from some councilmembers that we are adopting before we go through the budget process.

>> I think that's a viable way to do it again. Because of the one time versus ongoing would be -- wouldn't be my recommendation. The better way to do it is you go forward with your strategic planning process and determining what your priorities as a council are. If this is one of the priorities that we build that into our financial forecasting and staff comes back to you with a financial forecast model that incorporates increases to the homestead exemption and lays that picture out for you and that way you would be at a comfort level hopefully to adopt the homestead exemption prior to the June 30th

deadline in advance of your budget adoption, but we could have done the analysis and you would have a better sense for what the implications of that will be when it comes to budget adoption. That would be my recommendation more so than trying to find one time funds to do it this year and then having to worry about the ongoing commitments in a future budget cycle.

>> Troxclair: Okay. I won't spend too much time on this because I know we have spent a lot of time in other council work sessions on it, but I would say that that was the direction that the council gave to staff two years ago, three years ago when we adopted the initial resolution for the six percent homestead exemption, we gave specific direction that we intended to phase in a 20% homestead exemption in four years and we're in year three and only at eight percent. So I guess I would -- so I feel like we -- I feel like the council gave that direction to kind of incorporate that into the budget in future years and unfortunately we just haven't got tone a place where that's possible and of course I know that council changes and y'all have to be responsive to the changing minds of the elected officials as well.

[12:19:57 PM]

So -- I'll just have to think about -- if I feel like we've tried that and that's not working and we can't do this, I'll have to keep thinking about it. And I wanted to take a second. I think I gave a sheet to the clerk. Just to show to council the tax rate, historic tax rate that the city has adopted. I handed it out a little bit earlier. It was really helpful for me to see an historical perspective of the percentage over the tax rate that the city has adopted over 25 years ago, if we can put that up. So it might be a little small and of course the -- the last column is really the column that I wanted to focus on. The chart starts in 1991 and ends in 2017. And if you run down those numbers you can see in 1991 the council adopted actually below the effective tax rate and it was two%, three percent, four percent. No increase. Three percent, six percent. And really historically the only time that the council has adopted the maximum effective tax rate or the maximum roll back rate of eight percent was between 2007 and 2010 during the recession. And of course, that's to be expected because in times of -- I guess in times of prosperity, in times of growth the tax rate should go down whereas in terms of times of recession the city is trying to make up funds in order to recover programs and the trait goes up. And then even after that, you know, four percent, five percent, there are a couple of others close to eight percent. And this council came in and adopted almost the maximum tax rate in 2016 or a lot of us on the council came in in 2016 and adopted that tax rate.

[12:22:02 PM]

I think part of the reason that it was slightly lower is because we during the budget process we adopted an amendment to apply a certain amount of money to lowering the tax rate, which helped to get us

below that eight percent and the last year was that eight percent and this year we're looking at eight percent. So I wanted to say that as we go through the next day and a half, it really is unusual historically for us to be setting a precedent that in times of growth and prosperity that we are continuing to adopt the maximum tax rate and I heard one of the things that was said earlier this year about the homestead exemption and adopting the maximum tax rate was that the legislature was considering lowering that eight percent revenue, eight percent roll back rate to six percent or something around there. However, -- and at that time there were statements made that if that didn't happen that there would be -- that we could have more of -- that people would be more open to a conversation about a reduced tax rate and/or hopefully the homestead exemption. So now that the legislature -- the legislative session has passed and we don't have, I guess, the possibility of that being lowered at least over the next two years, I just really hope that as we go through the next two days that we keep in mind just the average taxpayers who are footing the bills. I mean, I know a lot of us ran on affordability and cost of living and although there are lots of needs in the city and lots of services that I think that there's certainly a need for a safety net. We can do this. And the city really has historically done it within well below the effective tax rate. And I think that if we continue down the path of setting a precedent that eight percent is just kind of the status quo, that is only going to encourage the legislature to take action.

[12:24:12 PM]

I mean, I feel like if the -- if this council this year said, do you know what, we're taking the concern seriously, we heard you, and we do have a lot of additional revenue coming in from growth we can do this at below the maximum tax rate, that that truly would make a difference in the eyes of the legislature as the city of Austin was one of them. And the bill that passed the senate -- actually, that passed the house in this last special session, the city of Austin was one of only two cities in entire state that that bill would have applied to, which I think is one reason that the city ultimately didn't concur with it because it didn't -- because they didn't know if it was really effective. But if the city of Austin removes kind of -- can show that we can be fiscally responsible with the trust that the taxpayers have given to us I think that would really go a long way. So I know it's easy to get caught up in all of the good causes that the city is spending money on, and thank you for allowing me to have a long-winded soapbox about this. I hope that -- I'm going to make a motion to apply to take south by southwest funds out of the general fund, move them over to funding the convention center, spring festival security costs, since that is clearly a tourism related activity and I hope at the very least we can apply that one and a half million dollars to lowering the tax rate and give it back to the people who shouldn't have been paying it in the first place.

>> Mayor Adler: I'll ask you a question too. If we were to come in at lower than eight percent will you join in urging the legislature in two years not to put on a cap?

>> Troxclair: If the city of Austin can consistently show that we can on our own adopt a tax rate that I think is reasonable, but we haven't started there so far.

[12:26:17 PM]

So I'm open to the conversation, just as you've said that you were open to the conversation of having a lower tax rate if the legislature didn't pass that bill.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's go ahead and break for lunch. Do we want to have a fire negotiation update? Staff is prepared to give us one. We could get it now. Relative to the budget or we could take it later or take it tomorrow. Do you want to touch base?

>> Today.

>> Mayor Adler: So then let's go back -- we could do it today, we could do it over lunch when we're grabbing lunch real fast. Yes, mayor pro tem?

>> Tovo: Apologies. You asked me if I had anything on my list and I forgot that I wanted to circle back to travel. I can do it right after lunch or if there's time during lunch I'll try to connect with the staff. But the departments that I wanted some more information about were ctm, APD, at least those two.

>> Kitchen: Mr. Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: When we come back we're going to continue on talking about the yellow items because we haven't worked out way through that list yet. Yes?

>> Kitchen: Just a quick point. I think we addressed it and may not come back to it. On the senior exception my understanding is that councilmember alter was proposing one million. So --

>> Mayor Adler: I just put in the number --

>> Kitchen: I know, but it looks artificially low at this rate. And I think that with the other items that -- some of the other items could be cut too. I would just rather have this reflected at a million.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. I highlighted it because I knew it was a big driver even though it was a small one. Are we ready to go back?

>> Alter: I just have one quick question on the budget staff for the homestead exemption. If we were to wait the first -- waive the first budget amendment is that doable or a decision we have to make today or today or tomorrow?

>> Legally you need to adopt it with the tax rate. After you've adopted the budget, ratified it, we'll need more taxes than the prior year, then you adopt your tax rate and the exemptions are adopted with the tax rate.

[12:28:22 PM]

>> Alter: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay?

>> Alter: So if it is the will of the council to move forward with a senior homeless exemption it would have to be adopted today or tomorrow?

>> Correct.

>> Mayor Adler: City council will now go in closed section to take up one item. Council will discuss legal matters related to the ordinance adopting the budget. Item number 1. Without objection, it is 12:28. We will now go back into executive session.

[Executive session]

[1:30:23 PM]

..

[2:28:22 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: We about ready? Looks like we have enough bodies but we're missing people on the dais.

[2:31:40 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: We about ready. We about ready? All right. So we're back -- back to council. It's 2:31 on -- what is the day? September 12, 2017, council chambers, back to talk about the budget. We are in the process of talking about the big items. We want to continue talking about the big items. Ms. Kitchen?

>> Kitchen: We could do that. I think -- well, I think -- I think my colleagues might be ready to make a motion. I'm not sure if they're ready or not. So, okay.

>> Tovo: So mayor, I would like to make a motion that follows -- that tracks along the -- tracks along the priority list that I submitted yesterday which really I need to acknowledge quite similar to several of my colleagues and brought those in. There is one addition and possibly a couple of changes and possibly if they asked my colleague IFS they want to reprint it or work with the sheet with the motion with the addition?

>> Fine with this. There will be additional amendments to it as well.

>> Tovo: Yeah, my motion will be -- it will amount to more in the ongoing funds than we currently have allocated. But we are -- we would either tinker with the amounts on here or we would save that for the conversation.

[2:33:41 PM]

I understand that. So it would be --

>> Kathy, I'm sorry, can you hold up the documents so we can make sure everybody has it?

>> Tovo: This is a combination of councilmembers. Okay. It's really a combination of councilmember Garza, Casar, and my priority list and largely councilwoman Kitchen as well with some flight changes. We also try to grab things from other contacts list as well. The only change from this document will be that - - I need to condition firm that with the public health department. I believe the amounts of passages and prep can be a bit lower because we have funding that could offset the costs noted here. It can confirm that when the staff get here. One addition, wages and benefits for temporary employees in the amount of 600,000. And then I would like to have a discussion. We were hoping our staff could let us know whether the me Len William youth equipment upgrades and the master plan items -- items on this list could be funded through -- through CIP funds or any other funding that might be available for those two needs. That would remove them from the one-time expenditures that total 886 and that would reduce it by 581,000. So that's my motion.

>> Mayor Adler: That's a base motion. Is there a second to that?

>> Tovo: Mayor. And I should note, I left off the concept priority menu item for the after school expansion to Mendez middle schools that's ex--45 on the menu.

[2:35:56 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So just to try to -- I like when at this point with the things we've gotten down, not a budget that anybody put together that I would think was a -- was a really good budget. Let's say I'm

concerned about putting the full amount to the aid expense. And I like that on your page you have both things that are listed to do right now as well as things that would be priority for budget amendment items. My hope is that we might be able to take a vote on things to put them in here. And if they don't get put in the first list, it could be a vote to put them on to the second list. So that anything that didn't get voted on the first might have a second vote and that way we can keep kind of running tally of what's important. Does that make sense? Can I from pose something perhaps a change -- someone had something if the first list that doesn't get approved, there's a second vote to add it to priorities of the latest amendments. So there are two buckets represented by this page. My understanding is that the aid parent-teacher support specialist program is for folks that are doing that work. I think that's all really important work to do. But my -- my amendment to the amendment would be to take the \$950,000 and \$80,000 and move those down to priority for later budget adjustment. And I would recommend that any amount that we keep in the first section that we ask the staff to come up with a way to equalize that by poverty and size of district in the city.

[2:38:01 PM]

So we can contain those two things. Divide those up and put them each to a vote. Yes?

>> Tovo: Mayor, I need you to let me know -- I missed the amendment.

>> Mayor Adler: Two part to the amendment. I'll divide it. The first is to take the after school program, both line items for that, and move that down to the priority for later budget amendment. So what would remain up top would be the parent-teacher support specialist, but the \$950,000 item and the \$80,000 item would go down to the -- to the second group. The second part of my amendment I'll call a vote for that separately is anything that stays up top. I would recommend that we equalize that by the number of taxpayers in the city, in other school districts, and poverty of the school districts so that if we were sending these programs so that -- so that we would equalize by poverty and number of taxpayers in the city of Austin.

>> Tovo: I have comments about both when it's appropriate to do so.

>> Mayor Adler: On the first one, I say we have so many other things to happen that I was put those two and the second one, we got the tax swap, we got the letter of the superintendent schools in Dell valley who said they were in desperate need of help as well and if there was after school support or help that they had programs that they knew could greatly use funding. And while aisd is facing really considerable challenges because of the money that it has to give back, it still has more money per student to spend than all of the schools that are not being equalized. So as unfair as it is, it's even more unfair for some of the other districts.

[2:40:01 PM]

So those are in too. Mayor pro tem.

>> Tovo: I understand this is not an easy -- this is not an easy -- none of these are easy decisions. I just want to remind my colleagues of what I said earlier that these are existing after-school programs so there are families who depend on these programs for their employment, there are kids who depend on these. I actually if I can find it, signed a comment -- yesterday had the opportunity to attend a greater crime commission, 16th annual 9/11 memorial. And admiral Mcraven spoke and one of the things he said in the course of his conversation was that he had an interview at one point in his career with someone about national security. What is the -- you know, what are some of the things we should be doing to improve national security? He responded to that -- to that reporter by saying that the -- that one of the most important things we can do to respond to national security threats to invest in education of our young people. In pre-k through 12. And you know, I think that -- I think that's a conversation and I think a value that I know probably most of us here share that when we invest in pre-k, when we invest in after school, it is -- it is a public safety strategy. It is a health and human services imperative. So I would just -- I would say it's important to those kids and these families that we keep the funding at that amount. I appreciate, mayor, that it would be an important priority for you but I'm going to vote to keep it in tier 1. Open to having that conversation because I think it's important that we support kids throughout the city of Austin and make sure that they have educational opportunities. I would ask if we have that conversation it would be a really thorough and comprehensive one that we look at -- we look at programs that might be getting funding, I think, in some of the other school districts.

[2:42:07 PM]

We are funding some programs within their schools. And I would like to have the conversation together and I would also like to have it in light of -- you know, in light of the really as you acknowledged, the differences with aid with regard to the fact that they're a recapture district and the others -- not all of the others are. So specific data about the cost per student and the amount of funding they have for students and other programs that they might be funding through public health contracts. That would be a good one for us to have, an important one as you indicated would be important at times.

>> I do have some concerns here because it looks like pretty much is going to take up all of our funding. And our are you proposing that we're not east Austin not going to get any kind of funding at all on this -- on the center?

>> Tovo: Councilmember Renteria, I'm happy to have those conversations. Those were not in -- those are not in this budget. But if you want to propose a swap, I think that's what we're doing. I would say I'm

not -- I'm not -- since we're talking about the -- since we're talking about the after-school programs, I just want to make sure that you know there are five schools in your district that would be impacted. Brook, Dawson, million. St. Elmo and day Zavala.

>> Renteria: I'm quite aware of that. And if all we're going to do is spend our money on after-school programmes, then I would be willing to go with you all the way through and put all our money and forget about the other projects that you have in here. You know? If -- resourcing the master plan. If we're going be doing those kinds of things, we need grants of \$150.

[2:44:12 PM]

I just don't see it right now.

>> Tovo: Councilmember, I would say if I could, I did my best to make sure that the big ticket items were those that were reflected on a couple of lists and that -- I mean I really did try to pick up items that were on some of the other council lists so I apologize if and I think we're going to have this conversation about what to amend and where to trim. But I thought it was a starting place for that. For that conversation. 150 was said, in particular, toward your concept list that identified four or five specific organizations. Itotaled them and tried to come up with an amount that I thought would cover all of -- all of those --

>> I tried my best not to get into the war-type politics and hoping that there could be some fairness around here. I hope that we take that into our consideration and fair is fair in how we -- and that's all I ask for.

>> With the council's vote, I think we did this wrong. I think before we put this up to strike this, a better way to go would be to reverse that and talk about programs that we would want to add. And I think if we went through that exercise, then we would know what number if anything we're trying to. And with the dias' indulgence, I would pull down my motion and go instead to things they want to add to this they didn't think and start voting on those that will take us to a number something north of this amount and then if there are cuts to make, we can look at those. But we'll figure out if there will be a better way to do it. It might be a better way to do it than kind of feels like an abstract kind of --

>> Without objection, I'll withdraw my motion.

[2:46:15 PM]

>> Are we still working -->>

Mayor Adler: Yes, mayor pro tem is -- I'm pulling back my amendment to mayor pro tem's. We're using it as our base.

>> Tovo: Mayor. I just want to -- I think I just want to respond. I don't know if the comment about war politics was directed at me, but I just want to point out that these are really programs that impact across the city and to the extent that they impact certain districts more than others, I would say district 9 was probably on the low end of those impacted. So, I don't see these as programs that are aimed at any one district in particular in the afterschool district throughout the city. With the higher concentration in areas of poverty. So I appreciate -- I appreciate, I think, your -- mayor, I think your intent to talk millennium youth center in district 9. Again, I was trying to prepare something that I thought reached across the city at the areas of highest need.

>> Mayor Adler: I appreciate something to work off of. On the table in front of us is the mayor pro tem's motion that we're talking about the amendments to that. Ms. Houston?

>> Houston: Thank you, mayor. I appreciate you and pro tem and other people who worked on revised priorities. There's a lack of equity here. I see that you've got the youth complex but you're trying to find other ways to fund that. The Asian American community is talking about translation, the need for language access for the three years that I've been on here. That's not here. That's critical to the people speaking the five other languages other than Spanish and English.

[2:48:18 PM]

It's not here. So I don't know how we can add on to this list because we've already added those things on the other list that you handed out and this looks like the original list that you presented to us that was almost \$11 million. And so you just kind of culled it down. But it's -- it's none of the other things that anybody else as far as the quality of life -- I hear you say that the mini grants are for are the things that are on the quality of life. But there are other people in this community that have other kinds of service and support needs that are not listed here. In my community, we need jobs and employment opportunities. That's in the secondary. That's something we need now. We don't need that in the secondary. I'm having a hard time trying to get my head wrapped around what it is that you want versus what other people and other parts of the district may want. And so I don't know how to improve upon this list.

>> Exactly that. So if there are things you want to add -- that's the process we're going through. A lot of people, Ms. Houston, want to make changes to this.

>> Houston: I doubt if they're seriously -- I was able to work off of yours much better. You had buckets. These are -- these are specific programs which is very different than a bucket where people can come in with an amount of money and they can apply. These are specific dollar amounts for specific programs.

>> Mayor Adler: And I will support you.

>> Houston: I don't see my programs.

>> Mayor Adler: I will support you. I also think we should go with the buckets. That's the process we're in right now. The two pages I'm working off right now are those two pages. The Tuesday work sheet page and then the this page. Those are the two pages I'm working off of. So I think mayor pro tem laid out a kind of a place to start working from.

[2:50:22 PM]

And now it's in order for people to propose changes to that. And we can take it up above there are 5.5 million on this as we're talking. We helped it to narrow down issues and we can massage it and work with it. But from my mind, what's missing from the chart is presented here is workforce element for me. The quality of life element for me. Things like the equity office that I think are important. So I'm hopeful that as we go through the discussions we can add some additional things.

>> Casar: Mayor, I'm open -- I appreciate the mayor pro tem to put out an earnest attempt at our spread sheets and recognize if I can make amendments to it, I'm sure everybody would have their own version. But I seconded it and am open to hearing the conversation. I do want to note clearly, though, as the community is hearing what we talk about but may not be looking at the sheet but as far as equity issues and issues recommended by quality of life commissions and other commissions, that's largely what is here. The aid programs are largely at low income schools almost entirely of students of color. I can't support as I stated before removing some of the after-school programs because -- supposedly because -- that is who is being served in at least my district and I know many many others. The prep funding is lgbtq quality of life commission item and one of the items they recommended. The millennium youth center and millennium resource center plans are also quality of life items. I want to highlight if we can figure out if there's more funding to do more, that's almost every single thing on the list.

[2:52:24 PM]

The multilingual and multicultural as possible at the request of the Asian American quality of life commission and the quality of life recommendation. The mini grants are obviously within that bucket and the sexual assault counselor training is a women's commission item. Now basically only leaves the public health contracts and passengers and homelessness services as the only items at a don't clearly fall into that bucket. So I just want to urge some level of recognition of that as people say we need more quality of life and more equity issues within this. It might mean that we want different ones. But frankly,

serving the homeless, providing prep access, public health contracts, after-school programs in largely some of our lowest income schools, it's -- it's -- I -- we can change what's in here and I hear council member Renteria and councilwoman Houston that you might want different things in this, but it's virtually all money to programs driving at racial and economic justice and equity what the quality of life commissions have brought forward, what the women's commissions have brought forward and the long-standing commitments to trying to increase the percentage of our budget going to the social safety net. I do want to lay that out. We do want to talk about different investments in the social safety net. Different investments to racial and economic equity, I'm happy to do that. But I would not want anybody to come away with the characterization, at least I had a strong feeling that it would be unfair to characterize this as anything other than really trying to address those needs.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay, Ms. Troxlaire?

