

City Council Work Session Meeting Transcript – 5/22/2018

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 5/22/2018 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 5/22/2018

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

[9:09:21 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: All right, guys, we have a quorum. We're going to go ahead and start. Today is -- this is very loud. Today is may 22nd. This is the work session. We're in the boards and commissions room here at city hall. It is 9:08. And we're going to go ahead and start. I would recommend that we start with the briefings this morning, but not do codenext. And then do the pulled items. The mayor pro tem will be joining us a little bit late and we want to make sure that she's here for the codenext discussion. So let's go ahead and begin. We'll take these in the order that they're listed, if that's okay. So we'll start with the legislative update. We'll do the police oversight and then the workforce development master plan and then we'll go to the pulled items. Morning, ree. >> Good morning, bree, intergovernmental relations. I know you have a lot on your plate today so I'm going to go through this quickly, but of course feel free to interrupt me at any time with your questions. We're here today to provide you with both a state and federal legislative update and we have members of our lobby team should you have more specific questions. So where are we right now in the legislative calendar? As you guys know we have a runoff election today. Actually there's voting here in city hall today. We are halfway, six months to bill filing. So bill filing will begin, session begins in January, but that's when we'll start to see, as we know there's about 2500 bills that are regularly filed. About cities and we'll start our review process of that. So what is the legislature doing right now?

[9:11:22 AM]

They're doing their interim charges, as some of you are familiar with that work. And about 63 of those relate to city issues. These issues that we're looking at are pretty familiar to you all from last session. We haven't seen many new issues pop up yet. And let me say this. This is the language they're using to describe these issues. So regulatory barriers, the property tax system which you know is revenue caps. Land use, open meetings and so forth. I don't think there's an issue on there that you all are not familiar

with. We have had two hearings already where the city of Austin has testified. Both of those were in the senate business and commerce committee, which some of you know is chaired by Kelly Hancock. Charge -- and I put in bold the words that I would like you all to take note of. That charge that they were examining is related to free market and providing electricity in the free market and was about a competitive versus non-competitive electric markets. So basically keep in mind that when the legislature did deregulation about 20 years ago, it was only the municipally owned utilities and co-ops that were not deregulated. Austin energy, our general manager of Austin energy, testified on behalf of Austin energy along with the other municipally owned utilities to talk about how the utility is performing the current market structure. And just to remind you all, our state legislative language from the agenda you all adopted regarding this issue remains to oppose any legislation that would diminish the city's ability to govern the taxpayers' investment in our municipally owned utilities. And anything that would negatively impact the rate case that you all approved

[9:13:25 AM]

in 2016. The second hearing we had in business and commerce related to the implementation of senate bill 104. What that bill was about was the implementation of what's called the small cell network nodes. So what they asked for from Houston, Dallas, San Antonio and Austin was an update of how that deployment of the network nodes is progressing. Also just to -- I know you heard some about this in the news. As a reminder there's also the governor's property tax proposal when we're still monitoring which he we leased. This would be a 2.5% revenue cap. I know we've talked about during the special session that the senate passed a four percent cap in house, a six percent cap in the the senate. The governor has proposed a 2.5% cap. And in addition it would require voter approval with a super majority of both you all, the council, and the public so a two-thirds approval to raise the cap more than population and inflation. It would also require council to vote to require property appraisals. There's not a lot more information that we have on this other than what he's provided at this point, but that is the information we have to date. I will note that in his proposal, and we can provide it to you all, the governor did note that the state has relied too long on the local tax elections for public education spending and also that they should prohibit the legislature from funding -- passing unfunded mandates. Those weren't defined as to what -- we all know that all comes down to the details of what they would consider an

[9:15:26 AM]

unfunded mandate versus what we would consider an unfunded mandate, but those are two areas there that had what we would call some bright spots to look at. Also I didn't have a chance to put this in here, but I don't know,. >> Mayor Adler:, if you want to update -- married, if you want to update the council on the meeting you had with the mayors in Houston on these issues. >> Mayor Adler: Colleagues, I met last week with the mayors of the 15 largest cities in a meeting that was convened by mature turner in -- mayor turner in Houston. We heard from legislators, also some lobbyists and people

from business community concerning many issues, including the mandates. I think that the mayors, as they are with Texas menu league, tml, all joining together to fight for the proposition that in our homes we ought to be able to make our own decisions. And that seems to be a recurrent theme that all the cities are agreeing on. We talked about the revenue caps, which is a huge issue for everybody. Everybody recognizes the same harm with that. Houston is a little bit different because they already have a four and a half percent cap that has been voted by their voters so it's part of their charter. But Houston hasn't been able to live under that four and a half percent cap, so periodically they've had to get special dispensation from the voters in order to get extra money in order to be able to fund public safety. So it's not -- at four and a half% they're starving