>> Troxclair: It may be -- this is just a process question, I guess. It may just be that mayor pro tem tovo was the first one to make a motion. I just wanted to understand that if there was a reason this was the base motion we were going to work off of. I know we had been working off of the mayor's sheet earlier.

[2:54:29 PM]

And we also know that it sounds like we appreciate councilmembers Garza and Casar and tovo all worked on this together. But there were a lot of councilmembers that have put together packages and it's always more difficult to -- it's more difficult to change something that's in the base motion. Maybe this is it the feeling of the dias that this is a good consensus start. That's fine. A lot of other people suggested things and I didn't -- I don't know if this is the best way to go about that. I also just wanted to ask if it -- we're so focused on this \$5 million. Maybe that's -- maybe, mayor, that's the way you thought about trying to get us through the process on time, but we're increasing the budget by \$60 million and there are a lot of people who have proposed cuts, ideas that have a lot of people outside -- that don't have anything -- that don't touch the \$5 million. It seems to me that it would make the most sense that the council understood how much money we had to work with which is what I remember doing in the past. But maybe you decided that process didn't work well. But I just wanted to lay the process issues out there and see if anybody else -->> Mayor

Adler: Let's have a conversation with the first. With the second one, we're now more than a day and a half to our three days. We're 50% gone. I thought it would be good to try to come up with a \$5 million budget because I think ultimately we're going to need that. The reason the mayor pro tem is in front of us she raised her hand first and made the motion. But we can certainly have the conversation and the way to do it would go back to the Tuesday work sheet and to take votes on those things and to pair that down or add to that list. We could do it that way too. Before we take a vote on that, do people want to weigh in on which way feels better to them?

[2:56:33 PM]

Yes?

>> Tovo: Alternatives. I think in some budget years, our staff have kind of kept a running list of our total. And people could make amendments and additions to this and then we could vote up and down on them once we see where the totals lie.

>> Mayor Adler: It's like the Tuesday work sheet.

>> Tovo: Well. The trouble I have with the Tuesday work sheet is that -->

Mayor Adler: I didn't -- I didn't mean for us to adopt that. I just meant to be -- it's -- it's a scorecard to work off of. So the second thing I proposed was very similar to what it was that you said. I think there were some people who were objecting to working off of the base budget. Not going to work off of the base budget, the alternate way to look at it is just to say, let's go through a list of ideas and take votes on them.

>> Tovo: We all forward our ideas and just -- just start voting.

>> Casar: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, Mr. Casar.

>> Casar: I would be interested to know if there are six people trying to modify this list. A lot of work -- not everybody, but lots of people brought their lists forward through the work sessions last week. A lot of conversations through the last few days trying to start itself. If we wind up in this list after the end of a long exercise, it will be a big span of time. Six people who really think we're not going to wind back up at this place, I'd be interested. But I think -- I believe that if we go through a long several hours, a long exercise, we will likely wind up to close to somewhere like this place so we might as well start here. If there are six people who would disagree, I would like to know. We can modify this and make some modifications to it.

>> Mayor Adler: Keep talking on the dias as to what people want to do process-wise.

[2:58:37 PM]

>> Houston: I can't speak for six I can't start from here. Nowhere on the African-American quality of life initiative was any of the after school care mentioned. That might be an equity issue. I say that's surely is.

That's not what they were focused on. But these things are what other people are indicated and envisioned that they're focused on, but what they've focused on.

>> Garza: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, Ms. Guard?

>> Garza: I understand your concerns. There is a bucket of \$150,000 to address some of those concerns. Of the ones you have, do you think just because they're not there spelled out doesn't mean they can't be in there. So do you think that you can get those in the 150 or maybe that number from 150 needs to be 250 or 300. But I don't want us to say no to this because it's not exactly what we all want. It's not exactly what I wanted either. Not what councilman Casar wanted or any of us wanted. But it's an attempt to try to get to somewhere that we can all attempt to agree on.

>> Houston: People who worked on it or the people who didn't work on it.

>> Mayor Adler: Other people speaking in terms of process, please

>> Renteria: When I left, we took a lunch break, we were going to come back and address these items that were in yellow, but now we got a late backup that I can't agree with that. If this was the way we're going to be running the final day we might as well tell the quality of life commission, we might as well do away with them because it's just a waste of their time. You know, they're out there just working, meeting and then we come down here and we give them one \$50,000, it's being proposed \$150,000, and okay, I can divide that four ways, you know?

[3:00:54 PM]

And I'm going why even go and have these people go through this exercise year after year after year and they're not going to get anything?

>> Councilmember alter.

>> Alter: I agree with councilmember troxclair that there may be some additional money like the south by southwest that would help with this process if we had another 1.5 million that would be potentially useful for this discussion. Also for other things like homestead and whatnot, so I would just point out that there are some other cuts --

>> Mayor Adler: And I think that there are. And my suggestion would be that we take a moment and we focus on this. Let's see how close if it's not five, it's six. If it's seven, it's 7.5. Let's go through this list and see what things get there. It's not that we're not going to double back to additional revenue items, other people have suggested additional revenue items. I just think we need to try to pick a process and start making some decisions and trying to move us forward. So the question is whether we just work off this

base or whether we just start doing down the list of things that more than one person named, which is not to say this is exclusive because people can add additional things to this too, but just so we can get started. Ms. Kitchen?

>> Kitchen: I have a suggestion. I don't know if it's of help or not, but I'll make the suggestion. I would propose that we add to this. Mayor, your list had 1.7 on it for quality of life. I guess I'm asking my colleagues, councilmember Houston and councilmember Renteria, if we raise this 150 and just put on the 1.7 right now or some number between 150 and 1.7, would that answer the concerns that you all have at the moment just for getting us comfortable with using this as a starting place?

[3:02:56 PM]

Because that would basically take the mayor's item about quality of life and put it on this other one.

>> Mayor Adler: So line four from the bottom, taking up mini grants to outside organizations and just having quality of life and taking the number up to 1.7 million.

>> Houston: It's hard for me to say that because some of the quality of life are not in -- it looks like on the one we're working off of, the mini grants were C 14 through C 19, some are in E, some in H. So we have to have time to figure out whether or not all of those get --

>> Mayor Adler: It's even more broadly than that. I think the amendment would be just to make it quality of life, delete the letters and take the number to be 1.7 M as go from the dais here we may refine that or note specific things that we need to get done, but for right now we would just be putting in the broad bucket of 1.7 without any identifications at this point. I think that's probably a good suggestion. Ms. Pool?

>> Pool: Is that similar to how we block granted last year?

>> Mayor Adler: Except we may continue to refine it as go. Last year --

>> Pool: So I would support that. I think that worked. And I did get -- and it's available for all of us. I asked staff to tell us which organizations were able to participate in the block granting done last year, so there's a significant list of organizations that you can refer back to if you look at the budget Q and a.

>> Mayor Adler: But that does not stop us from the dais from identifying specific things that we want to do. It's just as an amendment to take that one item, make it 1.7 million.

[3:05:01 PM]

>> Kitchen: Could I just clarify my motion? That's for purposes of discussion right now. In all fairness, it does not mean that I at the end of the day will be able to vote on 1.7. I'm just saying for purposes of conversation because I'm hearing my colleagues, let's just put it on the list.

>> Renteria: I have a problem because we also don't have the affordable care act. That's another very important thing. The president have cut funding for getting the information out for the -- to enroll people -- low income people in this affordable care act act that he wants to kill it. And now we're not putting any money for that either.

>> Garza: That would be included in the 1.7. It's not on here now. Ms. Kitchen said --

>> Renteria: Mayor, the 1.7 that you put on there, was that including all the -- the pan am cultural center, the housing summit housing repair, all the --

>> Mayor Adler: My concern is that we may have telescoped down too quickly to get to the deal. I think if we went through this list of things that more than one of us identified and talked about it in the context of the five million dollars, we might be able to hone that list down better. I hear you. My sense is, though, we may have -- that the attempt to do that, which I appreciate, may have tried to do that too soon.

>> Houston: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: But the question is -- Mr. Renteria, it certainly could. The \$1.7 million could include these things or not include these things. So if we added the 1.7 I would see us -- in a moment we'll have a conversation about each one of these things individually and they would be added either as an additional line item on to this and we could make a motion to add it as an additional line item on to this.

[3:07:16 PM]

You're not compelled it pull it out of the 1.7. But taking this and blowing it up bigger so that we can bring it back down gets us to the same place. Ms. Houston?

>> Houston: Thank you, mayor. The 1.7 was a hold Jeff from last year and that was -- holdover from last year and that was one-time funding. This year in the mayor's proposal it was ongoing general funding, the quality of life initiatives. And in the mayor pro tem's proposal it's in one-time only funding. The thing for the quality of life community is when do we get to be ongoing and not one-time only? Because every year we come back to these very same places and have to fight for the crumbs that everybody else gets. And so we're still having that conversation about whether we're important to be in the general budget, general funding, or are we always going to be one-time only funding.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. And certainly Ms. Kitchen's motion could be interpreted as putting the 1.7 in the ongoing column. Is that what your intent was, Ms. Kitchen?

>> Kitchen: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: So it's 1.7 put into ongoing funding. Yes, councilmember alter.

>> Alter: I would like some clarification. So the public health contracts increasing three percent and having the quality of life, a lot of the quality of life items are health relate and I'm just having a little difficulty parsing things out according to these buckets. There are things that affect quality of life, there are things that come from the commissions that are quality of life, there are health things that affect quality of life. Our job is to improve people's quality of life. Can you help me decipher what you mean by that and what that would be increasing and how that relates to the quality of life bucket?

[3:09:18 PM]

>> Tovo: And I think that's why it seemed to make sense as a starting place to identify particular programs rather than just lump everything into a quality of life. I will say I hope -- I think it's fine to do that. As councilmember Casar mentioned, almost all of these on this list actually originated with a quality of life commission. And I'll just take this opportunity to say the reason that C 14 through 19 were indicated as one-time funds were because they were specifically trying to capture the events and festivals which totaled less than 150 and which we've typically funded as one-time funds. I think it would be better as an ongoing and that's the reason they were that way. But with regard to the public health contracts I'm going to let councilmember Garza talk to that because that was something came forward as one of her budget priorities, but with regard to the other issues that is why it made better sense -- I would say however we do this, I hope we can provide some clarity about the kinds of programs we're going to fund within -- and that is why it seemed to make better sense to me to identify actual programs and then make amendments and change or vote them down or whatnot. But just actually be able to at the end of the day say we funded immigrant legal services, we funded these different programs because we did ask our quality of life commission to return to us areas where they felt we needed increased funding, whether they were health and human services, whether they were within the cultural arts, whether they were facility related.

>> Mayor Adler: Again, we're now -- we've spent almost half an hour on process and I really want to get us to substantive questions so part of it might be indulgence. I think we could put 1.7 million in there and as we go through the budget and add things let's come back and revisit the 1.7 and see if it's appropriate to reduce the 1.7 based on the other things we've added.

[3:11:26 PM]

We can look at other things we add and if they're health we can look at reducing it and we can have that conversation or not have that conversation if it's not doubling up. My sense, council, is either one of these vehicles I think would work and we can make people feel that they're going to be able to argue and suggest and get a vote on anything and everything, but if we could actually start working through a list of ideas and concepts we could probably find out how far we're off or how far the 1.7 comes down or whether the three percent is right. I think we should have that conversation. Councilmember kitchen?

>> Kitchen: That's fine. I just have one suggestion. In looking at our time and in working back it from wherever we are going to end, I'd just like to preserve some time at the end to go back to two of the major revenue items that we have so that we can make sure and address those today because it will inform tomorrow. And that's the hot tax one and the one that I had brought up earlier this morning. So if we just reserve some time at the end to do that, I think it would help our conversation.

>> Mayor Adler: That sounds good to me. Let's see if we can get there. Yes, Ms. Garza?

>> Garza: I had a time question. I had heard yesterday different -- do we have --

>> 6:00.

>> Garza: 6:00 is -- thanks.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Garza: Can I address the three percent question that was councilmember alter?

>> Mayor Adler: If you need to know. There may be offsets against it, there may not be offsets against it. If we listed other things that were health, you could say they were in it or not. It's --

>> Garza: She asked if there was a difference between quality of life and three percent. There is just because of the name, I guess. Actually, there is and there isn't. The public health contracts was previous resolutions that had been passed by past councils and this council saying that we needed token vest more in our public health.

[3:13:32 PM]

As part of that there should be increases because even as we -- as time goes by if we don't increase those contracts they serve less people because their overhead goes up. So it was just a goal to get that. So we have a large amount of contracts existing right now that serve the majority of those contracts serve African-American and mexican-american hispanic populations. So the idea that this is not addressing quality of life I have to push back a little generally. But that was specific to the current contracts we have. There is a concern for new programs and whether we fund new programs. And I'm open -- and I agree with that and we need to. And those are the quality of life initiatives. Those are the

hispanic quality of life, African-American. Those have recommended in addition to what we already have in public health contracts. So I've asked that we don't put our public health contracts capacity increases in the same bucket with everything else because they are two different things. But I would agree that they are all quality of life things.

>> Thank you. I was just trying to clarify what people meant by certain buckets since we hadn't had a certain conversation about the health ones yet. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, Ms. Pool?

>> Pool: So are we adding to the list from the mayor pro tem?

>> Mayor Adler: We are adding to the list of mayor pro tem. We've changed quality of life to be quality of life. We took out mini grants to outside organizations. We took out the letters and we put one point 'into ongoing. Do we need to take a vote on that? Is there an objection to that? Yes?

>> Alter: I don't have an objection. I have a question. One of the items is not on the list is the equity office with that under the 1.7 quality of life bucket.

>> Mayor Adler: No. I would say that 1.7 is just an undefined amount of money. So if you want to have the equity office specifically mentioned, then we need to bring that up and ask for a vote and see if people are interested in doing that.

[3:15:40 PM]

After we've had a series of those we can take a look at 1.7 and see if it's the right amount of dollars to have there, but right now equity office is not represented on that list. It's not on mayor pro tem's list. But given the opportunity, I will move to amend mayor pro tem tovo's list to amend the equity office.

>> Alter: I guess I'm confused we just amended hers to make it 1.7 for quality of life in general and the --

>> Mayor Adler: That's a placeholder. That's the --

>> Alter: Right. I just was wondering if it had to be added in as a separate thing or if it falls under that 1.7 bucket for now.

>> Mayor Adler: No, because if someone specifically wants to make sure that the equity office is in there, the only way for them to make sure that the equity office is in there to bring up the equity office and ask for a vote on it. Yes, Mr. Renteria?

>> Renteria: So this list here is just --

>> Mayor Adler: Hold on to that list. We're going to start working our way through it?

>> Renteria: We're working this list?

>> Mayor Adler: We're going to start adding the colored list to the white list.

>> Pool: When I asked where we were at, I was going to say I then have some items to add, which I was going to do, but if we're only talking about quality of life items right now then I will wait. Are we adding-- we're not limiting ourselves to quality of life?

>> Mayor Adler: We're forcing ourselves to make choices, right? At some point we'll actually have to start making choices. So we're trying to -- we're going to get as close as we can to five and a half million dollars. And we are now at a list that is at -- and is the 1.2 for permanance of the pay for success model, is that in this list or not in this list, mayor pro tem?

>> It's in the list.

[3:17:41 PM]

>> Tovo: It is in the list and then you will see the different calculations based on whether or not it is -- whether or not it is allocated out of our budget stabilization reserve fund or whether it's allocated as a separate dollar amount.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So -- so at this point we're at 6.7. We just added one. We're at 7.7. We're at 8.4, roughly.

>> Tovo: Probably at more. You may be working with a number that is --

>> Mayor Adler: I was at 6107.

>> Tovo: So mine was at 6.1 until we added in another million five and a half. So I think maybe --

>> Mayor Adler: I had \$600,000 added to that, which was the wage benefits and now that total is roughly 6.7. We added 1.7 to that. That makes it 7.7, plus .7 is 8.4. That's how I came one that number. Mr. Casar?

>> Casar: Mayor, I think that to address councilmember Alter's point and the points brought up by councilmember Houston and Renteria, I think that we could add -- we could add this 1.7 as a broad list of quality of life issues. You can actually consider our Veit sheet has allocating one million of the 1.7, which leaves 100,000 for the housing on conference and pan am and the equity office and workforce development, organizations, which would not have your number kicking 'up so high.

[3:19:42 PM]

And if you look at the spreadsheet that the mayor pro tem handed out it was balanced if you do it in the reserve. So if you -- if we accepted the amendment that way, that still leaves \$700,000. Our spreadsheet has \$1 million, 120,000 quality of life.

>> Mayor Adler: I think as we add things we'll be able to pull that back down. I think you're trying to cut a couple of steps too soon. I think we need to have a discussion about the equity office. I think we need to have a discussion about these other things because people want to talk about them and be able to defend them and explain them. And ultimately we're going to have to make a choice between those items and parks, perhaps, or A.D.A. Lighting. And I don't know how to do that unless we give people a chance to talk about the things they want.

>> Casar: I hear you. I just don't like the framing that a quality of life of is 1.7-million-dollar bucket and there are these other five quality of life items that are a one-million-dollar bucket and that we can't calling it 2.7 million to quality of life.

>> Mayor Adler: Maybe I misspoke. What I said we have a 1.7 that's a placeholder. I suggest that we go through and see if there are specific things that we want to identify that would also be under the quality of life deal. And when we look at all these we go back to that placeholder and we adjust that placeholder amount given the other things on the page.

>> Casar: Then I wouldn't object to making that quality of life amendment if it were framed. To me I think it's important because of how the conversation has gone. To frame it as we're now at two-point 'million for quality of life with one million of it allocated with what's on the spreadsheet because that's actually what happened.

>> Mayor Adler: That's fine.

>> Casar: We're at 2.7 for quality of life which is a good thing if we had the money. I just don't want us to say we have 1.7 of quality of life competing with other quality of life items.

>> Mayor Adler: I think that we'll get there. Yes.

>> Renteria: The thing that's confusing too is that.

[3:21:44 PM]

Is that the same as the after school program?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. Those are the same things as the mayor pro tem's things. But that was -- I have aisd/others, social service school support. So that item was on there because it was something mentioned by more than one person, four people.

>> Renteria: So how are we going to add that to this on top of that? Are we subtracting that?

>> Mayor Adler: You know... My suggestion would be that we take the things that everybody listed and we take a look at those numbers and we see whether we could cut them out or whether we could cut the numbers. That's going to get us to the big issues that we want to decide and then we can have a vote on those big issues. Or we could stay to the big issues, which is what I was going to do, the yellow issues, and then resolve those big issues and then we would see what the other pieces were going to be. Ms. Pool and then Ms. Houston?

>> Pool: So I had a couple of items that I wanted to add. They were on the mayor's list, but they were missed on the mayor pro tem's list. If I could run through them.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's figure out what the process is that we're going to do. Ms. Houston?

>> Houston: I just had a question for staff about prep. It was my understanding that they could accommodate that, but now I see it's back on the list. So what is the real answer.