[9:17:28 AM]

government and services and things that the community needs, but that does impact the debate a little bit and where people are when we're talking about caps because Houston is already capped. We did talk about some of the other areas that the legislature could preempt cities, and the topic of earned sick leave came up as something that's going to be discussed. In that group of 15 big city mayors there are both Republicans and Democrats. There's a pretty wide feel for people's individual political views. Everybody still stays joined together on the thought that local areas ought to be able to decide for themselves what their values are. But I did hear from some of the mayors that Austin was making things difficult for cities when we step out to press our -- make our decisions here locally. But there is some divergent views on whether that's good policy or not. And we know from the last legislature when we were dealing with different mayors and different views on that, that impacted sometimes the passion with which people were willing to fight for local determination. But it's a group that's going to meet again in November and then probably in February that group will meet in Austin as the legislature starts. >> Thank you, mayor. So just to wrap up, just what we're seeing on state side, just to wrap up what we're seeing for next session, again, I don't think any of these issues so far are unfamiliar to you all. And we interpret I much anticipate to have a very similar session this session to the one we had last session in terms of this type of legislation that we filed related to cities.

[9:19:30 AM]

So moving on to the federal update, just to give you an overview really quickly of some of the things that we accomplish with our lobby team for 2017, as you know one of the major things that happened for 2017 was the new tax cut bill. And as part of that there were definitely some exemptions that we had to fight to preserve. Luckily when the bill came out it preserved the tax exemption for menu bonds so as that would be related to the bond package passed by voters for the 720 million, the bond package being considered now, without that exemption those taxes would have to be added to the cost and therefore paid by the taxpayers. Originally -- now it's not in the bill so we maintain that exemption. Also, originally when the bill came out on the house side at least, they also removed the exemption for -- they removed the exemption for private activity bonds, so these are the bonds that you all have used for -- we have

used for the airport and also related to housing to fund those items. And I'll tell you that senator Cornyn actually stepped out to preserve that exemption for those bonds and we let our delegation know how we've used those bonds for both of those uses and how important they are for the community. Also in 2017 Austin was selected for the department of defense's innovation unit experimental office. This is also known as the diuc's office. We were the third city in the country to be selected after the silicon valley and Boston. And what this office does is try to more quickly align the technology sector with the department of defense. There was also increased funding for core programs that are important to this community, including cdbg, community development block grants and funding and we also it dealt with efforts at the federal level as

[9:21:31 AM]

we're dealing with at the state level of preemption, local authority on managing public right-of-way. So the same battles we're seeing at the state level on the use, management of the right-of-way, we're seeing at the federal level. There were some things in that tax bill we wished they hadn't put in there, the tax funding and municipal bonds that allows our treasury department to go out to the market when there's a lower interest rate and to refinance bonds. They've decided to no longer allow that as an exemption in the tax bill. And there's also as you all know and maybe many of us did our local taxes or federal filings, the state and local tax deduction at 10,000 and so forth. The other significant action at the federal level is related to the budget. The administration did come to a two-year budget agreement that increased discretionary spending by almost 300 billion. So this is all the spending that is non-military spending. This is significant because this is the first time this has been done in about seven years. Prior to this for the last seven years they've been operating on what's called a continuing resolution where they just reauthorized the prior year's budget. Also as I know that is important to many of you in this room there was the reauthorization of the community health centers and also the chip program was authorized for up through 2027. Looking forward, for those of you who will either go on the chamber trip or will have any trips to DC, these are some of the items that we're talking to our delegation about right now. And that's looking ahead at the 2019 funding. We did see an increase in the 2018 funding for cdbg and homophobe 1 point -- home for 1.5 million total. We are pushing for an increase in those sources for 2019. We are also pushing for full funding of the census, which as you know will be needed to have an accurate and true count of all the people in our community.

[9:23:32 AM]

Also, we've asked for funding of the urban area security initiative to 887 million. We have used this type of funding in prior years for the regional intelligence center over at the emergency operations center. The funding that this provided in the past was very significant when we had the bombings in our community and provided training and resources that were then used in that effort. Chief Manley was asked to go testify before the homeland security committee by chairman Mccaul and he spoke to this issue on behalf of the city. And right now abia is processing international travelers with customs and

border patrol officers on loan from Puerto Rico, and once they return home to Puerto Rico we know that that processing time will increase dramatically for international travelers. And as you all know we've seen a significant increase in international travel at our airport. And also on there as you may have heard, that Austin is on the short list for an army's future command headquarters. We believe this is for a non-military installation designation. It would be -- again, we think this is part of the army and department of defense's desire to connect with the technology business sector more quickly. Just to also talk about we know that at the beginning of the administration there was a lot of talk about having a big infrastructure bill. Just to be frank, that bill has stalled. And instead what they're working on is focusing on the allocations to infrastructure related to departments through the budget. So they're working on the increased funding for the federal aviation administration, water resources and so forth, but we are not seeing a significant infrastructure bill moving forward at this time. And don't anticipate it to be quite frank. What's going to happen next just to give you an idea of the calendar coming forward, I'll come back around -- these are all tentative

[9:25:33 AM]

dates, but around August 7th so we can start preparing for the adoption of the state legislative agenda, would like to bring that forward to you some time in September because as I said bill filing will begin in November so I want to have an agenda in place that we can use as we analyze all those bills. And November will bring forward a federal agenda updated for adoption again. At the end of this packet for you all for your review is an update on all the state and federal races. You guys can all use it as a guide tonight as I'm sure you all will be watching all the results coming in as I will. So are there any questions for me or the team? >> Houston: Thank you, and thank you for the report. Maybe I didn't hear you on slide 15, the American surface transportation, can you speak a little bit more about that? >> I'm actually going to ask Jeff booth who works on transportation from our federal lobby team to help me answer your question. I know enough to be dangerous, councilmember. But basically right now I'm going to be frank with you all, we're not seeing significant effort to fund highway -- to fund the highway programs. And we do need to see that act. It expires in 2020, it will need to be reauthorized in order to provide more funds, the highway trust fund, but I'll let Jeff give you more details. >> The current authorization bill expires September 30th of 2020, which is just before the November 20 elections, which is not a good time for the bill to expire. The gas tax no longer supports the program and hasn't done so since 2008. So we're at a point where now if we want to sustain current funding levels for the program, we must identify a sustainable funding source to allow the program to go forward. And right now there seems to be no political consensus

[9:27:35 AM]

around that, so to identify as a vehicle miles traveled fill, there is a carbon tax, an increased gas tax are all the of the options being considered. The issue about that, and we've had discussion about that yesterday when we met with departments is failure to act is a form of deevolution. It turns it back to

state and local governments and now it's up to the state and local governments to figure out how to fill the funding gap. And that's what happens defacto if congress fails to act for a permanent and sustainable funding source to let the program go forward. >> Houston: And do you know off the top of your head how much the state of Texas was getting? >> I don't off the top of my head, but I can certainly provide that information to you. It's certainly available. >> This would be helpful. >> We'll do. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool. >> Pool: I guess we have Mr. Stockman to thank for that devolution term, right? >> Yes. There's probably a good 75 to 100 house members that would support devolution today. >> Pool: On another topic and maybe somebody -- I don't know if you can answer this one, but the opportunity Zones program, it sounded to me when I read the description of it and I think I wrote to you about this, that it sounded pretty darn vague. And it also sounded like a lot would be expected of municipalities and anybody participating in it, but with very little lift from the federal government. Are the opportunity Zones any more specifically described or has that gone away completely? That program? Or that concept? >> So opportunity Zones were -- >> Pool: Good morning. You should probably tell us who you are. >> Ralph garbunchon with capital edge. On opportunity Zones were included in the tax law that became law right before the holidays last year. And it's one of those things that tax law moved very