>> Mayor Adler: Prep. There was a answer of being able to know whether it was being funded internally or not. And we have 2.7, maybe more than 2.7. I think that we're going to be able to get to where we need to get to if we work off mayor tovo's list and start adding things to it.

>> Houston: And mayor, I think we'll end up where we -- back where we started.

[3:23:46 PM]

But we can try.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's see --

>> Kitchen: We've already cut some from where we started.

>> Mayor Adler: We need to be discerning in votes. Until we take votes we don't know how discerning people will be.

>> Houston: I don't know whether to be concerned that prep is -- I don't know where we are and I've heard different things.

>> Mayor Adler: Do we need to put money in here for prep.

>> Stephanie Hayden, interim director, Austin public health. The department is going to do a pilot next fiscal year for \$50,000 with prep. In addition to a pilot we are also doing a solicitation next year for our HIV general fund dollars. If an entity would like to apply for those funds for the HIV services they would be eligible to do so.

>> Flannigan: Mayor? My staff has been investigated this at a quite detailed level. One of the things that I think is difficult with this is that the pilot program is with a different entity than was recommended by the lgbtq quality of life commission so it's not an offset like I originally -- there was some miscommunication between offices. What the organization recommended by the lgbtq quality of life commission wants to hire a full-time physician so it doesn't make sense to not fully fund it because it wouldn't do the thing that they wanted to accomplish. The \$600,000 that will be up for bid next year is currently being spent, but it hasn't been up for bid for how many years?

>> It's been about 12 years.

>> Flannigan: So there's a pretty large set of funds that haven't been through a renegotiation or a rebidding process for over a decade. It's possible, but not -- we can't promise that the prep organizations will be able to survive that process and get a piece of that nor to the organizations that get that funding.

[3:25:59 PM]

I haven't had time to dig into that. There also remains the question that public health is investigating how much of this is really the responsibility of central health. As opposed to the responsibility of the city of Austin. So there are a number of confusing elements to this. As I said during budget work sessions, I think it's a little premature to go down this road, especially given the large amount of funding that's going to be up for bid next year and that would give both us and the newly formed lgbtq commission better time to vet the recommendation.

>> Mayor Adler: What was your recommendation at the end of that, I'm sorry?

>> Flannigan: My recommendation remains what it was before, that while the commission recommended 130 whatever it was I'm not sure that they've had the time to work with public health on this type of outreach and next year there's a huge pile of money that comes up for renegotiation that the prep services should be able to get access to although we cannot promise until we get those contracts?

>> Mayor Adler: Are you remaining a line item and an amount? Is there an amount on the line item or are you recommending no line item or amount because it's being handled otherwise.

>> Flannigan: I'm saying we can pull prep out as I said in work session several weeks ago, but I didn't feel I had the votes to keep it out. But councilmember Houston asked for detail on prep so I've provided it.

>> Houston: Thank you, councilmember Flannigan. And Ms. Hayden, I would appreciate your continued support with public health. This is what they get a lot of big dollars to do.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem, are you comfortable with taking it to the \$50,000?

>> Tovo: Thank you, director Hayden. I know we've had maybe three dozen emails back and forth including over the weekend.

[3:28:01 PM]

So I just want to be sure I understand. We have 110,000 in here, which was responsive to the quality of life commissions' suggestion. It is -- it was a line item that was not directed at any individual organization, it was just directed at trying to make sure that something that has been a priority for the community and something that I think we talked about, gosh, two years ago maybe at our health and human services council committee, but there was not funding at that point to help support any of -- to help support the clinic. It was my understanding that you have identified 50,000 for the pilot, but that more money would be of help in that pilot. Are you saying that 50,000 is all that you need with regard -- the 600,000 aside, is 50,000 all you need for the pilot and should we -- is it your recommendation that we remove this item?

>> Due to fact that we are going to be doing a solicitation and typically before we do a solicitation we go out and collect a significant amount of community information as well as look at the data in addition to coming through the health and human services committee with that framework for approval before we do the solicitation. So in light of all those things, then I would recommend we move forward with the pilot, which will serve -- which will provide prepare for 60 people. We will continue our conversation is with central health and community care about how we can partner for prep and we will also continue those conversations with the commissions about what they would recommend.

>> Tovo: And just leave it at the gift thousand that you've -- fist thousand that you've identified.

[3:30:04 PM]

>> 'Em.

>> Tovo: I know councilmember Casar has also been working on this issue, so I will await his feedback.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there any objection to 50,000 on that item?

>> Tovo: I think we need -- I don't think we need 50,000 because it's already in the existing budget. I think -- if that's the recommendation of our staff, then I'm certainly fine taking the recommendation of our staff over our quality of life commission. Again, we were trying to be responsive both to that pressing public health need, but also to the commission's recommendation.

>> Tovo: So then the budget line for passages can go down to 70,000, understanding that it good portion of that program will be just one-time funded and we'll be back in the same place next year trying to find ongoing funding for it.

>> Mayor Adler: Do we want to keep it at 160 and just show a one time negative 70?

>> Tovo: Either way is acceptable to me. As it's an ongoing need I would like to keep it in the ongoing category.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to take the passages and keeping 160, but putting a negative 70 in the one time? Hearing none we're going to do that. Mr. Casar, do you have a problem with taking out the prep? So the prep comes out then without objection. So prep comes out without objection. Let's see -- we'll do these one at a time. Ms. Pool, did you have one that you wanted to recommend? An amendment that you wanted to offer?

>> Pool: The items that were included on your list, none of them are on the mayor pro tem's list and that I had three other items that were --

>> Mayor Adler: I'll let you do them one at a time.

>> Pool: Just eight I offered up this year and they were all fairly low dollar.

[3:32:04 PM]

I was trying to be respectful of the fact that we didn't have a lot of funds to allocate. For \$17,500, H 22 was on the mayor's list, connecting children to nature in the eastern crescent. And this funding would come from other funds, which is the urban forestry fund. So that's not general revenue. Since that isn't -

>> Mayor Adler: I want to divide the question first and see if we want to put money toward this program. And then we could also have a discussion about whether we want to cut the other program.

>> Pool: Okay. Just to reiterate, it's \$17,500 and this is phase three so far of the planning grant for the national league of cities and the implementation grant that we also won in a competitive -- on a competitive basis from the national league of cities. And now we are bringing it into our own city as a model and it is promoting public awareness in the eastern crescent of the benefits of connecting children to nature. The money is available and it's in the -- what we colloquially call the tree mitigation fund.

>> Mayor Adler: If you could earmark for us, Ed, when we talk about saving money if we could talk about the tree mitigation fund or the tree fund?

>> Pool: It may be this piece is the one that comes under a general revenue? There is another piece that is qualified under the urban forestry or tree mitigation fund.

>> Mayor Adler: But in any event, the motion is to add '17 thousand 500 to the -- 17,500 to the tovo list S this a one time fund.

>> Pool: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: A one time fund of 17,500. Any discussion? Any objection to adding that? Then it's added. I move to add the equity officer to this list. Increasing the capacity in that office. I think it was just over \$200,000.

[3:34:05 PM]

Is there a second to that? Seconded. Is there any objection to that one being added to the list? Hearing none, that one is added.

>> Casar: Mayor, two positions, is that correct?

>> Mayor Adler: It's two positions.

>> Casar: I'm supportive of that.

>> Kitchen: Mr. Mayor, I think councilmember pool had some more that she wanted to add.

>> Mayor Adler: We're doing one at a time. We're giving other people a chance to do one too. We'll get right back there. Do you have one?

>> Kitchen: Yes, I do. I would like to add the senior exemption, which is e-201, and I think councilmember alter had it down for a million so I would like to add to that.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there a second? It's been seconded. This is a-million-dollar addition. Discussion? Mr. Casar?

>> Casar: Mayor, while I've voted for this every year in the past and understand the need, just to give -- I think there are lots of ways that we can get this spreadsheet where we're at right now to being able to fit in budget, but I don't think that at this high of a level I can -- I can support its addition. I understand that there may be a later point to where we free up sufficient revenue that it could come in, but at the stage we're at where I'm trying to figure out how to gauge it within that amount, I wouldn't do it, but if there's enough money freed up that we could, I would accept it.

>> Kitchen: Mr. Mayor -- I appreciate what you're saying, councilmember Casar. I thought our process was to add things since we're not going through --

>> Mayor Adler: But that doesn't mean we add everything. We just have a discussion. He's saying he's going to vote no to adding it.

>> Kitchen: No, I don't think he is. I think what he asked for was whether or not -- he said within the 5 million, but that's not the exercise that we're going through right now.

[3:36:16 PM]

If we're going through the exercise and only put in here what we have money for, I would respectfully ask that we make our motions for hot tax and for the other item because then people would know what there are additional dollars for.

>> Mayor Adler: I think we're prioritizing. So we're going to get the sense of the dais for the first five and a half million dollars. We get some additional revenue, then we'll have some additional votes on how we spend the additional revenue.

>> Kitchen: If we're going to vote, I would vote no on the equity officer. I don't want to vote no on the equity officer, but if that's the way we're going right now I would say it's not my highest priority. I thought what we were going is adding everything on here that we consider to be a high priority and allowing it to stay on here until we had the conversation about the other revenue.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm actually trying to make us make choices, but we could certainly -- we could reconsider the vote on the equity officer if you wanted to. Yes, Ms. Garza?

>> Garza: I am supportive of us trying to vote on things for this five-million-dollar bucket so we can get somewhere today with this. I know there's -- there's a possible additional revenue with the hot tax discussion, but I'm ready to vote on whatever motions anyone makes.

>> Mayor Adler: The motion in front of us is to add a million dollars to this for the senior exemption. Ms. Troxclair?

>> Troxclair: So what is the total that this list is at already?

>> Mayor Adler: We're trying to narrow this list as much as we can. Ms. Troxclair I know, but we haven't so far. If you're trying to -- if we need to make choices then when we add things we need to identify something on the list that we're cutting, but we're already -- we're already at like nine million dollars so I don't understand that we're trying to fit in-- trying to make this decision about five and a half million dollars -- either we're adding everything or we're making choices, but so far --

[3:38:33 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: We're making choices and going to come as close to five as we can and right now seven is as close to five as we can. But we're going to add things that cut things out.

>> Alter: We have five and a half.

>> Kitchen: Mr. Mayor, when I made the 1.7 motion, made it with the understanding that we were putting everything on there. If we were changing our process, which is okay. I will follow whatever process we're doing. If we're changing it, then I need to revisit that one and I also need to revisit the equity officer. I did not object to either one of those because I thought what one doing is putting everything that we wanted on the list. If that's not fine. I will do what we're doing and I will follow that.

>> Mayor Adler: We will have to continue to revisit things, but yes, we're going to revisit those things. We can either revisit them now or revisit them later.

>> Kitchen: I would like to revisit them now. If we're not going to vote to put the senior exemption on then I want to revisit quality of life and the equity officer.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's finish on the senior exemption and then we'll revote on those other two. We're voting now on the senior exemption. It's a-million-dollar item. Is there any further discussion on this? Yes?

>> Renteria: Just for clarity. So we're just -- we're adding the million dollars to this list here.

>> Mayor Adler: We're trying to work off mayor tovo's list.

>> Renteria: Eventually her list will go on to this.

>> Mayor Adler: My hope is we'll have a discerning conversation about these. I don't know that everything on here is going to make it to this list, but I hope that we can actually start making some more difficult choices.

>> Renteria: So after we put all these on to this list then we're going to go down and make another decision?

>> Mayor Adler: My hope is we're not going to add everything on this list. That everybody won't vote for everything. That everybody will tailor their votes to trying to get as close to \$5 million as they can, recognizing this is going to be iterative process.

[3:40:34 PM]

All right. So what is on the table is the million dollars. I'm going to move to amend that because I think that it would be good for us to have some senior exemption and I want to consider it on the list. But I would move to amend it to take it down to \$250,000, which is I think roughly two%.

-- Two% because it's \$126,000 for each. So I would amend the molestation to spend a million dollars and take it -- amend the motion to spend a million dollars and take it to \$250,000. Is there a second to that? Mr. Reason seconds that? Is there any discussion? Let's take a vote.

>> Alter: Can we understand what that would mean for the individual homeowner a million dollars versus 250?

>> Mayor Adler: It would mean one fifth of it. We can certainly have the numbers. In my mind the votes don't exist to get it on to the list right now and I would rather do this than to not have it on the list. I can't vote for it but I can have it on the list. What is two, \$250,000. \$2,000. The cost of doing a 200,000-dollar senior exemption was about \$200,000. It was a budget question.

>> Pool: Mayor, I think on your sheet it does have senior homestead exemption for each 1,000-dollar increase in the homestead exemption, which is the property tax piece valuation, and it is 126,699, is that correct?

[3:42:38 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: That's correct.

>> Pool: And then it has 39360 in one time and I don't know what that means.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm not sure what the one-time associated expense is, but it would be a \$250,000 would be a 2,000-dollar increase in the exemption.

>> Alter: It would not because we have the one time as well. So you need to have at least --

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry?

>> Alter: If you double what you have here it would be 250 in the general fund and 80 in one-time cost.

>> Mayor Adler: That's correct.

>> Alter: So that adds up to more than 250.

>> Mayor Adler: 250 roughly in the one time -- you're right, it does. The exact number is \$126,699 times two, and '39 thousand \$360 times two. That would be two percent. That's the amendment. Any further discussion. Ms. Pool?

>> Pool: Remind me, Mr. Van eenoo, are we at 82,500 for the property tax value? Exception? So this would take it up to about 84 or 85,000.

>> Mayor Adler: 84.5.

>> Pool: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Any further discussion? The vote on my amendment, please raise your hand? Houston, pool, Renteria, me, the mayor pro tem, Garza, that's six. The others voting no. That amendment passes. We'll now take a vote on the senior discussion.

>> Houston: Councilmember alter made an amendment on --

>> Mayor Adler: She made an amendment. I have amended her amendment. And this is not set in stone.

[3:44:39 PM]

We can come back and change these things later. But what is in front of us right now is increasing the senior exemption by \$2,000.

>> Houston: I just want to say for the seniors I know the million dollars is a better deal than the --

>> Mayor Adler: There's no question that it's a better deal. And later on when we get into an iterative process if we want to start cutting stuff to increase it we certainly can. This keeps it on the list. Those in favor of the amendment please raise your hand? It is -- I can't tell if you're rise R. Raising your hand or not. It is Houston -- this is to add to the tovo list a senior exemption in the amount of \$2,000. Alter, Houston, pool, Renteria, flan and me, that's six and troxclair is seven. The others voting no. That gets added to the tovo list. It gets added to the base list.

>> Kitchen: Mr. Mayor, can we now revisit those other items?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Kitchen: I don't know what the proper method for doing this is, but -- and I don't know what order you want to take it in because --

>> Mayor Adler: We can take it either one. Without objection we're going to reconsider the votes on the quality of life number and we're going to revisit the vote on the equity center. Any objection? You object?

>> Casar: Not because I want to do it differently than that, so I want to have an explanation. I had brought up earlier, which is we took a vote that I objected to -- actually, I don't think it actually got it because I objected and the mayor deferred it and so we didn't have a vote on quality of life. Because I

objected because I think the quality of life bucket, the proper motion was not to make it 1.7 million for quality of life because we already have 1 million for quality of life in it. So my question is we haven't taken a vote on the quality of life one or at least procedurally we couldn't. So my question is whether it's a 700,000-dollar increase off of the existing one million or whether it was a 1.7-million-dollar increase.

[3:46:53 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: So you can see Ms. Houston and Mr. Renteria we're just adding things like this and it's an open process to do this. Even if this placeholder went away I think it still enables us to be able to call up all the things this we want to call up so the process remains that way. Okay. What we added was 1.7 for quality of life. We can reconsider that -- I'm sorry, go ahead.

>> Casar: But mayor, I objected to that and you said we should work on that later. And I said well, there wasn't a vote on it. My question is -- my suggestion would be and a motion that I would support would be for the current 1,041,000 that's in quality of life in the mayor pro tem's list, if you look at the existing specific quality of life recommendations it adds up to 1,041,000.

>> Mayor Adler: Which ones are you adding?

>> The millennium youth center upgrades, asian-american center, immigrant legal services. That adds up -- I'm sorry, prep was a certain amount that I removed from that. So it may be less than a million now because I removed prep. And the quality of life mini grants is another 150,000. So I just wanted -- so if we make -- if the motion is to make quality of life 1.7 million, then that's a motion that I would -- that I would support because ultimately then you're not adding an additional 1.7 million to a spreadsheet that's already over filled. It's creating space for us to add pan am and east Austin work development and the housing conference and the equity office to get the quality of life recommendations up to 1.7 million total rather than adding 1.7 million to the existing around one million. Then you aren't creating as much of a hole and you're recognizing the quality of life recommendations that are already in this spreadsheet.

>> Mayor Adler: So I add up those I get about \$900,000 with the prep change. So you're saying as a placeholder at this point to keep those four items in specifically, but to have a placeholder line that is quality of life that's 900,000.

[3:49:04 PM]

>> Casar: No, not a placeholder line that's not quality of life because that's not recognizing the other quality of life. It would be \$800,000 for more quality of life initiatives than the 900,000 currently in it.

>> Mayor Adler: That does not limit us to the 900,000.

>> Casar: Exactly. And then there could be votes for make those \$900,000 to include pan am or workforce development or the equity office,kets et cetera, considering there's 900,000, get us to 1.7 million.

>> Mayor Adler: So you took out 100, so it would be 900 because prep came off.

>> Casar: Correct.

>> Mayor Adler: Is everybody okay with changing that line to make it more quality of life and making it 900?

>> Kitchen: I think we should take a vote. Let's be consistent.

>> Mayor Adler: That's fine. So any further discussion on this?

>> Tovo: Mayor, I want to say again I really appreciate councilmember Casar identifying that so clearly. I think it's an extremely important message for the public to hear as well as for our quality of life commissioners to hear that their work has absolutely influenced this. And we would just note that the after school expansion to Mendez and burnet middle schools we're double-checking as to whether or not that was a quality of life commission. And I am not certain that the master plan was a quality of life commission suggestion, was it, councilmember Houston? I counseled find my original document.

>> Houston: It's the asian-american quality of life --

>> Tovo: I wasn't sure. That number may be actually 980,000. We're double-checking.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So a vote on the 900,000 for more quality of life. Any discussion? Those in favor please raise your hands?

>> Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> This is to go from 1.7 to nine to add clarity on the list?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. The one point we're changing it to be more quality of life and the number is 900.

>> [Inaudible].

>> Mayor Adler: But the line item just seize 900 at this point.

[3:51:05 PM]

Those in favor please raise your hand?

>> Troxclair: You're counting all of the things that could be considered quality of life spendings into that total of 1.7 is that what you're doing?

>> Casar: We are. The things that are quality of life in this are there so we're adding \$900,000 more from the commissions.

>> Mayor Adler: With the understanding that we're not limiting ourselves here so I'm not voting to limit the quality of life elements to that total because we're not taking that vote. We're just putting in a line item that has that at this point. Okay? We take this vote, we could --

>> Renteria: We just voted?

>> Mayor Adler: We're going to vote now. Those in favor raise your hands? Those opposed? That change is made. Now we vote on the equity center. Increasing the capacity of the equity office. Adding two new ftes. Any further discussion? Yes, Ms. Kitchen?

>> Kitchen: I just want to explain that I do feel like this is an important item, but with because we're in the stage right now that we're making choices, given the other items that we have, I can't support this at this moment. I could in the future, and depending on what kind of dollars we have available, then perhaps I can support it in the future. But I can't support it but I can't support it at this point.

>> Mayor Adler: I understand.