[9:29:36 AM]

quickly from introduction to being signed by the president. >> I think it was greased lightning. >> So opportunity Zones were included in there and it was a very fast process. The governor -- I forget the exact timing, but I think the governor had 30 to 60 days to designate opportunity Zones. Criteria for opportunity Zones is the same as the tax credit and the governor could designate up to 25% of eligible census tracts in the state as an opportunity zone. So the governor designated several census tracts in the city of Austin. And treasury is moving forward with regulations, but if you read the law and you read the statute, I spoke with somebody in the general counsel's office, in the intern revenue office, and they are doing comments before the proposed rule and then do a final rule. But it was an interesting conversation in that they are kind of feeling their way as well. The statutory language in the law is essentially treasury irs rights and regulations to govern that program. So even by the broad standards of congress these days, when they're giving regulatory direction to an agency, that's pretty broad. So they are welcoming comments, but I will say the role of the city, once that opportunity zone is designated, it's designated for 10 years, and that means anybody who makes an eligible investment in that census tract is eligible for tax benefits. And so they could work with the city, but they could also choose not to do so. >> And that was a piece I wanted to key on. Because it looked like the ability of the city or any municipality to have any voice in that would be muted, which is of great concern. >> So the bill, unlike other economic development legislation you've seen that defines a clear role for the city, and actually names the city as being either the owner of the funds, the owner of the program, this legislation had none of

[9:31:36 AM]

that. And the IRS, our fear is, will only be speaking to how the capital gains should be addressed as a tax issue and will not be speaking to how those funds -- in fact, the legislation didn't even define that they should have a public purpose, which is what we look at every time in terms of how municipalities address public funds. What is the public purpose and use of those funds. So you're correct, councilmember, it did not set out a clear role for cities. So if someone who takes advantage of this program chooses to Ralph's point to work with us, it will be a choice they make, but not required by the legislation. >> Pool: And then they can change their decision to partner with us at any time? >> Yes. Short of an agreement that we insert into with them. >> Pool: Knowing the current administration's abhorrence of regulation and anything that would impede the free market, is this a way to open up a door that otherwise would have had regulatory guards on it so that private business can just flood in and operate the way they would like to unfettered? >> You will have to wait and see what IRS comes out with as a proposed rule. When I spoke with her she wasn't able to share much information with where they're going and I think that was because she didn't really have it. They're really feeling their way as well. But absent specific direction from Congress for regulation, I think they will tread lightly. And particularly in this administration I think that's the case. >> Pool: And by tread lightly, you mean have a light hand on regulations, which could create additional problems for municipalities. >> Yes. And ahead of the proposed rule certainly and once the proposed rule comes out, I think the city should file comments outlining its concerns and outlining how the city thinks the program should work. >> Pool: I agree. And I guess, bee, we would work with Mr. [Indiscernible].

[9:33:36 AM]

I would like to see what our comments library before we submit them if that would be possible, maybe share them with the entire council. >> Yes, we can do that. >> Pool: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Anything else? Ms. Houston? >> Houston: Do you have a list of the census tracts in Austin? I didn't get it or read? >> I didn't, but I can send it again. >> Houston: And do you know where those census tracts are located? >> 'Em. And we can provide it to you by your councilmember district. There were a number of tracts designated in Austin. Going back to that process, the governor had the discretion to take our opinion or not and he did state some -- not all of your districts, but a majority, I believe. I will send that out to you again. >> Houston: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Anything else? Already, we'll move on. >> Houston: Sorry, mayor, I had it written down and forgot to ask. If there's something we want to put on the state legislative agenda, when does that process start? >> As you know you can amend the state legislative or federal agenda at any time by resolution. I believe there's one on Thursday, but what -- going back to -- we can bring the powerpoint back up real quickly, the last slide -- one second. There we go. What I'd like to do is start on August 7th. It would be a work session to discuss that and then action taken on September 20th, but if we need to add more dates in there to provide you action to amend in addition to that September 20th, I'd be more than happy to do that, councilmember Houston. >> Houston: Thank you. And mayor, I'm asking because you know as we found out lately that the green line has some impediments to it that the parts of the Travis county delegation we're trying to solve last