>> Casar: Mayor? I would like to offer an amendment and I hope you will find it friendly and potentially it could change councilmember potentially. It would be up to you. I would amend to make it so that of that \$900,000 that we just added, since this is a quality of life commission recommendation from at least one, I don't have them all memorized when they overlap, that this 200,000 be recognized as one of the quality of life commission recommendations so it is part of the 900,000 that we just added. So that -- we had \$900,000 and I would like 200,000 of that to expand the equity office considering ha I think what the equity officer has said is that he wants -- one of those folks to work closely with these commissions and the commissions have recommended that.

[3:53:13 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: My concern with doing that is if we start doing that it looks like it's capped out at 1.7 million and I don't think that was the intent. I would rather us go through and to talk about the things that we want or not want and at the end of the process then adjust that number to whatever it is that is the appropriate place to adjust that number. I don't have an expectation that we'll go through this budget and approve all the things that people suggest and that there will be necessarily the 1.7 at the

end, but if we start doing one for the other, then I think that what you're telegraphing is that it's capped, and I would rather us not do that. That's why I was treating it kind of as a placeholder.

>> Casar: I understand that. Since it will probably get to us the same place and not put us through the set of votes on this, if there's not objection, I'll withdraw my amendment, I'll support it and just note that if we don't get the votes -- if we don't get six votes on your motion, which I will support, that we may have to come back to this vote.

>> Mayor Adler: I understand. Any further discussion? Councilmember alter?

>> Alter: I was going to say I was going to make the same motion as Mr. Casar. I think we have to start to make some choices and this was on everything every one of the quality of life commissions' recommendations. So I think it is fair to come out of that pot.

>> Mayor Adler: So the commotion, councilmember alter makes the motion to do the offset. So to add \$200,000 and change for the equity office and to decrease the 900,000-dollar number accordingly. That's the amendment. Those in favor of the amendment please raise your hand? It's the dais. I voted no on that. Now we'll take a vote on the measure itself. This is the item that now is amended by councilmember alter. Those in favor please raise your hand? I'm sorry, yes?

>> Tovo: I'm in favor. I just want to indicate the housing summit I think is one of the items that we've discussed as potentially being in this pocket.

[3:55:14 PM]

As I've said a couple of times, and will say again, and I think I forwarded it to our staff to consider, I think it -- I think it's eligible for hot tax, that's why it's not on any of these lists. I don't think it should come out of the general funds. I think it's appropriate for hotel-motel tax dollars.

>> Mayor Adler: Those in favor of the amendment? It's unanimous on the dais. So 900 now goes down by 200. That's now 700 and the equity office is on the list at the 2202. Councilmember alter, do you want to make a suggestion.

>> Alter: I would like M two to expand the capacities of the parking enforcement officers to serve as mobility service officers. This is of no cost to the general fund. It is not on her list. It is on the sheet that I passed around that had the budget adjustments. This would allow for parking enforcement officers to have the training to become mobility service officers. They would then be in a position to take over some of the mobility related duties that are currently done by police officers, the transportation department is in favor. There is funding in the parking fees, and this is a pilot they've been talking about for a few years. It was M 2 on the concept menu.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there a second to that? Ms. Houston seconds that? Does staff support this?

>> Robert Goode, assistant city manager. We've agreed to welcome with the transportation department, expected police department to work out how these services would be provided, but yes we agree we could move with this as a pilot program.

[3:57:15 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to this being added? Hearing none, it's added. Anyone else want to make a suggestion on one of these items? Ms. Pool?

>> Pool: Thanks, mayor. I think the next one I'd like to talk about is the item that you and I had developed in tandem, but on parallel tracks and that's E 18, the developing the policy tools to fight gentrification and displacement. The \$16,000 for the study that we have broad agreement with the university of Texas about, but of course we haven't engaged in actually setting it up. And then I think your -- your displacement task force was added to that, is that right, for \$100,000. These are one time funds and this does track council resolution that we had in August of this year. So the piece that I have is 69,000 and the piece that the mayor had is --

>> 69 plus the 100 is 169 total.

>> Mayor Adler: I second that motion. And I support that. Displacement is an issue that we hear everywhere we're going right now. There seems to be a broad range of opinions. The mayor pro tem penned a list of 30 studies or 30 resolutions we had on that and we need to actually decide this issue and I think it's timely given the land planning work that we're doing. Any further discussion? Mayor pro tem

>> Tovo: Can we dive the question, please?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes

>> Tovo: My approach to this is -- I think both are valuable. However, within the 5 million or 5 million five or whatever at the end of the day we'll end up with in terms of general fund I thought was really an important anti-displacement tool wasn't something I could find room for within that 5 million.

[3:59:18 PM]

To me at this point I can't support putting money in the budget in case we need a consultant for the displacement task force over doing eviction, intervention, which is around the same -- it's a lower cost home repair, lower cost. I'd rather put our money into those programs at this point so I'm going to vote no on at least one of these.

>> Mayor Adler: So we'll divide that question. I support both of them, and I understand the argument about putting the dollars to something that actually is designed to provide support to an individual, but I also think that we have to focus on things in the budget that will have a leveraging impact. And I think that the displacement task force that the council set up needs this money to be able to do else work as well as it could and I think it has the potential to help thousands of people with work that can be done.

>> We'll divide the question and the first item will be 69,000 from Ms. Pool. Any discussion on that? Yes.

>> Flannigan: I tend to agree with empty on this both items frankly, when I saw that resolution come across with, you know, ten, 20 resolutions, actions, studies, data, I don't think we're going to learn anything new but we will have taken money away from other quality programs or taken it away from senior exemption or taken it away from other things. I feel like at some point you have studied something to death. When I talked to the community they don't have any questions about who is being displaced or gentrification is happening but we had that conversation in a separate resolution but I don't feel like it's the best place to spend the limited funds right now.

>> Mayor Adler: I think people know those things but I think one point the community does not feel like they know the answer to is what to do about it, and the \$69,000 study maps it, but the task force was going to actually give us -- hopefully reach some kind of community consensus on what we should do.

[4:01:26 PM]

We can take a vote -- yes, Ms. Houston.

>> Houston: Before we take a vote, yes, we all know where it's happening, we all know why it's happening, and we also know that if we had taken some action, if we had the political will in 2001 when recommendations were made, we might not be in the place we are today. So what I'm hoping is that hopefully there will be the political will on this body once these studies are complete to do something and not just put it on a shelf and let it go because people's lives are being destroyed by some of the policies that we are enacting and some of the ones we refuse to enact. So this is the last time I'm going to vote on either of these items because it's past the time. That's 17 years that we've been doing this, and we know why it's happening. The Brookings institute has told us what to do and we've just ignored it. Because we're growing. And so the things that make us grow displace the people who are the most vulnerable.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. We'll take the first vote on the 69,000 UT study. Those in favor please raise your hand. Those opposed? The no votes are Alter, Flannigan, Casar, Garza, Troxclair. That passes 6-5. Then the vote on the displacement task force, staffing please raise your hand. Those in favor. It's me, Renteria, Pool, and Houston. The others voting no. It's defeated. Ms. Troxclair -- I'm sorry, what? The others voting no. Okay. Next item.

>> Houston: Nobody seems to have items -- oh, there's -- there's the document we're working from. I'm sorry. I have another item.

[4:03:28 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Houston: It's page -- messed my pages up. It's h19 under health, which is found on 25 of the concept menu, and I guess this is another question for staff. The African-American qualify life commission recommended 750,000 to provide mental health services to African-Americans, and are we providing that services, Ms. Hayden? Or is this a gap in the service delivery system that we need to address?

>> Stephanie Hayden, interim director, Austin public health. Yes, ma'am, it is a gap in the service delivery. We do have contracts with integral care, for example, and they serve all populations. But to have a contract that's targeted to -- specific to African-Americans for behavioral health, no, we don't.

>> Houston: Thank you. Thank you. I'd like to add -- I would like to -- there's no motion --

>> Mayor Adler: You can make a motion.

>> Houston: I'd like to move that we allocate \$750,000 to provide mental health services in the African-American community.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there a second to that motion? Okay. I think that's too big a ticket item. There's no second to that motion.

>> Houston: Mental health is a big ticket item.

>> Mayor Adler: No. It is. Anybody else want to make an addition to this?

[4:05:29 PM]

Mr. Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: On your list, mayor, you've got victim services as [indiscernible] Are we intending to do that later? Full-time ftes in addition to the training.

>> Mayor Adler: If it's not on -- if it's not on the --

>> Flannigan: But there are some public safety items that we were considering to take up later and I'm wondering if this falls under that bucket for you.

>> Mayor Adler: I don't -- would victim services be considered within the public safety budget?

>> Kitchen: Mr. Mayor, that's my item, and I was thinking we could take it up later. It is part of -- it's part of A.P.D. It's one of their departments.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Flannigan: I bring it up because it's important to me as well. I just wanted to make it clear when we were considering taking it up.

>> Mayor Adler: We'll make sure --

>> Flannigan: Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: We'll make sure we bring that up later.

>> Kitchen: We don't need to add it to this.

>> Mayor Adler: Not yet. Eventually we will because this is a working deal. I would also -- yes.

>> Tovo: I'd point out that the training is in this so if we want to have a conversation around that, my thought was that the training was probably pretty critical given the timing of the kits coming back and things of that sort. But if our policy is that we're going to take -- discuss all of these at once, I just want to highlight the fact that sexual assault counselor training is on the table for potential offending.

>> Kitchen: There's two items, yeah. There's the training and then there's additional ftes.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. I'd like to put on the table then the translation services element. Ms. Houston, I think that was on your -- yours as well.

>> Houston: Correct from the asian-american quality of life.

>> Mayor Adler: I don't remember what items those were.

>> Houston: It is g12, page 29.

[4:07:32 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: G12, translation services?

>> Houston: Mm-hmm. It's down there for a hundred thousand dollars.

>> Mayor Adler: \$110,156. I would move to add g12.

>> Houston: I'll second that.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there a second to that? Ms. Houston seconds that. Is there any discussion.

>> Flannigan: Would we not consider that part of the open-ended quality of life bucket that we already created? This is a quality of life recommendation.

>> Mayor Adler: Certainly could. Someone could make the same amendment that Mr. Casar made before but it is not specifically identified if we don't call it out specifically.

>> Flannigan: Are you identifying this on top of the existing bucket or to be part of it?

>> Mayor Adler: It was because my preference would be when we're done with all of this, when we take a look at how much we're over or under the main number, we then go back and revisit that number rather than doing it on a dollar for dollar transfer. It's been moved and seconded. Any further discussion?

>> Casar: Mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Casar: So I'm supportive of us doing translation services and I appreciate the commission's bringing this issue up. Requested a language access audit and worked with several council offices here and auditors on that. I just want to have a better sense of what -- from -- I'm not sure which staff would administrate this work most closely or if it would be from the very top I want to understand well what 100,000 verse 50,000 versus \$150,000 gets us as far as addressing the critical needs identified by our audit.

>> Ray, chief of staff, city manager's office.

>> Casar: Sorry, ray. I knew it was you. I blanked on it.

>> In answer to your question it's currently overseen by the public information office. So currently we have a temporary who is doing this work, and so we'd like to add an fte for language access coordinator to do it.

[4:09:34 PM]

>> Casar: And this would be in -- for our public information generally? There's Mr. Matthews. Public information generally or is there a need identified by the audit that was seen as -- of all of the needs

identified by the audit as far as translation services go, what rises to top that isn't funded? Is it y'all or was it something else?

>> Well, I -- my understanding is this discussion is around the proposal for additional money specifically for translation. To give the full history, when an allocation was made from you all last year, that money was -- has been used to formulate and stand U a comprehensive language access program. One of the keys to the audit was the finding that folks didn't have appropriate language access plans in place. So that's where we started our obligations work, was -- our work, was working with each department, training them to develop their own language access plans, which would then guide where we chose to do translation, where we would need interpretation, and we've been building some of those programs parallel so once the language access plans are in place folks have a guide for where they need to focus their attention, where they need to focus their budget when it comes to actually doing translation. I think there was some misunderstanding from the quality of life commissions last year that we were just going to take that money and translate a bunch of things, which we didn't feel like was the most prudent use of the funding.

>> Casar: Right.

>> So we do have a language access coordinator that's part of the proposed budget now. The asian-american quality of life proposal is specifically for the act of translating documents into those Asian languages. At least that's my understanding.

>> Casar: So help me understand from the staff perspective overseeing the broad change that we need to make full because my understanding from talking to lots of folks in various communities, including members of the asian-american quality of life commission, is we do want to leverage money the best we can to make as structural of changes we can make to help people that need access the most, especially in those less spoken languages.

[4:11:55 PM]

So if we were to direct -- regardless of what the commission's specific detailed recommendation was, what is -- is there any tension between that and what our staff would see as the best use of some amount of money from 50 to \$200,000 to address -- to address the outcome and the need that we want the most as opposed to just saying specifically how we would do it?

>> I don't -- I don't interpret there to be any tension there. I can tell you that the biggest issue that we've had as we've been working with departments on development of the plans is the departments want to do the right thing but they're not funded to be able to do the right thing. So the fact that we've been able to direct some of last year's funding towards helping them translate their information has been a huge help and it's helped move us forward in the process. So if there's a proposal on the table to have money available to help continue any --

>> Casar: That's what the commission recommended and that's what this funding would do?

>> Correct.

>> Casar: So they're the same thing. I wasn't asking because I suspected there was tension. I was asking because it's always good to check.

>> I can't imagine there's a department that will refuse money to help do the right thing.

>> Casar: That's helpful. Thank you.

>> Sure.

>> Mayor Adler: It's been moved and seconded to add \$110,000 for translation. Yes?

>> Alter: I had a question in the reserves in the statement of how the extra reserves were already allocated by the city manager, it said there was a certain amount that went to language translation. How does that relate to this proposal?

>> We were allocated \$250,000 in last year's budget. So we've used part of that for -- we have used part of that for physical translation, part of that to bring on a temporary person who can come to work every day and focus their attention on this. We did not spend that full 250. So we worked with the budget office on a proposal to carry forward whatever was left from that 250.

[4:13:59 PM]

I can't recite for you exactly what that number is. It's just over \$100,000 from what I understand. But we are keeping that money in a program account so that we can bring it forward to help support the activity this coming budget year.

>> Alter: So I know you might have just said this for Mr. Casar but I'm not fully clear. What would this additional money get us?

>> The Asian-American Quality of Life Commission has a very focused interest on getting materials, particularly health and human services materials, applications and things of that nature translated into the core critical Asian languages. That's been a consistent pressure since the last allocation was made, and we've been asking them to be patient while we made sure that we had the plans in place to support whatever it is that we did. And I believe that that's why they've brought forward the recommendation this year.

>> Alter: And this money would be used specifically for that?

>> Correct.

>> Alter: Okay. Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any further discussion? Yes? Councilmember Garza.

>> Garza: I was going to make an amendment but I think -- I was going to make an amendment but I think you're going to ask a question.

>> Tovo: I have a question. I'm trying to understand this. So we have \$100,000 to spend on language access this year. You said there were some requests to translate this into -- to do more translation into Asian languages, which is the substance of the -- which is part of what is motivating the request for additional funding this year. In next year's budget.

>> Mm-hmm.

>> Tovo: It sound like it wasn't a lack of funding that kept you from doing that but a lack of time because you had the planning work to do first. So I'm trying to see -- I'm trying to determine whether there's really a financial need to add to this. To add to this bucket. Or . . .

>> From my perspective, I'm not sure that I'm -- that I can make that decision for you.

[4:16:02 PM]

I can tell you that the need far outstrips the resources. And additional funding wouldn't hurt. We do have some funding that we're carrying forward that will help pay for some of those activities. I feel like the -- my understanding of the discussions that have happened specifically with the asian-american quality of life commission is they want funding that's focused specifically on the communities and languages that they're representing. The funding that we're carrying forward we're going to distribute that where we feel like we're going to have the most appropriate impact. I think that they want some particular ear mark that they know those communities are being taken care of.

>> Tovo: That's different than what we were talking about about creating an fte. The request then I would just need to clarify is the request for -- is the request that we're about to vote on for language access specifically for -- in response to the asian-american quality of life recommendation or is it for an additional fte for Pio?

>> I believe it's for the recommendation. We have already --

>> Tovo: I was actually asking the councilmember who made it.

>> I'm sorry.

>> Tovo: I want to understand --

>> Mayor Adler: I was repeating asian-american which looked to be an fte but if there's a question about whether or not that's the best way to spend that money, I'm fine listing it for an fte, allowing for -- listing it for \$110,000, allowing that to be something that our staff goes back to the asian-american commission to take a look at to determine the best way to spend it. If it is the fte then I would do that. If there's a better way that looks like to address the translation issue I'd be fine with that too.

>> I don't believe this is the fte -- the fte is part of your current proposed budget. So there's no -- there's no proposal that's attached to an fte at this point.

[4:18:03 PM]

>> Tovo: I'm sorry. There's -- the city manager's proposed budget includes an fte?

>> Yes.

>> Tovo: So the -- so you said you've been handling this with a temporary employee. You are converting that temporary to a full-time -- or creating a full-time employee. We're not taking a vote on that at this moment because that's already in the proposed budget.

>> Correct.

>> Tovo: We're simply talking about supplementing the hundred thousand dollars rolling over with additional funding for translation services particular -- okay, thank you.

>> Correct.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember Garza.

>> Garza: My amendment was similar to councilmember Casar's previous one, that we include that in the quality of life bucket. Because it was a quality of life recommendation.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Garza moves to amend it to say with the \$110,000 increase there be 110 thundercloud decrease to the number which is 700, I think at this point. So it would be decreased down from that. Ms. Houston.

>> Houston: I would agree with that if we know that that's what it's for. Because the asian-american quality of life did a whole study I think the first year we were here about there are five languages that they need information translated to that get no information in anything but English. And so we've got to make sure that they get the resources that they need to be able to influence their community.

>> Mayor Adler: So the question for us is if we add this do we take it out of that other bucket? Ms. Garza makes the amendment to take it out of the other bucket. Is there a second to that? Seconded by Mr. Flannigan. Any discussion? Those in favor of the amendment please raise your hand. Those opposed. I

think I'm the only one opposed. Now we'll vote on the item for 110 with the corresponding drop. Those in favor please raise your hand. Those opposed. That one is done. Next item, Ms. Pool.

[4:20:08 PM]

>> Pool: This one is h21, access to playground for children with disabilities. This is improvements to playgrounds so that we are in compliance with Americans with disabilities act. You'll remember that when I first introduced this concept from our staff, they had given us a list of ten playgrounds where this work is needed to be done and the cost per playground is an average of \$100,000. In whittling down this list because of the scarcity of funds, I would propose that the parks and rec department be tasked with doing two playgrounds to improve access for children with disabilities at 200,000.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool.

>> Pool: That would be one-time only, one time, although obviously the need is ongoing, but one-time funding for this year at 200,000.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool moves to add two playgrounds one-time funding Ada accessibility. Is there a second to that?

>> Houston: I'll second that.

>> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston seconds that. Any discussion?

>> Kitchen: I have a question.

>> Mayor Adler: Ms. Kitchen.

>> Kitchen: Could that be taken out of C.I.P.?

>> Pool: You know, that would be a really good question for Mr. Van eenoo or some other of our budget staff. But if the C.I.P. Budget could handle the Ada compliance of our -- two of our park-owned playgrounds.

>> It certainly would be a C.I.P. Project but there's not -- you know, there's funds in the C.I.P. That are allocated to it, so it's a matter of what the funding services -- we would transfer -- if you take it out of one-time funds we'll transfer the one-time funds to the capital improvement budget program to do these improvements.

>> Pool: Are you saying that we've spent all of our -- or these weren't part of bonds, for example, and there's no money in capital improvements?

[4:22:13 PM]

>> I would have to check with pard if it's something they have money in their bond program that could be allocated to these projects.

>> Pool: Looks like acting director Mcnealy is here.

>> Kimberly Mcnealy, acting director for the parks and recreation department. So our current C.I.P. Program or bond funding, as you well know, is at the end of its life cycle from 2012 to 2017. So the funding that we have remaining in our bond program has been allocated to specific projects, has been encumbered for specific projects, or is already in process of being spent. So to answer the question, we don't have the \$200,000 to reallocate. If we did, that would just mean that we would be taking it from a particular project that's already scheduled and it would become a \$200,000 less project. So we would just be taking from one to pay for the other.

>> Pool: Let me check with the dais to see if there's interest in pursuing this and putting it on the list and hopefully maybe finding the money for that. And putting it as a proxy. Placeholder.

>> Mayor Adler: You could put it in as a one-time general fund cost. Is that your motion?

>> Pool: Right, for 200,000. I was trying to assess the interest on the dais for going ahead and including that knowing at some point we will probably have to go back and reassess the projects that we've already added in.

>> Mayor Adler: We're going to have to do that to everything.

>> Pool: Right.

>> Mayor Adler: The question is whether that rises to this level of priority at this point. It's been moved and I think -- moved to -- it's been moved and seconded already. The issue in front of us is \$200,000 to make Ada compliance to parks, one-time funding. Ms. Garza and Mr. Flannigan.

>> Garza: Which concept item?

>> Pool: H21.

[4:24:16 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: It was listed -- yeah, h21.

>> Pool: It was -- it's on the transition plan for pard Ada compliance and the Austin parks foundation had recommended this as well. This may also have been an item that gave had supported but I might be wrong on that.

>> Mayor Adler: It was listed as one mislead on the concept menu.

>> Pool: Right.

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan.

>> Flannigan: I'm curious what the 200,000 goes for -- it's for two parks.

>> Pool: It's for two playgrounds and the estimate from staff is each playground is about \$100,000 to do the Ada compliance work. There were ten playgrounds around the city that they were interested in doing the work that needs the work. This was scalable when I first introduced it you'll remember we talked about it was ten of them at \$100,000 for a million and that we could always reduce the number of the playgrounds that we would ask pard to do in the fiscal year and it also of course goes not only to funding but also staffing capacity. So I have whittled down the ask to just do two playground for \$200,000.

>> Flannigan: It would be up to pard to decide which two.

>> Pool: They have the list, yes.

>> Flannigan: They have a list of ten.

>> Pool: They do. I would presume they would go with the two that have the highest need, but acting director Mcnealy is here and she could respond to that.

>> Me again. I do not have the list of ten playgrounds with me today. But it is correct, we do have a list of playgrounds that were assessed quite some time ago. We know exactly which playgrounds need to be replaced and in which priority order. What we have done in the past if it would be acceptable to council is we have come back in the past via memo to provide you information of how we prioritized and which playgrounds we selected and for what reasons and we would be happy to do that should this be an item that you all desire to put on the crept list.

[4:26:18 PM]

>> Flannigan: -- Concept list.

>> Flannigan: This is a tough one for me because I think we have a duty to respond to Ada compliance issues but I think at the same time we are about to come into a bond program and, you know, I know I've heard from community -- I've heard from advocates that they say promises were made and not

fulfilled in prior bond programs so I'm also hesitant to trust a process that the people that I'm trying to help save doesn't work, but I'm at least okay with keeping it on the list for now.

>> Mayor Adler: It's been moved and seconded. Councilmember Garza.

>> Garza: Sorry. I have a question. You said we were at -- I have the same concerns as Mr. Flannigan. You said we were at the end of this bond program, the fund have been encumbered for capital projects. I know we still have to have a conversation about what will be in an upcoming bond but I think we all have are pretty sure there will be an upcoming bond so where would Ada compliance rank on something that parks was asking for in an upcoming bond program?

>> In my recollection it is a named program for Ada, Ada compliance. I don't want to call them issues but Ada compliance renovations to make sure that we're compliant with Ada. We did an Ada transition plan that told us that we have a significant dollar amount. I think it's \$140 million of items that -- infrastructure items that we could be repairing in some priority order. So it's definitely something that will be a part of our bond program. Suggested as part of our bond program.

>> Garza: And so when we -- the data specifically says improvements. I'm just wondering if there's a better -- I know there's some playgrounds that they already have the equipment but the swings that would help a disabled child aren't able to be used right now. Is that what this is referring to? Or this is referring to, like, installing ramps for wheelchairs? What is --

>> I can tell you that a hundred thousand dollars for a playground is -- is not much money. Playgrounds can run as much as \$300,000 so this would be ap sub equipment or access opportunity for individuals to be able to access that space.

[4:28:27 PM]

Or both of those things, to allow for individuals who are -- who are disabled and individuals who are not disabled to play in the same place. I don't want to give you the impression that it's, like, a boundless playground if you're familiar with those, but it certainly would add an element to the playground that would allow individuals who are not disabled and individuals who are disabled to play side by side.

>> Garza: Okay. And I just have a question. On the list we're working on, the million was a one time. Where are we on the one time? Are we over a million now? We're not --

>> Mayor Adler: I think there were some things being added. I would say we're close to it.

>> We had these being just [indiscernible].

>> Garza: And I thought the millennium and the asian-american resource center was moved into the -- things were just added. We just added additional --

>> Mayor Adler: I would assume that, Ms. Pool, if we have \$200,000 in this, if in looking at need the parks decided that it was a particular piece of equipment that was good, but they could move it to four different locations, they could do that too. So really it's \$200,000 or A.D.A. Compliance, spend it the most wisely that you can.

>> Pool: I think that's a fair assessment.

>> Mayor Adler: It's been moved and seconded. Any further discussion? Those in favor of adding it please raise your hand? Those opposed? It's added unanimously. Ms. Kitchen?

>> Kitchen: I have a number of items that should be addressed later because there are items that are agreed to by staffing.

[4:30:28 PM]

They're just reallocation agreed to by our staff. So it seems to me to make more sense to kind of get to those later. Is that all right?

>> Mayor Adler: Yeah, if staff thinks it's the wise thing to do, it's what we'll support.

>> Kitchen: Just to be specific, I have two items like that and then I have two items that are hot tax related, but I think we'll get to that later. And then I have another item that is the ems service delivery model, which is also a reallocation. So that's all I have remaining.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mr. Renteria, anything else on your list you want to move forward?

>> Renteria: I still have the \$300,000 for the -- to aid the foundation community and Latino health care reform on the affordability outreach enrollment service to target to Austin uninsured at 100 to 150% federal property limit. So that's my recommendation. The foundation community last year served over 7,000 people and enrolled about 7,000 people, and the Latino also did an excellent job there in east Austin enrolling people. You know, the present administration in Washington and his desire to kill this program has reduced all kinds of funding to do outreach work, and it's just another example of when there's cuts going on at the national and state level it would end up making us having to pick up the cost for the service, so that's my recommendation.

[4:32:42 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. \$300,000 affordable care act enrollment. Is there a second to that? Seconded by Mr. Casar? Mr. Casar?

>> Casar: I would like to ask councilmember Renteria if we can also include this in the -- in the bucket that is existing for quality of life and quality of life recommendation for various groups and to leave it as affordability enrollment broadly so that even though I know very well both these organizations, I like setting the practice of setting what we're funding and not who we're funding.

>> Renteria: When it comes up later I have no problem by bringing it up. I would like to make sure that, yeah, we're going to be able to discuss this, take action on it.

>> Mayor Adler: So it's been moved to add to the list affordability enrollment, \$300,000, and to take it out of the bucket. It's been seconded. Is there any discussion? Yes, Ms. Pool?

>> Pool: I just wanted to note that this year they've shortened the enrollment period. I guess we've already engaged the effort, but we need to definitely step it up because we don't have as much time for the enrollment, is that correct? That's too bad. I'm glad you brought this forward.

>> Mayor Adler: Further discussion? Mr. Flannigan?

>> Flannigan: I'll support keeping it on the list, but I think it's important to remember that this is one of the reasons why advocating for putting as much into reserves as possible, I don't think it will be the last thing the federal government does that our community will be expecting us to fulfill and step up and fund. We'll keep it on the list because we want to keep things moving, but we're spending a lot of money that six months from now we're expected to spend more on.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

[4:34:46 PM]

Those in favor please raise your hand? Those opposed? Troxclair voting no, the others voting aye and alter abstaining. That \$300,000 is added. Ms. Houston?

>> Houston: I have.

>> Alter: I want to say that I'm abstaining because I have put forth a reserve that I think would help with this.

>> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston?

>> Houston: Thank you. And I was trying to get Ms. Mcneely while she was still up and walking around. Councilmember alter has C 29 regarding the cultural centers. George Washington carver had a decrease that we're trying to put back in for programming. Could you explain what happened in -- what is it, 2003 and 2013 that we're trying to --

>> Sure. In the 2008 through the 2011 fiscal year period, of which I was here for two years, there was some requests that needed to -- there were some requests to decrease all budgets for us to find cuts in all of our budgets of a certain percentage. So the George Washington carver, just like every other cultural center and recreation center, made those cuts. The impacts of that, however, were that the George Washington carver had a very interesting program called Broadway bond, which is a summer camp program which serves anywhere from 75 to 100 youth in the summer to be able to produce a play. That money -- that was the impact and that money was never replenished to their budget, which means that the parks and recreation department depends upon annual funding from the Austin parks foundation every year in the amount of \$40,000 in order for that popular program to continue.

[4:36:55 PM]

So while the budgets appear to have increased, that particular amount of money -- it was approximately \$48,000 over that time period, that particular amount of money was never replaced to the tune of approximately 40,000 -- 48,000. So we depend upon Austin parks foundation money to run that program. If ever they were not in a position to fund that, which I believe they support it wholeheartedly, but if ever there was a time that would be something that the carver would no longer be able to provide.

>> Thank you for that history because I think it's important that people in that the reason that some requests were being made is because of historical things that have never been brought up to equity.

>> And if I may, you will -- some of you may, if you are looking at the budgets, will notice that in 2014-2015 there was an increase in funding and then a decrease in funding the following year. And that had to do with utilities. So the utility rates went up. All of the parks and recreation department received a certain amount of utility funding. It was just placed in the wrong funding unit and so the parks and recreation department continues to have that utility funding, but it was no -- it wasn't needed at the carver, it was needed at another location. So it appears as though they received an increase in funding and then it was taken away, but I assure you that was utility money that was then moved to another location that had a utility bill that required that \$48,000.

>> Houston: Thank you. So don't go yet. So my motion is to include the George Washington carver museum in the amount of \$50,000 to cover -- that's many years of not having the funding, but at least we could get it up to par next year that would be helpful. Do you have any idea when the -- we're talking about revenue-generating venues.

[4:38:57 PM]

The Boyd Vance theater is one of those. Do you have any idea how old the sound system and the lighting -- I know we got new seats.

>> We did get new seats and we provided an upgrade to the sound system this year. I don't remember the amount of money that the upgrade was, but the rest of the equipment was the original equipment from the time that the carver opened. 2005? I believe it's 2005. I would have to look it up. I apologize.

>> Houston: As we look at community venues for people to use, we have to make sure that all of our equipment is up to date otherwise they won't contract with the site to do that. So I appreciate that. My motion is to -- for this time to include the George Washington carver and the amount of \$50,000 to get them back up to where they've not been for the past, since 2013.

>> Mayor Adler: It's been moved to take carver up to \$50,000. I assume this would be the same offset to the bucket? Is there a second to that? I'll second that. Any further discussion on this? Yes, Ms. Kitchen? Ms. Kitchen and then Ms. Alter.

>> Kitchen: I wasn't sure -- did I hear someone say offset, mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes. I'm assuming this would be treated the same way.

>> Kitchen: Okay, gotcha. So it's an off sit against --

>> Mayor Adler: Against the 900,000-dollar bucket.

>> Kitchen: My question was I'm wondering if this is the kind of thing that could be considered for the hot tax. No? Okay. Never mind.

>> Mayor Adler: And tomorrow we'll have a whole hot tax day and maybe find other things that we can pull off of. Councilmember alter?

>> Alter: Councilmember pool and I had brought forward, C 29 that I think includes this item, and that was for expanded hours in capacity for a city owned cultural centers in order to utilize the facilities for affordable centers space.

[4:41:07 PM]

It was originally put down as 140,000 from the general fund and 100,000 from the one-time funds. I think it covered the carver, Daugherty, and the asian-american resource center. Councilmember pool has the details here. I think that I will maybe let councilmember pool ask the questions. We had identified another source of funding and it looks like you have your sheet here so I will let you proceed with those questions.

>> Pool: So I'm passing out a sheet that gives you a description in the impact and the council direction. There's a balance in the cultural arts fund and if you look in volume one, page 652, there's two million dollars left in that fund and this I believe is the 15% on the hotel occupancy tax. And these are expanded venues for four city-owned facilities, cultural facilities that folks from out of town do visit as we know. And the proposal is to use \$240,000 of the 2 million in the unexpended balance in that account to cover the cost for expanded hours. This increases program requirements for the cultural arts fund. It's a recommendation that was from the music and ecosystem stabilization report and a strategic initiative that's in the parks and recreation department strategic plan, it's in the 2017 to 2021. So the \$240,000 actually has a revenue source and that will be the cultural arts fund that is currently in, I believe, that's economic development. And then it's only one-tenth of what's in that unexpended balance.

>> Alter: And I just want to mention that I left off the mac, so it was the asian-american research center, macc, Daugherty and carver.

[4:43:08 PM]

>> Pool: Thank you for that, councilmember alter. Everybody can see the four cultural facilities that are targeted for this. Asian-american resource center, Emma Barrientos the mac.

>> Mayor Adler: I have a question about the funding source because there's a scheme that's set up to allocate the cultural arts funding and I don't want to do anything which disrupts that or sets a precedent where the process gets disrupted.

>> Pool: Yes. I appreciate that. I was once on the music panel and was once an arts commissioner and that's right. There's indeed an intense and fairly sophisticated process. I wanted to find out from staff, I don't know if someone is here who could speak to the unexpended balance. What has happened is the money has flowed into the bucket. The assessments have been made and the cultural contracts have been allocated. So can you talk to us about the two million that was left at the end of the year?

>> Yes. Good afternoon, sylvonia holt-rabb, assistant director with the economic development department. Our ending balance, we are required to keep a 50% reserve within our cultural arts fund in case of a downturn, so there is a little extra in there, but again, we never know what will happen in the future, but per the arts commission and the ordinance we are required to keep a 15% reserve.

>> Mayor Adler: Is this 250 in addition to that reserve?

>> Pardon me?

>> Mayor Adler: Is this \$250,000 in addition to that reserve requirement? >>

>> Pool: The \$240,000 would come out of the unexpended balance. And so 15% of 11 million --

[4:45:09 PM]

>> So there is a little that we could --

>> Pool: This is about 10% of what the unexpended balance is. So we think it will fit in, but I would be happy for staff to think about it until tomorrow when we take up some more hotel occupancy revenue discussions.

>> Mayor Adler: I want to make sure that we're not violating the reserve visual impairment or messing with the cultural arts funding.

>> And which facilities, all city owned facilities.

>> Mayor Adler: There are four she can give you.

>> Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: So let's hold that until tomorrow. Mayor pro tem?

>> Tovo: This may be a question you were asking staff, but I wonder whether the 240, you said there's a little bit more than 15% in here. I think I understood that. So if you could have for us the figure of what is beyond that 15%.

>> Okay. And this is to address the space concerns from last year, correct?

>> Mayor?

>> Alter: This follows the recommendation --

>> Mayor Adler: Trying to acknowledge improvements -- leverage improvements we already have.

>> Flannigan: When I look on to the balance it was at 3.9 million, 4.7 million, 3.9 and now it's proposed to dip under two. When you look at the program expenditures it has exceeded the income to the cultural arts fund for the last two to be spent is more than what's being proposed to be left. So I think some clarity around this is going to be helpful for me.

>> We can do that and we can also give you an historical perspective of the funds and the requests.

>> Renteria: Mayor?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, Mr. Renteria.

>> Renteria: Also, I'm going to be requesting from staff about the funding that I put in there summit, the housing summit.

[4:47:12 PM]

I would like to get clarification to make sure that if we do put it under the hot tax that it's going to be totally legal. I know we have staff, including hr, that have been working on this project.

>> Mayor Adler: So let's hold off on the hot tax question --

>> Renteria: For tomorrow.

>> Mayor Adler: But I'll take that as a motion to include it in this list and we'll have it on hot tax and it's something that will come O so it's been moved that we include the housing summit of \$75,000. Is there a second to that? Ms. Pool seconds that. We'll have a conversation tomorrow about how we can pull that out with hot tax money if it passes. Any discussion? All those in favor? Those opposed? Troxclair voting no.

>> Alter: Are we voting to put it on the list or where its funding source is?

>> Mayor Adler: We voted to put it on the list, but the lists are malleable and we'll have a conversation tomorrow about hot tax and once we have that conversation we'll probably look at everything on this list to see if there are changes that we should make. But that one now is added as well. Councilmember kitchen?

>> Kitchen: I think it might be appropriate now to deal with the item, which is the ems service delivery model study because there's a relationship between my item and councilmember pool's so we could handle both those right now.

>> [Inaudible].

>> Kitchen: This has to do with the -- there are two parts of it. My item is the ems service delivery model study and councilmember pool's is the item related to the electronic patient care report solutions, which is the electronic medical record for ems. So if I could -- I can lay that out. Okay. So I'm going to pass this out. So basically what this does is -- we're passing out our pieces here. What it does is it-- the document that I'm passing out to you all has -- explains the scope of study.

[4:49:22 PM]

Remember we had some conversation at the work session about what the scope of study would be and what was involved here. So I'm passing out a -- did I pass that out? The top of it says budget rider for budget concept item s-20, and this is a budget rider that reduces the funding that's in our current

budget for the service delivery mode efficiency study from 250,000 to 75,000, and it switches the 175,000 over to ems's electronic medical record. Now, there was some -- when we brought it up at work session there was some questions about what this meant and what the study was. So the item that I've passed out details the scope of work for the study, and I also passed out a letter from Dell medical school because our ems folks have been talking with the folks from Dell medical school and the letter from the Dell medical school indicates their interest in working with ems on this item, within this scope of work. The scope of work includes a number of things. I will -- just for clarity, it's about researching, identifying and assisting ems in implementing alternative concepts to improve population health, address high costs by reducing preventable emergency room visits and readmissions, and increase the financial sustainability of ems department. To collaborate with national experts on cutting edge ems service delivery innovations, including Dell medical school, Ibj school of public affairs, and the national planning project ems agenda 2050, which is being carried on by the national highway transportation safety administration's office of ems and supported by the department of homeland security office of health affairs, ems for children program at hrs and the office of the assistant secretary for preparedness and response at dhhs.