[9:35:38 AM]

session so that's something that we could also support, I would like to add that to the legislative agenda. >> Mayor Adler: I would join you on that. Thank you very much. Let's go to the next briefing. Police oversight. >> Mayor and councilmembers, as staff comes up I want to provide a little bit of context. As you are aware I sent a memo out last week providing the overview of where we are in the broader context of negotiations with Apa. Today's presentation is really focused on a resolution that was passed back in March on oversight efforts and research that is being conducted by the office of police monitor. So with that I'm going to turn it over to Farrah, our interim police monitor on the work she has done since that resolution has passed. >> Good morning, councilmembers. My name is Farrah muskinen. I am the interim police monitor. I want to go over the presentation outline. Today we're going to discuss the resolution as the city manager just mentioned. An overview of some of my preliminary research which would include the oversight models, some preliminary observations and next steps in the timeline. If you recall on March 22nd council approved -- passed a resolution directing the city manager to look into evidence-based best practices and oversight and that resolution included consultation with various stakeholders, including the police department, interested community organizations and commissions. Shortly after the resolution passed, I reached out to Nacol, it is the national association of civil oversight for law enforcement. They are experts in this field and provided a lot of guidance to me in this research. And through their

[9:37:40 AM]

publications, Nacol talks about considered jurisdictions on best fit and best practices when structuring their oversight. You may recall on the 21st century policing recommendations is a task force created by president Obama in 2015. And pillar two discussed policy and oversight. And specifically they discussed that every community should define the appropriate form and structure of civilian oversight to meet the needs of that community. Furthermore, Brian Buckner, the former president of nacole, he testified before the policing task force and he said citizen review is not an advocate for the community or for the police. This impartiality allows oversight to bring stakeholders together to work collaboratively and proactively to make policing more effective to the community. Civilian oversight alone is not sufficient to gain legitimacy, without it however it is difficult if not impossible for police to maintain the public's trust. Nacole surveyed 97 civilian oversights across the country and they were able to find five common goals of civilian oversight programs. Those include improving public trust, ensuring accessible complaint processes, promoting thorough, fair investigations, increasing transparency and deterring police misconduct. Nacole also defines three types of models. Those include the investigative model. The investigative motel model is where a civilian investigates police misconduct. The review focus model is where civilians review the thoroughness of the police internal affairs investigation. Third we have the auditor model and they are audited in its literal sense or monitor in its literal sense investigations by internal affairs and they review

[9:39:41 AM]

broad findings of review and discipline. I also added an additional model which is the hybrid model, which is a combination of the three above. When I reached out to various cities across the country I wanted to look at certain factors in those cities. And those include the type of oversight model they fell into, the length and time that the agency existed, the city's population, the size of the police department, the city's resident median income and how the oversight agency was created, for example, the legal authority of such. And in my research I spoke to 28 oversight agency directors and they fall in these respective areas. 14 investigatees that oversee investigative agencies. 14 were review focused, five auditor monitorer and two hybrid. I expo to the nacole research fellow, two consultants to Bart, the bay area ban pid transit system. I spoke to the chair of the Dallas police oversight board and the board liaisons to the Houston and San Antonio respective oversight boards. And lastly, the NCPD inspector general, the former president of nacole and the former director in Washington, D.C. And this is a visual of the cities by models that I talked to across the country. This is approximately maybe 20% of the models across the country. They're probably just about over 150. Next I want to go to and discuss preliminary observations. Obviously as you know, state laws vary and most of the jurisdictions in the agencies that I spoke to don't have a statute like 143, which has some legal restrictions that we face that other jurisdictions do not. Most, if not all of the agencies that I spoke to

[9:41:42 AM]

were created by charter, ordinance or state statute. Previous some examples, Seattle and Albuquerque, they will negotiate components of their oversight in their collective bargaining disagreement, the discipline in the length of term of the investigations. Denver specifically delineates what can and cannot be part of a collective bargaining agreement and in their ordinance they specifically prohibit oversight from being part of the collective bargaining agreement. And then of course here in Texas charter and ordinance cannot supersede state law. The funding for the oversight agencies varied, but many ever them were funded by a percentage as a percentage of the police department, their respective police departments and that ranged from a half a percent to a percent. Next -- the next observation is regarding the 180 day rule. I think most of you are aware that with chapter local code 143, investigations and discipline have to be proposed within the 180 day. Of the 28 that I spoke to none of them had this type of time frame in which they had to impose discipline. The civilian overboards were really across the board. They consisted of anywhere between nine to 23 members. Some were appointed by the mayor and approved by council. And the time commitment was pretty surprising when I spoke to some directors. They talked about on average it's 30 to 40 hours a month. And -- which is significant, particularly on a volunteer basis. And so part of them started a rotation, rotation of working in panels of three to five so they could rotate the workload of the volunteer panels. Discipline, most jurisdictions provide recommendations as to discipline, but it was pretty consistent that the final determination was with the chief of police. Staffing ranged from two to