[4:51:38 PM]

So as you can see there's a -- there's very impressive group of national experts that are working on these same issues and so this scope of work is for our own local experts through the Dell medical school and the Ibj school of public affairs working with this national effort and these national experts on this list of scope of study items. And I know that some people had some concerns when we were talking about work session about the relationship to the fire department. So this scope of work includes that. The last item is to consider synergies with the Austin fire department's mission. So that's part of the scope. And then you'll see the items that are very specific, they're things like investigating options for pricing new services, methods that ems can use to collect fees, alternatives for being eligible for payment from CMS for community paramedic services, other innovative services and methods for receiving payments, et cetera, et cetera. So the point being that I think that the scope of work gets at the kind of concerns that we had in terms of improving our opportunities from ems to improve our population health, address high hosts, the emergency room and increase the financial sustainability ems department. It's set up and it reflects the work that's already occurring in ems with our local experts. And it takes -- it keeps the study. It just takes it down to a number that helps us with -- given what's going on with budget. We just had a conversation a minute ago about not wanting to spend so much on studies when we can be spending it on actual services. So this freeze up 175,000 to go for something that's very much needed at ems, and that's for their patient medical records.

[4:53:40 PM]

And I'll let councilmember pool speak to that particular item. So I think that this -- and it also reflects -- you know, you don't have to have 250,000 when you're working with local experts like the Dell medical school. We're so fortunate to have them available here in town. So anyway, so that's my motion. I guess a second?

>> Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool seconds that.

[Inaudible].

>> Pool: Okay. And so... The 175,000 replaces ems's outdated system for tracking patients' medical records, the item reduces the funding in the ems service delivery mode study from 250,000 down to 75,000. And uses the corresponding 175,000 to update their software to track patient records. And obviously this would allow us to have more nimble, more accurate and better service delivery and better resources for our first responders in the field.

>> Kitchen: And then finally, just to be clear, there's no cost to the budget. We've been working with the staff, with ems, and this is something they support, and it's a reallocation.

>> Mayor Adler: I have a question. I like both expenditures, they make sense to me. I'd have to think about the priorities, but I am concerned about the study. And I need to understand the relationship when we originally put in this study it was because we had this recurrent question that we've had during budget times about the service model of fire and ems and platooning folks and trying to figure out if there was a better, more efficient way that could potentially save us millions or make people safer or change the way that we're doing things.

[4:55:51 PM]

The manager had put that study in the budget I guess at the 250,000. Is that where that came from? So I guess my question would be can we still do the same scope or is this study a different study that we should also consider funding?

>> Kitchen: My response would be this is the study that's needed. This is the study that owns in on -- hones in on the financial stability of ems and has huge potential roi for us. And so I think it is the study that gets to us most efficiently using ems services and it also takes advantage of cutting educational efforts that are going on to look at what is the best use of ems services. It does include, if you will read the scope of work, the last item acknowledges that it's important in reviewing ems's work and the -- the particular items one through five, that it will consider synergies with the Austin fire department's mission. So to look at potential collaborations and the possibility of enhancing capabilities such as they're doing right now with host and other things like that. So to answer your question, I very strongly

believe that rather than putting 250,000 into a study that we don't even have the scope for that we really put the focus on something that we know is going to get us there in terms of efficiencies. It's something that our ems department wants. It's something that Dell medical school is very interested in working. And that's why I passed out the letter from Dell medical school. That's why I'm bringing this forward and I would like us to vote on it.

[4:57:54 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan. Ms. Kitchen councilmember kitchen, I think we may not be in the same place in what we're hoping to accomplish with the studies. And the layout of the study you've presented seems like a good idea. It's just not the study that I was hoping to have. And we can have that disagreement, that's perfectly fine. When I look at the public safety budget and I look -- and I include the departments like ems, which have fairly considerable cost recovery. It's not 100%, but it's not zero. There's -- the intent of my original request around fire and ems study was to be more proportional to its impact to our budget, not the reverse, which I think is what you're proposing. So more study on the -- I mean, I'm laying out what I want.

>> Kitchen: Go ahead, and I'll explain why.

>> Flannigan:

>> Flannigan: You can disagree but this is what I was laying out originally, was that fire represents a much larger proportion of our public safety budget and so my intend was a study would spend a commiserate effort exploring possible efficiencies. The ems department is a significantly smaller proportion, even smaller when you consider it has cost recovery options than our fire department. The \$250,000 cost it's my understanding that is a general number that staff has come up with that the scoping to be determined at a more specific level later, but that it wasn't able to be accomplished -- the original intent wasn't able to be accomplished under 75,000. Now if the council wants to could a different study for 75,000 that you've laid out, that's fine, we can have a vote for that but the original intent that I was hoping to accomplish that the manager had included with the base budget.

[4:59:54 PM]

>> Kitchen: Can I ask a question? I don't understand the difference because if what we're -- if our aim is to efficiently provide emergency medical services or medical services to the community, this is the way to get there. If we're talking -- if we're talking about some general study that talks about whether we put fire and ems together, that is -- I mean, why would we do that? I mean, what we're asking for is what is

the most efficient way, which is I thought what we were talking about, is we're looking for efficiencies. So the efficiency is how do we deliver these services? This hones in on -- takes advantage of what we know already and it doesn't have a have us at -- we don't have to do a starting point that's just going to come back and tell us what we know already about what's important about what ems provides. If you're just talking about about you want to study whether you put the two administrative units together into one unit, that's not a study I want to have. Because I don't -- that's not where you're going to get efficiencies in terms of how we provide medical not the study that I want to have either, and we have made it clear --

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Flannigan: Let me finish. We have made it clear, I have made it clear that combining the agencies was never my intent. It was never anything this council said we wanted to explore. But because they're not the same, defining a study so specifically about ems with an afterthought on the sixth item on the back page about fire is the opposite intent of what I was hoping to accomplish.

>> Kitchen: I guess I don't understand the scope of work that you're looking for.

>> Flannigan: Can the manager -- you included 250 so there was something in your mind about what we were going to accomplish with that study.

[5:01:56 PM]

Can you help us with this, please?

>> I can. During my review we talked about potential for a study, not to -- and you clarified, not to look at the combination of our fire department and our ems department, but to look at the efficiencies of how they dispatch their units to see if we can provide that coverage in a different manner to reduce the resources that we're putting on specific instances. Many cases we have a fire department arrive at an accident first to be -- or two units and then one is called off because ems is arriving. They do provide different services, but we were looking towards some way we could find efficiencies in how we dispatch and what we dispatch first. That was the intent. It was not to combine the departments. No, we have not written a scope because we needed the budget before we invest the time in that work.

>> Flannigan: So would the 75,000 being proposed change the ability to accomplish that objective?

>> I believe that it would, but not having a scope yet, you know, sometimes people are willing to do things for a city our size just for reputation so I don't know what the --

>> Flannigan: I think --

>> 250 was a placeholder.

>> Flannigan: I think we might be talking about different things. What you've laid is very interesting and maybe has value on its own but it can't reach the scope and breadth on the fireside that I was hoping to see studied.

>> Kitchen: I respect that. So we'll just vote on this.

>> Mayor Adler: We'll divide the question into three parts.

>> Kitchen: No. I -- Mr. Mayor, I have a --

>> Mayor Adler: Ask the question to be divided?

>> Kitchen: I have a motion on the table and I would like to vote on my motion.

>> Mayor Adler: He has the ability to be able to divide the question as we have consistently for the last two and a half years. Do you want to divide the question?

>> Flannigan: It would be divide that it would separately decide --

[5:03:57 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Whether we fund a 70 thundercloud 70 -- \$70,000 study, whether we fund a ems service study and whether we reduce the budget by taking \$250,000 out of the -- for the report.

>> Casar: Mayor, as a point of order question, I think under Robert's rules but I would like to have a check of that, that we we should be allowed -- I think you can object and take a vote on dividing the question. Traditionally we don't object and I've never heard anybody objective in two years but my understanding of Robert's rules is that you could.

>> Mayor Adler: That is correct.

>> Casar: And I would like to stick to the rules if possible.

>> Mayor Adler: First thing that happens is there's a request to divide. There's a ruling by the chair. Then the council as a council could object to that if they wanted to.

>> Casar: But I think that councilmember kitchen objected to the division of the question.

>> Mayor Adler: It's not her choice. The council can override the chair.

>> Casar: No. I'm not talking about overriding the chair. I believe under Robert's rules that the body has a right to vote on division of the question if there's objection.

>> Mayor Adler: The body -- the body does. I don't -- it hasn't even been requested yet.

>> Casar: Okay. I --

>> Mayor Adler: The body will have a chance.

>> Casar: Fine. Not a big deal. Perhaps I misunderstood you. I thought you stated that there is a rule that if somebody requested to divide the question that it will always be granted.

>> Mayor Adler: No.

>> Casar: Okay. I'm not even sure if I object to councilmember Flannigan's thing. Just an intent.

>> Mayor Adler: There's not a request yet nothing to vote on.

>> Flannigan: I'm fine having councilmember Kitchen's motion be intact. We don't have to be cute or clever. Sometimes we are. But I also think the EMS system is part of the budget for which we know there will be ongoing deliberations. Both of these really I think arguably fall under the ongoing deliberations piece of it, too, so we can have a reasonable disagreement on that but I'm -- I'm fine keeping your motion intact.

[5:06:08 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Can we take the motion as it is? Ms. Houston.

>> Houston: I have a question for councilmember Kitchen. What is the role of central health and this conversation about population health improvement programs?

>> Kitchen: You're very familiar and you know of course that population health is -- that public health is the city's responsibility. They can certainly collaborate with central health and if you would like to add that to the study scope we can certainly add it. And this was not an attempt for the city of Austin to take on any new responsibilities.

>> Houston: Yes. But I also have -- understand that central health talks about population health.

>> Kitchen: Right.

>> Houston: As a way to get services into the community, which they're not doing now so I think they should be a part of this conversation.

>> Kitchen: We can add to the scope that we -- that we collaborate with central health.

>> Houston: Yes, please. Let's add that to the scope.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Houston: Yes, please.

>> Mayor Adler: It's been moved and seconded. Is this further discussion?

>> Alter: I'm just a little confused with what happened on the divide the question because I support -- I support both of these items but I also want the other study so I'm a little bit uncertain what we're voting on and I'm uncertain why we can't vote for the ems stuff and keep the study in there and/or put it under health because it's a health issue though it's a public safety department. I think the part of what I'm hearing ems argue is that this is really about health and not just the public safety. But I would just like some clarification on the procedure here because I think the other study is really important as well.

>> Mayor Adler: And I think it is. What we'll do is take this vote and if this passes I would entertain an amendment to add the \$250,000 study back in.

[5:08:17 PM]

>> Kitchen: Could I make a suggestion?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Kitchen: I think if we take this vote, what this vote is is to use this 250,000 -- since we're talking budget, to use this 250,000 in this way. If someone else would then I mean, let me just back up. This is the interpretation that I understood that our study was. Now I understand that people had different interpretations of that, but because there was no scope out there, no one -- I mean, no one has an ownership on what the scope of this particular \$250,000 study was. I'm proposing that this is the scope of that study that we take it down to 75. So I think we should just vote on that. Then if people don't like -- if they want something different then you can bring a separate motion.

>> Mayor Adler: That's what we said.

>> Kitchen: I thought you were going to then vote again I thought you said on this motion?

>> Mayor Adler: No. We're going to take a vote on this motion. It will be done.

>> Kitchen: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Then if someone wanted to make a motion to add a \$250,000 study.

>> Kitchen: I apologize. I misunderstood.

>> Mayor Adler: They would be able to do that. Does that answer the question? I was going to divide it to do it but not the way that the sentiment on the dais want to. It will accomplish the same thing. All right. We're back now to councilmember kitchen's motion. It's been moved and seconded. Those in

favor please raise your hand. Troxclair, the mayor pro tem, Casar, Garza, me, kitchen, pool, Houston, and alter. Others voting no, two voting no. Okay? Do you want to make a motion, councilmember alter?

[5:10:18 PM]

>> Alter:

>> Flannigan: I'll move to restore the 250 to the study.

>> Mayor Adler: There's been a motion to authorize a \$250,000 study. Is there a second to that motion.

>> Alter: I second that.

>> Mayor Adler: Ms. Alter seconds that. Is there discussion? Okay. Let's take a vote -- I'm sorry.

>> Alter: I would just like to point out that our -- I guess I would like to ask the city manager why you included this study and that management thought this was an important study for us to move forward with.

>> During the spring budget work sessions, as we went through the department deep dives for both ems and the fire department and as we continued to work on the fire department overtime issues, the city council asked for recommendations on what we could do to gain efficiencies. And so during my review, we talked about a consulting study that would include a review of dispatch efficiency. We also talked about a consolidation of the two departments. You made clear to me that you did not want that to be a part of the consulting study. So I sent -- so I sent back a brief description of what was in my goals for next year, which included this study. We have not yet developed a scope because we didn't have the funding. The 250 was a placeholder if you wanted to cut it to 200. We don't know how much it's going to be. Until we get the proposals in. Many of our study -- I think the matrix study cost us about 250,000, which was a study of the police department, and so that was really how we settled on that amount. But this was really in response to discussions we had during my review about what we could do to better deliver service but do it at a lower cost.

[5:12:27 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any further discussion? Let's take a vote. Those in favor of authorizing the study please raise your hand. Mayor pro tem, troxclair, Flannigan --

>> Tovo: No, no, I'm sorry.

>> Mayor Adler: Troxclair, Flannigan, me, alter and Houston. Was that six? Five.

>> Tovo: Mayor, I didn't intend to vote for it.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Raise your hand if you're in favor of this. Five. The rest voting no. That does not pass. Next item. Mayor pro tem.

>> Tovo: Mayor, long ago we were talking about the program at the carver and I think the amendment is a good one to replace private funding with public funding so that there's consistency to that. I did mean to say at the time I really appreciate the park foundation's support, it was the park foundation as I understand it who had continued to support that and I wonder if we might ask them if they were will to continue that funding for potentially another need. So that was just -- I'm just throwing that out there into discussion.

>> Mayor Adler: Help me because there's some ambiguity. In the middle conversation about the carver there was also suggestion that we increase the spending to also cover three other facilities as well.

>> Tovo: Yeah.

>> Mayor Adler: So we kind of laid one on the side to see if we were going to resolve it that way. I fully intended us to come back to that and I don't know if those are similar or if they're different, if they're different things.

>> Tovo: I think that's a good point because I was reflecting I'm not sure we voted on the carver program.

>> Mayor Adler: We did not.

>> Tovo: It sounded to me from the description they're not one in the same. One is about extended hours and the other is about a particular program as I understood it, councilmember Houston, so it probably would be appropriate to go back and vote on the program.

>> Mayor Adler: I agree with that so let go back and vote on the program again if they're different. Yes?

>> Pool: And I was curious whether that program was something that fell within the parameters of cultural arts funding.

[5:14:35 PM]

For the Broadway program. You don't think it does? I don't know.

>> Tovo: I just remember when I was looking into summer programs I think it's a summer and afterschool program for children in our community so my guess is it --

>> Mayor Adler: Not designed --

>> Tovo: Would not qualify for hot tax funding. Am I remembering that program right, the Broadway program?

>> Mayor Adler: Because it's not just arts, it's arts designed to --

>> Pool: There was always a really strong educational component to it though and programs and schools was huge -- but I'll admit it's been 20 years. So I won't go there.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's consider adding it as part of our hot tax conversation tomorrow if we can pull it off we'll pull it off. Ms. Houston moved to add \$50,000 to carver for that program. Was there a second to that? Ms. Pool seconds that. Go ahead. It come out of the quality of life bucket. Any discussion?

>> Houston: Are you -- hold on just a minute. Are you going to check with the parks foundation? Thank you.

>> Mayor Adler: Any discussion? Those in favor of the allocation please raise your hand. Those opposed? It's unanimous on the dais. Yes, Mr. Renteria.

>> Renteria: I'm just -- you know, it's been a long day so I'm just trying to verify something real quick.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Renteria: When I -- when we were discussing about not having to have an outreach person for the mac because we had one already, we found some money that was already there where they continue that program. Do I have to put -- did I include that I wanted some of that fund to go to the -- I know we're not supposed to be calling out groups but there was some valets for 22,000, for a video documentary on chicano artist at 17 five and continuous funding of Sam's corner.

[5:16:44 PM]

I assumed it would all be in the pocket of the quality of life funding.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's call those out. Mr. Renteria calls the three items on the page he listed out, top list Sam's corner, other two programs, ballet east and other. Is there a second to that? Ms. Pool seconds that. Is there any discussion? It would also be netted against the bucket. Okay. Take a vote --

>> Tovo: Wait, mayor, I have a question. So is the motion to fund these organizations specifically? Or is it to create a program as we had discussed that would allow different organizations to apply?

>> Renteria: I would like to see it more specific because this has been -- two groups in this area have been continually funded as one-time funding. I would like to see it in therefore and then we can have a discussion tomorrow about seeing if we -- finding some other source of funding for it.

>> Tovo: Can you help me. Which ones -- what items are they on the concept list?

>> Renteria: It's the c14, c15, and c19.

>> Tovo: I'm flipping to see because there was a mix of individual outside organizations and I think there were -- c14, 15, 16. Okay. Yeah, I guess I'm going to stick with what we had talked about in last year's budget, and I -- you know, I think the programs are all very strong ones but we can send a signal to the community that we weren't going to fund individual organizations in the same way, and I'm going to have stick to that policy conversation that we had last year. I am extremely supportive, as I've indicated, of creating and doing, you know, whatever council direction we need to do to create a program where individual organizations can apply for money and it's a very low barriers program for them to have festivals and events, but I can't support the allocations to specific organizations this year.

[5:19:03 PM]

>> Renteria: And that's why I'm asking but then we also had other groups that have put individual amounts to fund like the carver and that was individual. You know, so --

>> Tovo: I guess I draw a distinction with city facilities.

>> Renteria: Mm-hmm.

>> Garza: I have a question, mayor.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, Ms. Garza.

>> Garza: Councilmember Renteria, could you explain the three and -- do you know how many people that they serve?

>> Renteria: The ballet east is [indiscernible] Mendez, and he worked with a lot of school-aged kids, especially in east Austin, so it's a great program that have been working with our youth for years. Sam's corner is a program where they're teaching kids how to do health screens in montopolis. Montopolis, if you want to call it, it's -- it's not very kids friendly. We only have one rec center there. It's a good -- it's an excellent program. They've been working with our area chicano kids there in the montopolis neighborhood area, which is a very low-income neighborhood. And we're trying to develop as many programs as possible that -- to help these kids to keep them from going the wrong way. So I have to say one thing about the c15, that that is something new that has some -- that had just been started earlier

this year and they're documenting all the chicano artists that have worked there in east Austin before the history goes away.

[5:21:13 PM]

So the recommendation -- that was part of the quality of life, and because we didn't need the \$81,000 for the mac full-time

[indiscernible] We were able to find funding that was already there to fund this position. That's why -- and it didn't make the original recommendation earlier this week or last week, and that's why I'm asking to be put in this time around.

>> Garza: So would c15 be a one-time fund?

>> Renteria: Yes, they're all one-time funding.

>> Garza: Did you say they were all one-time funds?

>> Mayor Adler: Do you want to do that at this point or keep the Sam's corner, which has been recurrent? Sam's corner has been something that's been recurrent rather than making that a one-time -- one-time fund, the quality of life bucket we have right now is annual expenses.

>> Renteria: Okay, yes. Because that's an ongoing --

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any further discussion? Mr. Casar.

>> Casar: Mayor, these are -- this adds up to about \$100,000, and like I had stated before, all these different organizations tend to be people itch -- I have relationships with and like but if we could vote on a hundred thousand dollars to be cultural and arts small grants for community organizations, serving communities of color, I would just be more comfortable with that sort of wording than just to make a good government change more than having anything to do with this item because so far I feel like we voted only on needs and not specific groups, knowing that the carver is -- and asian-american resource center, et cetera, are city facilities.

[5:23:19 PM]

But when giving out dollars to private organizations want to just list the need. So I would mention to councilmember Renteria and others supporting this motion that I would give my support if we listed it

as a hundred thousand dollars, which is what this adds up to, in small grants for these organizations and communities of color.

>> Renteria: Total is \$81,000.

>> Casar: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: No, no. There's three items, 55, 35, is 90 -- the numbers changed?

>> Renteria: There's a new amount.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry. Okay.

>> Renteria: On this sheet right here.

>> Mayor Adler: I got them. I'm torn. I mean, I generally agree that that's the correct policy. My sense is we're going to through a little bit of a transition that's why I posted the deal. I think if we were able to execute that this next year we would finally be out of it. I know that there were some conversations in the quality of life commissions this year where most of them did it, they all didn't do it, there was some pushback because there was concern that people weren't able to make it within the vetting process that the city presented. And for me I'm going to vote for these as they're presented because I believe that we're hopefully going to be able to set into a process this next year that moves us past that. Ms. Pool.

>> Pool: I'm going to offer one more tonight.

>> Mayor Adler: We have Mr. Renteria's motion in front of us.

>> Pool: Sorry.

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Renteria, do you want to change your motion at this point? Do you want to see what the vote is?

[5:25:21 PM]

Well, the question was we have three programs here that list three different entities. Do you want to have a vote trying to approve them with those three different entities and then come back if that vote does not pass?

>> Renteria: I would like to definitely have the -- take it in separation and see if we can continue Sam's corner. That's one of the

[indiscernible] That really is the only program that we're going to be providing for in montopolis.

>> Mayor Adler: Part of that is its location-specific. A program for people that would represent the community base and is -- is ongoing.

>> Renteria: Well, this would be on a continued -- if it's continuing, I'd like to see it.

>> Mayor Adler: He's requested that we divide the question. Objection? Let's vote on Sam's corner. Those in favor of Sam's corner please raise your hand. That would be councilmember Garza, Flannigan, me, Renteria, pool, Houston. That's six votes. The next two, do you want to keep those with those names or do you want to put them as --

>> Renteria: I would like that in bucket.

>> Mayor Adler: \$40,000 for --

>> Renteria: To compete with the --

>> Mayor Adler: For arts?

>> Renteria: I would like to, yeah, put it in there --

>> Mayor Adler: Let's convert this to \$40,000 for small grant arts. Yes, mayor pro tem.

>> Tovo: Mayor, as we continue to look at that bucket and refine it, it would -- I think it would be a great thing to get that 70,000 back up to where we started the process at 150 so that there is more money in there for other events that might come up throughout the year, events, programs, small things like that to be able to access that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. So we could -- we pulled out 41. Do you want to take that to -- are you -- his motion is 40 for small cultural grants program.

[5:27:29 PM]

>> Tovo: I'm -- happy to leave it where councilmember Renteria has it. I want to note it's a decrease from where we start at 150 and if we have an opportunity to do so I think that's an area where we can do a lot of good with 150, a relatively smaller amount of money.

>> Mayor Adler: We can look at that again tomorrow.

>> Tovo: It was not met with success earlier so I'm just going to leave it where it is now.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. This is a motion to approve small cultural arts grants, \$40,000. Recurring expense. That's where the bucket was. Those in favor please raise your hand.

>> Garza: I'm sorry. Did it change from one-time to recurring?

>> Mayor Adler: Did I because that's where the bucket was. The bucket was recurring. So I was netting it against that bucket.

>> Garza: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: \$40,000 small cultural arts grants. Those in favor please raise your hand. Those opposed. Let's take the vote again. Those in favor please raise your hand -- small cultural arts grants \$40,000 please raise your hands. Mayor pro tem, Mr. Casar, me, Renteria, pool, Ann is not here. We'll hold that for a vote with everybody's indulgence until she

>> Renteria: Mayor, did we put in the ab Cantu, 45,000?

>> Mayor Adler: No.

>> Renteria: I would like to make an amendment to add 45,000 for the ab Cantu cultural center, the health site's summer concert series. This year is going to be -- and I'm asking for one time. This year is going to be the 60th year anniversary. We have -- they have been able to over the past year, to raise money to hold these events, and this year we bring out as many as 2,000 to 5,000 people on this night series.

[5:29:43 PM]

And they want to have a celebration and fix up the hillside there at the an am. It's a pretty old -- at the pan am. It's a pretty old facility. In fact, the fuse box that powers that place is still the old fuse that you screw in. They had a big power outage last summer where they had to go and buy generators to generate this. So part of this money could be used to fix up and rewire the stage there and help with the certificate. Also our tejano --

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Renteria, sorry, I'm going to interrupt you. We were going around and giving other people a chance as well. We had several in a row here. Let me give other people choices. Other things to put on the other amendments to bring? Ms. Troxclair?

>> Troxclair: We haven't talked about adding or funding the 12 unfunded police officer positions. We haven't talked about funding the 12 police officer positions. Is this a good time to do that?

>> Mayor Adler: We could certainly do that now. We had also talked about holding off on the police staffing questions until we had resolved the police contracting questions. And that was as far as our conversation went. We don't have to hold off, but that was my recommendation.

>> Troxclair: That's fine.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Yes, councilmember alter?

>> Alter: Thank you, I would like to increase pard's maintenance funding for 252,000.

[5:31:47 PM]

This is item seven on the concept menu supported by councilmembers pool and Garza. This is also supported by all of the parks groups. We had several people coming to support parks funding at our budget hearings. This would allow the playground inspections and timely repair of playground equipment. This is a revised number from what was originally in the parks adopter -- the parks advocate request that has been reviewed by the parks department and that would hire three parks ground specialists for these ground maintenance and inspections. And this would free up the districts for that responsibility allowing them to draw up for other parts of the city. That's for 252,117. And I would just remind people that in terms of our playgrounds they are open to everyone. This would go for everyone all over the city. We have playgrounds that are unsafe at this time because we can expect them and I think it's important that we have this capacity on a regular basis.

>> Mayor Adler: It's been moved to add the parks funding. Is there a second to this? Councilmember pool seconds it. Discussion?

>> Garza: I'm sorry, what was the amount?

>> Alter: This is 252,000, item H 7 that you had been a co-sponsor on under health.

>> Mayor Adler: Any discussion? Mayor pro tem?

>> Tovo: It's becoming less and less clear how one should vote on items like this.

[5:33:50 PM]

I certainly support it. I think it's a great need, but frankly, I don't believe we're going to have money within our -- I mean, making space for this need means getting rid of something we've already identified. And so I'm in a quandary. If I vote against it it's because I believe that we have different priority needs, not because this one is not a need. I think it's an important need. I guess I would and did kind of place it into a tier two if we're able to come back -- you know, if we are in a position of making other budget amendments later on.

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Garza?

>> Garza: I'm in the same place. I co-sponsored a lot of things on the concept menu knowing that it exceeded the five million dollars that we had allotted. And I wonder -- we voted for the A.D.A.

Compliance. I wonder if there's a way to split that and do one park and maybe one fte for maintenance. I wonder if that's an option. So we could fund both, but I don't think I can add an additional thing.

>> Mr. Casar?

>> Casar: And the way I'm starting to judge these votes is I think I'm not going to vote for this because if I vote for it I imagine that this is going to be one of the -- unfortunately one of the first things that I would have to cast a vote to take off and so to save us that time since we're at the end of getting close to the end I just want to be sort of honest with that, even though this is an important thing. And I appreciate it being brought up, but can't vote for it because just to single that.

-- Just to signal that.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Yes?

>> Alter: I think it's really important that we recognize that we have a lot of needs in our parks department and everyone all over the city accesses this as a quality of life issue, is this a health issue?

[5:35:50 PM]

As we currently have it set up the hot funds are not going to resolve any of these issues. These are basic issues. We could also talk about the lighting. People care about our parks. It's one of the things that they love most about Austin. It's why people enjoy -- one of the reasons people enjoy living here. As we densify our parks are even more important. We cannot go on without funding our parks and expect to maintain the quality of life.

>> Mayor Adler: Further discussion?

>> Garza: Can I ask pard a question? I don't want to put you in a tough position, but if you -- if you had a choice and if you don't want to answer it, that's fine, between funding two A.D.A. Parks versus one and one fte maintenance, would you feel comfortable giving a suggestion?

>> So it's interesting you should say that, acting director Kimberly Mcneely. We were trying to be creative. If we had this amount of money, 200,000, 250,000, how could we accomplish both things? And we didn't come up with the conclusion, but I can assure you that we would use it to the highest and fullest extent to meet the most need possible. So I guess I'm not answering your question because I haven't had a chance to really think it through, but that's exactly what we were debating back there, given a certain amount of money can you make some portion of both things happen.

>> Garza: So could we give direction that 200,000 to go to either A.D.A. Compliance or maintenance, whichever pard feels is best bang for the buck kind of thing?

>> Absolutely. Or a combination of.

>> Mayor Adler: Are we okay making that change?

[5:37:51 PM]

>> Alter: I would like it to be more than 200,000. We have all of these other items items on here and parks is not on here. And parks is accessible to everyone everyday. So I'm not sure what the right number would be. I would be comfortable with having a parks bucket, but I do think that limiting it to 200,000 and then we're going to take money out of pard's budget for hot hot taxes and not do that, there is a way forward that the general fund money that comes out of the hot taxes goes to parks and then I would be willing to consider that if we wanted to purge is that way. But to take money out of the general fund to substitute for hot and not give anything to parks I think is an important thing that we should be considering.

>> Mayor Adler: Ms. Pool?

>> Pool: Well, could we have a parks bucket and this money could go into it for use kind of like the block grant that we did in the past with pard? I think our first budget year we put a million and a half into kind of a block grant for parks and that was all spent really carefully. To the extent we have some general revenue funded projects that I know several have been looking at that are shifted or won't be done because they would fall under a different funding source than some of those monies or all of those monies could shift into that bucket too so that the parks and rec department doesn't see a net decrease in their budget. I want to make sure that that doesn't happen this year with all the considerations that are being made.

[5:39:57 PM]

>> So one suggestion that I -- after Sarah and I just spoke is perhaps if the positions were granted we could work very closely with our partners as you had suggested before with the Austin parks foundation who we all know very much supports the parks and recreation department, to help us provide for the contractuels, the commodities or the pieces of equipment that we would use for the playground. So if we had two positions to do maintenance and/or playgrounds inspections and then worked with partners -- and the Austin parks foundation is not the only partner, but other partners that they'd be willing to help us support the other part of that perhaps that's a great compromise for us to be able to, again, use the money to it's highest and best use and keep you from struggling with the choice. Just a suggestion.

>> Alter: I will modify my motion and make it a parks bucket for 350,000 which includes also the 200,000 of A.D.A. From before.

>> Mayor Adler:.. There's a motion. Anybody object to changing this motion to make it a park bucket at 350,000? That would represent \$150,000 more than what is currently on the budget and it would replace that item.

>> Pool: And it combines it with the other item that we already talked about for the A.D.A. Playgrounds.

>> Mayor Adler: So it increases it by 10-1 50.

-- By 10050.

>> Pool: And it's less than the two items separately put together.

>> Alter: And I have a lot more parks items which I could, that I won't add, but if we have a parks bucket that can go up and down like some of these other things we've talked about can go up or down and we don't have the time the afternoon to do that because we would have the parks bucket to be able to work with.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any objection to that. Hearing none, this is to change the A.D.A.

[5:42:00 PM]

\$200,000 to now be a general parks bucket of 350,000. It's been moved. Is there a second to that? Middle school seconds that -- Ms. Pool seconds that. Any discussion? Any discussion? Okay. We'll take a vote. Those in favor of the amendment please raise your hands? Troxclair, Flannigan, pool and alter. Those are four votes so it does not pass. Anything else?

>> Garza: Mayor, I have one item. E 45, which is 80,000 one-time, I -- it's actually -- it shouldn't be just aisd, it's just post-secondary preparedness program at Mendez middle school. And I would move to decrease that to 70,000 and move it to the quality of life bucket.

>> Casar: I'll second that.

>> Mayor Adler: Which item? I didn't follow.

>> Casar: It's the item that's already in the base motion. It's a reduction of 10,000 and --

>> Mayor Adler: From the base motion. Is that the one we started with this afternoon?

>> Casar: It's already in. It is the second line. She's reducing it by 10,000 and moving it from -- we didn't have the quality of life bucket when there was the base motion so now it's moving it into the quality of life bucket which is recurring, and reducing it by 10,000 as part of that movement. It's the second item on --

>> Mayor Adler: I see that.

>> Garza: And it should be named post-secondary preparedness program at burnet and Mendez middle school.

>> Mayor Adler: So you're calling this as a callout item, that is right, underneath the quality of life?

[5:44:02 PM]

>> Garza: Yes. I'm moving it to the quality of life ongoing, reducing it to 70,000. It's a one time right now.

>> Mayor Adler: 70,000. And it's for again, please?

>> Garza: Post-secondary preparedness program.

>> Mayor Adler: Any objection to that Ange okay. So the 80,000 in one-time expense shown for Mendez and burnet middle schools now become recurring and under the quality of life bucket. At 70.

>> Casar: Mayor, I have a question. Are we still leaving here at six?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes.

>> Casar: Do we have any sense of what we're spending our last 15 minutes doing and how we're explaining what we're doing tomorrow? And if we can start any earlier tomorrow.

>> Mayor Adler: Well, I think tomorrow we -- one, we'll take a look at where we are today. Do you have a feel generally? Are you keeping something cumulative?

>> [Inaudible]. I was going to say if we take a vote on this item we're ready to tell you where you're at.

>> Garza: You mean the one I just -- there was no objection.

>> Mayor Adler: There was no objection so that change was made.

>> Pool: Mayor, I have one more item that I actually have a funding source for it so I just want to get it on the table.

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, manager.

>> A clarification on that last vote on the parks item to combine the two that failed. Does that mean the 200,000 A.D.A. Improvements stay on the list?

>> Mayor Adler: Yes, yes.

>> Just wanted to confirm.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. What I see us doing generally, and we can talk about it, we're fairly well narrowed in here at a really high level. I think we're just over two million dollars for the recurring, like 2.4 by five and this is really rough, about two and a half million dollars over.

[5:46:09 PM]

And then we're about 360, \$370,000 over on the one-time. That still has the homeless pay for success model in this total.

>> [Inaudible].

>> Mayor Adler: It keeps it in the total, I think.

>> [Inaudible].

>> Mayor Adler: No, it's a million dollars more than that: Okay. I would see us, you know, beginning tomorrow talking about the hot tax issue so that we can see what we're going to do with that beginning with that and then talking about other revenue sources tomorrow and then coming back to this exercise here. Ms. Kitchen?

>> Kitchen: Did you want to go first?

>> Pool: Go ahead.

>> Kitchen: I have a quick one that's a reallocation that's been agreed to by the staff. So if it's -- if it's timely I can do that.

>> Alter: I have an additional one that a lot of people had agreement with before.

>> Kitchen: Do you want to go first? That's okay.

>> Alter: I wanted to put forward capital idea, E 20, this is for workforce development, and 230,000 would be from general fund and 469,000 would be from other funds. That's E 20 and not the workforce development. So it's a total of about 700,000, but it is split up with a general fund of 230,349.

[5:48:11 PM]

And staff identified 469,651 that could be paid by other funds.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sorry, this is a 230,000-dollar increase. This item?

>> Kitchen: I'm sorry, I passed that out. She's talking about a different one.

>> Alter: It happens to be 230,000 at the same time.

>> Mayor Adler: I was totally lost on that, I'm sorry.

>> Alter: On that sheet she just passed out it's E 20 --

>> Renteria: Mayor, are we taking some other items? I thought -- you said you were going to go around the council and so --

>> Mayor Adler: That's true. And you had a parks one so -- he's right. So let's rotate it around. Did you have one after him or before him?

>> Kitchen: I have one whenever order you want me to take it in.

>> Pool: And I have one last one for the day.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. We'll take you three. Pio first and then kitchen and then pool.

>> Renteria: Yes. I propose to put the C 17 into the quality of life bucket. I just got off the message there and they're willing to reduce it down to 30,000 from 45. And they could survive with that. I'd like to put that into the quality of life bucket.

>> Mayor Adler: For 30,000?

>> Renteria: Correct.

>> Mayor Adler: This to me is like montopolis, it's the pan am center facility. So I see this as being different under the standard that the mayor pro tem --

>> Renteria: C 17.

>> Mayor Adler: So I'll second that. This is the summer concert series under the quality of life bucket at 30,000.

[5:50:16 PM]

Is that what you said?

>> Renteria: Correct.

>> Mayor Adler: It's been moved and seconded. Is there a discussion in approximate on those if favor -- these in favor please raise your hand? Those opposed? Flannigan voting no, others voting aye. It passes. Ms. Kitchen?

>> Kitchen: This is the sheet I passed out. It is a budget rider saying the city will cover the increased contribution for health insurance to retirees over 65 and dependents. It's reallocation. I've worked with the staff and they've identified the 230,021 that it will take to do this and they are -- they've said that we could reallocate the funding from the ending balance of the employee benefits fund. And that would cover the increase.

>> Pool: I'll second that. This is an item that is really important to our city of Austin retirees and their families and we've been looking for a way to offset the increased costs of living that they are -- that they are seeing, and it's hard to find additional funds either to give them a cost of living adjustment or to further offset or to increase our offset on health insurance benefits. So this is a really creative way to come up with the monies and I strongly support this.

>> Mayor Adler: Mr. Van eenoo, would you explain the ending balance?

>> I think we have hr staff that can respond to that. I wasn't in that conversation with the ending balance.

>> Kitchen: I had worked with Joya from hr on this. I don't know if she's here.

>> They were outside, but I'm familiar with the concept and I think certainly we're comfortable with the one-time use.

[5:52:20 PM]

Is that the concept, one-time use fund balance?

>> That's right.

>> I'm okay with that as well.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. It's been moved and seconded. Is there discussion? Ms. Houston?

>> Houston: But isn't it ongoing? If we do it this year we'll have to do it next year and thereafter. I'm a retiree. I know you can't just do it one year and -- because then the following year I would be not getting that funding.

>> I think there are two ways to do it. One would be making it sustainable, but that would disrupt the rate structure, but we would go back and evaluate the claims experience for the following year and see what adjustments would need to be made. It may not need that level of subsidy depending on what the claims experience is.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Any further discussion? Mr. Flannigan?

>> Flannigan: I'm concerned about the ongoing and one-time thing too. I mean, I know -- I don't know how you can't be concerned about that. I don't know how this council approves money, one-time funds over and over again and then we come into this meeting and what do we hear? Well, we better keep all the programs that we approved under one-time funds because the community depends on them. We can't just invent money out of nowhere. When I look at the employee benefits fund in the budget on page 596, volume one, it shows the declining balance until this proposed budget that we're going to reduce again. Mr. Van eenoo, can you help me understand the financial policy around this fund?

>> Essentially this fund receives funds from the departments that have staff or have employees and then also from the employees. So there's contributions both from active employees and departments. There's also contributions from retirees and then the city also contributes funds into the employee benefits funds for retire S.

[5:54:27 PM]

That's how the fund receives dollars. We have an actuary that we work with to set those rates. Part of setting those rates includes maintaining a contingency amount and over and above that contingency amount I know we have some ending balance amounts. So the \$230,000, I think you're right, it's not an issue from a one-time basis, but I do think it's a real question and I've heard this item discussed both ways. Is this a matter of just for fiscal year 2018 or for the plan year beginning January 1st of 2019 to not see an increase in the premiums for those post-65 retirees that can be accomplished with the current ending balance, but then there's a separate question is does that just result in a larger increase in fy20 by holding them down now or alternatively are we permanently changing the ratio? So there's a ratio between how much the city funds and how much we trees fund. So it's really the fundamental question are you permanently changing what it is where the city funds more and the employees less or is it a one time let's not pass on premiums, but that would result in a bigger premium increase in fiscal year 20?

>> Kitchen: Can I speak to my motion? I'm putting this as a one-time because I understand that there are larger issues in terms of the rate for the future and I will be happy to work with our staff to consider whether it is the kind of thing that we can change the rate for the future. It may be a very minimal impact on the rate. You have to look from an actuarial standpoint. And councilmember Houston, I understand your concern, but as a -- I think as a retiree, I think retirees would rather say give it to me this year, try to do it next year. If you can't you can't. Rather than we can't give it to you this year because we can't figure out right now what to do about it in the future.

[5:56:30 PM]

So I am happy on -- I am bringing this forward as with one time and I will work with hr staff and they're very familiar with what we need to do from an actuarial standpoint and you can remind me this next year.

[Laughter]. And if we -- and I promise I will never say why did this not come back as ongoing because I've I'll work with the staff. And your point is well taken. So I'll remember that.

>> Mayor adler:the motion is to add -- no, to do the 230,000 paid with the end balance. Any further discussion? Let's take a vote. Those in favor please raise your hands. It is mayor pro -- those opposed. Houston and Flannigan, otherwise passes. And we'll remind you. Ms. Kitchen and then Mr. Casar -- I'm sorry, Ms. Pool and then Mr. Casar.

>> Pool: So first I want to ask if everybody is up for me presenting this because I can do it tomorrow. This is the tree education position. We have the money for it. It's in the urban forest fund. So it's not new money. It's just directing staff to spend out of the fund that already exists. But if everybody is tired I don't want to put this at risk. It's \$73,000. And it's a tree education position that engages residents on the value of trees and importance of conservation and these days knowing with climate change and all the rest how important this kind of conversation is to educate our youth, that's what this is for. And it's a cultural and learning opportunity. It's a health under those strategic outcomes, modeled on youth education program, one fte for \$73,000 out of the urban forestry fund.

[5:58:36 PM]

So if that sounds like a good deal to everybody I'd be happy to offer it up tonight knowing that the money is available. We don't have to put it in a bucket. We don't have to find the money. It's there. But if everybody is too fatigued and tired I don't want to run the risk of not getting this on the concept menu. So I am at your pleasure.

>> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem.

>> Tovo: I had a question for you, councilmember. So this is, as I understand you're using the tree mitigation fund. I did see a fund somewhere in our list of funds that I wondered if it would also be an appropriate funding source, and, if so, I wondered if there was an advantage to using one you had cited.

>> Pool: This -- and this is a combination that both I and councilmember alter have been working on. She has -- and you'll see on this sheet that I'm passing around the first create a pilot tree education is my initiative and the second one, councilmember alter's is the second bullet create the opportunity to use existing department funds for two additional programs and we've combined them and maybe that is where you saw the second item.

>> Tovo: No. It's the second fund that I found in the budget that I was wondering if you had considered -- if these are fully funded through the tree mitigation then I'll -- I mean, it seems in line for that except it was supposed to be used for planting, as I remember --

>> Pool: Right.

>> Tovo: I'm not trying to expand.

>> Pool: We've had extensive discussions with the staff and arborist and education around trees --

>> Tovo: I hadn't finished my sentence.

>> Pool: Okay.

>> Tovo: I said the expansion of that seems to me appropriate, but, again, I just want to give it a little thought. It was the planting for future fund within development services. It has an ending balance it looks like at the end of last year for 47 of thousand \$600 and I don't actually know what the planting for the future fund does beyond what was indicated in here.

[6:00:47 PM]

It was started -- funded by the city council in 1991. It's used to fund tree planting materials and education, and it, too, I think is an appropriate funding source and potentially even more appropriate than the mitigation fund. So I'm comfortable with moving forward if there's not a general fund expense, but we might just consider which those funding sources is the appropriate funding source.

>> Pool: I'm open to getting some direction from staff on which one they think is more appropriate. I'm glad that the funds are available in both cases.

>> Mayor Adler: You want to check that tonight and report to us tomorrow?

>> Pool: Yeah. We can check into that. I hadn't heard of that fund either so --

>> Tovo: It was a very healthy balance so if they don't have plans for doing -- you know, in this next year investing in lots of planting for the future fund activities, then we might have some to suggest from one of the lists that you had put together because I know you put a lot of thought into trees and education and nature and it might help support some of the other children in nature items.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. There was a vote that we started taking -- so you'll check that and report back to us tomorrow the right account for that.

>> Pool: That sounds great.

>> Mayor Adler: There was a vote you missed, Ms. Kitchen, that was a close vote and I'm going to call for again. There were two items that Mr. Renteria had. He had listed specific entities for those. They totaled about \$40,000. We changed that to be not those specific providers but in the heading called quality of life mini grants. And we kept a \$40,000 bucket for that. Do you feel comfortable taking a vote?

>> Kitchen: Yes.

>> Mayor Adler: Let's take a vote on that issue. Those in favor of the buckets, 40,000 for the mini grants, please raise your hands.

[6:02:49 PM]

Mayor pro tem, Mr. Casar, me, Renteria, kitchen, pool.

>> Pool: Ms. Garza.

>> Mayor Adler: Ms. Garza. Those opposed? Troxclair voting no -- I'm sorry, what?

>> Houston: We didn't vote on that already.

>> Mayor Adler: We took a vote but it was 5-5 so we needed a sixth vote so we delayed the vote until Ms. Kitchen came back.

>> Houston: Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: It now this time seemed to pass with everyone except for Ms. Troxclair and Mr. Flannigan. And did you --

>> Alter: I'm abstaining.

>> Mayor Adler: And alter abstains.

>> I'm a bucket of mini programs but I'm not sure where this one is fitting in so not to derail anything more --

>> Mayor Adler: We can revisit it tomorrow and that's added and it gets netted against the equity quality of life number. Mr. Casar.

>> Casar: So I'm not bringing up any new item. I just wanted since it's 6:00 wanted to communicate that personally and I think I would imagine folks on the dais would like a copy of whatever spreadsheet that we're at as soon as we can get it, understanding that even though may not be perfect -- I would totally forgive there being any changes between 7:00 P.M. And, you know, 8:00 A.M. Tomorrow, 9:00 A.M., 10:00 A.M., whatever, just what we've done today I would really like to be able to work on it probably into the night tonight.

>> Mayor Adler: It would be good if we all had them.

>> Casar: Even if we get several versions of it, I'll speak for everybody else, we will too, I just don't want to --

>> Mayor Adler: I'd be happy to post the one I have but I'm sure yours would be much better than mine. Is that something you think you can post an excel spreadsheet too or are you so tied into all your other things when you try to pull out a page all the numbers go haywire?

>> No. We have a simplified version of it that I think Diane and I reconciled \$2.9 million over on the ongoing, \$300,000 over on the one-time, give us 30 minutes at the close of this meeting to make sure we have that exactly dialed in and we will put it out on the website.

[6:05:04 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Sounds good, thank you.

>> Casar: My only question about those numbers is the pay for success in the reserves or is it part of that 2.9 overage?

>> Mayor Adler: It's the fourth line, I think.

>> The pay for success, it's currently part of the ongoing the way it was brought forward on the council --

>> Casar: But is it coming out of the reserves or is it coming out of --

>> Mayor Adler: No. That was part of that total. So the three-point -- 2.8 or whatever it was over includes the 1.2 for the pay for success.

>> Casar: So pay for success came out of the reserves we would then be at 1.7?

>> Mayor Adler: Correct.

>> Casar: Thank you.

>> That's correct. And I might suggest that we do have responses to some of the items that council asked for and so it's your pleasure in the morning when we start --

>> Mayor Adler: If you have answers why don't you give them to us now so people have the answers.

>> Kitchen: I'd rather -- I'm sorry. You said you had answers to?

>> Mayor Adler: To questions that people had asked today.

>> Kitchen: Oh, okay.

>> Garza: I have a question about the report, the spreadsheet real quick. Can you -- we did the 1.7 bucket for quality of life. Will there be a true-up of that? Can you delineate 1.7 and all the things that fit into that 1.7? I'm curious if we exceeded that 1.7 and if we did how we're going to reconcile that. Thanks.

>> Kitchen: One last question. So we -- I'm not sure what we did about the bucket of things for budget amendment. Did we decide we would get to those later?

>> Mayor Adler: Mm-hmm.

>> Kitchen: So we don't have a list going for that?

>> Mayor Adler: No. Well, we have the list that's at the bottom of the page that the mayor pro tem handed out.

>> Kitchen: Yes. But there may be other items.

>> Mayor Adler: I'm sure there will be plenty more purchase that's probably a .that's probably a good place to start that.

[6:07:10 PM]

Why don't you ask your question and we'll conclude with Ed giving us -- did you have something else.

>> Alter: I got cut off with my motion with respect to workforce development. I wanted to make a motion that would provide a workforce development program that provides college-level education for living wage jobs and has a proven track record. And I'm just trying to respect the idea of not having specific names for e20, 230,349 general fund and \$469,651 and, you know, this is not something to help people just with a resume. This is giving them college education that gives them a living wage and has a proven track record.

>> Mayor Adler: Is there a second to this motion? Ms. Pool seconds this. Any discussion? Ms. Houston.

>> Houston: Well, I'm going to have some discussion. We've been funding this non-identified group since 2011 and have given close to \$12 million. So, you know, it seems like we need to provide access to those funds to some other people. That's why I hope in that bucket for job training that other people have an opportunity and that that non-identified group will work with people who are trying to make sure that they go deeper into our community. I would like to know what demographics are for people who actually graduate. I have -- I have some budget questions about the actual goals and outputs in some -- under retain employment for six months, the goal was 94%, the actual -- 95%, actual is 64%. I would really like more information about the program that we're not mentioning.

>> Mayor Adler: I will tell you I agree. I think we should put in money to support workforce development but I agree we need a budget direction that lists exactly what the criteria and goals we're trying to achieve.

[6:09:18 PM]

All right. It's been moved and seconded to add this item, which like 235 or something?

>> Alter: Item e20.

>> Mayor Adler: E20.

>> Alter: It was 230,349 general fund and 469,651 --

>> Mayor Adler: Went to the other departments?

>> Alter: From the other departments.

>> Mayor Adler: Right.

>> Alter: So a total of \$700,000 for workforce development program, but some of it is covered by other funds.

>> Mayor Adler: Right. 235 out of the general fund.

>> Alter: 230, 230,349.

>> Mayor Adler: Item e20. Yes.

>> Garza: I know we fund a certain workforce development program. Do we know what that current funding is? Because this is in addition to what we fund already. Is that right? I thought. Do we have any -- is economic development here?

>> Houston: What they gave me was current contract was economic development -- hold on. It's little. 1,130,000 and from one-time funding 350,000 to make a grand total of 1,078,650.

>> Garza: That's what we currently fund?

>> Houston: Mm-hmm. Some of it -- the lion's share is from economic development. The other part was when we gave them one-time funding for the last -- since 2015 there's been one-time funding for \$350,000. Each year we ask them to scale.

>> Garza: It's my understanding so the total was 700,000 and the 200 was remaining after we were able to find revenue sources elsewhere?

[6:11:19 PM]

Is that correct.

>> Alter: So there's -- when I originally submitted this, I just submitted that I wanted to fund this, the budget office came back and said that I was 700,469,651 could come from other funds.

>> Garza: So that's not general fund money.

>> Alter: That's not general fund money and that the 230,349 would need to come from general fund. So there's -- depending on how you want to -- you know, that's 700,000 with a 230,000 hit to general fund, obviously those affect other things and that's a decision we have to make but it's different than some of the other items that we've been looking at.

>> Garza: So the other funds, if we didn't do the 200 but did the other funds, that does not come out of the general fund?

>> Alter: I don't know if that is an option. That would be something the budget office would have to clarify.

>> Capital idea is presently an economic development program so we fund it out of economic development. Council has approved economic development being a shared cost center between Austin energy, Austin water, Austin resource recovery and general fund. So any increase to economic development we allocate to those four departments because that's how council decided that economic development would be funded. Increase that economic development by 700,000 it's going to be allocated to that. Increase it by 469,651, that would be allocated out and some would still come to the general fund.

>> Mayor Adler: This is a \$700,000 allocation to workforce development. And you've allocated it out. It's a \$330,000 charge to the general fund.

>> Alter: 230.

>> Mayor Adler: And I support it not for any one group but with the criteria we will put on in budget direction.

>> Alter: I think the workforce master plan might already delineate what such a program should be.

>> Mayor Adler: Might very well. Might very well.

[6:13:20 PM]

I think we have a question --

>> The existing capital idea fund.

>> Sure. The existing capital idea fund totals about \$1.7 million, as you mentioned earlier. But there is a ongoing contract from fiscal year '16 for 1.1 million. In fy15 we added 350,000 from the dais and in the last year we added an additional 300,000 which brings us to a total of 1,000,700 plus.

>> Mayor Adler: The motion is to add \$700,000 for workforce development not tied to any group. \$330,000 goes to the general fund, other gets allocated.

>> Alter: 230,000 goes to the general fund.

>> Mayor Adler: How much? 230,000 goes to the general fund.

>> Kitchen: I'm sorry. When you say the other gets allocated, does that means the other -- I'm sorry. I'm a little slow.

>> Mayor Adler: We've been asked to -- so --

>> Kitchen: Do other departments have to come up with that money.

>> Mayor Adler: They do and we're told their budgets could absorb those.

>> Kitchen: Well, which departments' budgets would absorb those?

>> Alter: Austin energy, Austin water, and Austin resource recovery.

>> And the dollar amounts are listed on e20 so it's allocated out by the size of the departments revenues so more of it goes to Austin energy because they have a large revenue base, less to water, you know, and a relatively small portion is allocated to resource recovery, but, you know, it was -- I think it was 304,000 for Austin energy, 43,000 for Austin water and 21,000 for Austin resource recovery. It will have an impact on the ending balances of those three enterprise operations but it's nothing that would cause them to change their rate structure or anything.

>> Kitchen: We could pay for those things out of -- I thought -- well, I'll talk about that later.

[6:15:26 PM]

Because I thought rates could only be spent -- enterprise funds could only be spent on something that was within their department?

>> And we have historically funded economic development out of Austin energy and then, say, maybe five years ago we decided that we'd transition that so it wasn't a hundred percent funded out of nearing, it was a shared cost between water, resource recovery and general fund, with the idea that Austin -- or economic development is a value-added service to Austin energy, to water utility and to the enterprises, to Austin recovery as well.

>> Kitchen: I thought that our cost of service and rate structure was such that we couldn't spend -- that our rates had to be set and could only be spent on things that were directly related to what the cost was and this sound a little bit different than that. If that's the case, that's great because that helps me understand that there may be other -- other things that are legally possible to cover under rates.

>> Renteria: Mayor.

>> Houston: One of the things that I would like to know is how many of those individuals have been hired by the city in any of those entities because I think there has -- there should be a direct relationship between the money that you give economic development and then what that money is used for. So I'm probably not going to support it for all the reasons that I've said before, is that it's -- it's a legacy project that I'm not sure what the outcomes are. I know everybody says they're great, but I don't have any data to support that. So they --

>> Mayor Adler: Let's go ahead and take a vote. Mr. Renteria?

>> Renteria: All right. Gonna be general fund money coming out? Where would it come from?

>> Mayor Adler: It would be this budget right now, tomorrow we're going to try to get down to five and a half that at this point we're 2.9 over and if you move the [indiscernible] Out we're 1.7 over.

[6:17:43 PM]

>> Renteria: I'm not going to be able to support that.

>> Alter: We can have million if we figure out how to move the south by funding.

>> Mayor Adler: All right. Those in favor of this workforce development -- Mr. Casar, did you want to say something.

>> Casar: Yeah. I would -- I'm supportive of this work but just seeing how tall the order is I'm trying to be realistic and get some of our work done for tomorrow done today so I make an amendment to make the general fund allocation a hundred.

>> Mayor Adler: It's been moved.

>> Casar: Which I anticipate the funding increase would be around 300 but a hundred to the general fund just to save us a vote tomorrow likely.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. It's been moved. There's an amendment that's been offered. Seconded by Ms. Pool. Any discussion on the amendment? Those in favor of the amendment please raise your hand. Those opposed. Troxclair, Flannigan, and alter voting no. That amendment is in place. Workforce development \$300,000 total, hundred thousand dollars -- keying off \$100,000 to general fund. Those in favor please raise your hand. Those opposed. Mr. Flannigan, others voting aye. All right. You had some answers for us, Ed? Can you quickly go through those in case they're information people would want to have tonight?

>> I don't know how quickly I can go through them.

>> Kitchen: I'm going to have questions about them.

>> Several handouts, department directors ready to respond. I don't think it would be quick.

>> Mayor Adler: Can you tell us what the subjects are in case somebody -- what I don't want to -- since tomorrow we start, if there's information that would help someone tonight with their work, I'd like them to know at least it's available.

[6:19:48 PM]

>> We were asked to come back and we're still working on this one, we wouldn't have this one ready until tomorrow but the development services item about removing the 51 positions and the ancillary costs, just wanted to get back to you to how much that would actually lower the general fund budget by. That was one question. The second one had to do with \$5.2 million of their budget that's general funded. And exactly what are the elements that are in that, and is there potentially a million dollars of a reduction we could get from there. There was questions about the mayor and council's budget and difference in the change between council office budgets and the mayor's budget, questions about animal services department and those handheld radios and radios that go in the vehicles. I think acting assistant city manager Hensley has already emailed you something on that so unless there's questions about that we would have nothing more to do on that. Then there was a question about ctm and Austin police department's travel budgets. And those directors I believe are ready to respond to those questions as well. So we can -- instead of doing this verbally in person we can try and get this information out somehow in writing and that way you'd have to tonight and maybe wouldn't have to spend time talking about it tomorrow.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> We can do that for you.

>> Kitchen: I'd like to add one other. I had a conversation -- I mentioned earlier that my staff had a conversation with A.P.D. And so there's one piece of information they're track down for us, and so that is supposed to be available in the morning too.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mayor pro tem.

>> Tovo: Mayor, I just want to add -- just clarify that it was also the line of -- I think you were gonna get back to us too on the administrative support line within mayor and council budget, I think it included 50,000 for -- you thought it was terminal pay and this and that and if you could just add that --

>> I was right it was a \$30,000 increase in the food and ice budget to keep pace with the number of meetings and make sure we have enough money for all those meetings and true it up to our actual experience with \$50,000 relate to this terminal pay experience when do we do when a councilmember loses a staff person and have a terminal pay out --

[6:22:03 PM]

>> Tovo: I'm happy if you want to put it into a list of responses that would be great. I wanted to add that to the list. I did have an opportunity to talk to the chief about the A.P.D. Travel budget and I've resolved that that's all related to training for licenses and other things and so I'm not pursuing the travel issue further if you want take that off the list.

>> Okay.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay.

>> Mayor? I just wanted to mention that I have a few more things on my adjustments I'll bring up tomorrow that don't affect the general fund but I just wanted to -- if you want to look at that sheet again, there will be a few items on there, including the second half of councilmember pool's motion on trees, the minority chambers and some C.I.P. Stuff for pard that was on the other sheet.

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else? All right. I think we have this done tomorrow. 6:22. We stand adjourned.

[Adjourned]