[9:43:43 AM]

15, however, I just want to add a little outlier. The city of Chicago's oversight has over 145 employees, so that's an extreme situation. Most of them fall between two and 15 staff people. The complaints ranged from 30 to 1500 and it really depended on the model with the complaints and whether or not they reviewed internal and external complaints. Next steps. We will continue our research and analysis. At this point we will probably engage our community stakeholders and organizations. To discuss the research to more detail. And that will hopefully lead to determining what cities we want to do a deeper dive and look more closely into. And also finalizing the team that may do site visits or participate in video conferencing when we get to that stage. Next we're going to develop a community outreach plan because obviously the community's input on this is going to be pretty significant. And that will be done simultaneously with legal review because it's going to be important to determine what can be done independent of the meet and confer agreement. This is just a visual to show in my next presentation a breakdown of the cities and some factors that I looked at in asking specific questions. For example, if they had a civilian board, if they have subpoena power, how are their discipline recommendations handled, so just that you will have a preview of a visual that we'll bring to you in June. Our draft timeline. We plan to come back in June with preliminary oversight report and the recommendations for the site visits and the site visit team. Then in July we'll either conduct those site visits or do the video conference. In August and September, again, simultaneously, will be the community outreach and the legal review with our commissions and stakeholders. And then we hope to come

[9:45:43 AM]

back in October with a final report and recommendations for the council to consider. I just want to leave you with this final quote in my research it was pretty consistent that through the directors that I spoke to that oversight is very specific to the community. And so I leave you with this. Given the differences between cities and counties in the U.S., it is likely that no single model oversight will work for all jurisdictions. As a result, the best form of oversight for individual jurisdictions simply depends on the circumstances faced by the jurisdiction that is either creating or updating its oversight processes. With that I'd be happy to answer any questions. >> Mayor Adler: I want to thank you for this work and I think you've set it up really well. And I think what we can learn from other jurisdictions would be great and I like the focus on finding something that may be unique to Austin, but works for us. Obviously with the conversations that we had in September before we're able to move in to a long-term contract with the police association this work has to be completed so that anything that needs to be incorporated into the contract is able to be incorporated into contract. The line that you had at the bottom of page 13 where you talk about deciding the process and then entering -- bargaining over that in negotiations. My hope is as you pull this group together and you have the stakeholder groups that lots of different groups in the city participate, most especially the police association, because we really need them at the table as we go through this process. My hope is at the end of the day that we're able to reach some form of consensus where

[9:47:44 AM]

the community, including the association, has identified what it is that is the best practice for our city, the practice that keeps us safe and is best at maintaining trust and the other benefits that you talked about. So that we're not actually negotiating in a bargaining session for what is the best practice for our city. I hope we have a consensus and that just gets incorporated into whatever is necessary to be in the contract in order to be able to effect that so that we're not bargaining for the best policy or paying for the best policy, but rather together we've been able to reach that consensus. And I hope the association and the whole community participates so that we can get to that place. Mr. Casar and then councilmember pool. >> Casar: I also want to compliment all of the community groups and your office and labor relations on this work so far because I think also speaking from the experience in December that we really would benefit on something that is as high profile as this issue locally and nationally from very well researched models across the country so everybody knows -- so the council and the community can come to a consensus around which model we want so that we can -- because I think it's important for us to know what it is that isn't working and what is working best across the country. And I know our staff from all different departments work researching best practices across the country, but just from the looks of this presentation and how you have broken it out, it really does look like y'all have put in some very serious thought and that's what's required for us to get this worked out right. So this is really promising to me regardless of where people stand on the different issues and which model we land on, getting this level of different

[9:49:46 AM]

replows and understanding how it works across the country, it seems like you are going above and beyond on that. I want to give you that compliment. And I want to second what the mayor has said, which is that my hope is that we can break away from the model in labor negotiations where we're bargaining over -- where we're bargaining over what we see as just the best things for the city and instead that we really make sure our bargaining is targeted towards making -- on those -- making sure that we are keeping up with labor marketed, we are leading the market on this case with wages and benefits to attract the best that. We try to bargain in those areas because when we start conflating too much how it is that we pay and treat our employees with what the appropriate oversight models are, that will earn broad community trust. I think we set ourselves up again for really challenging public hearings over pay and benefits versus community oversight and I would really like for us to all try our best to agree on which models we want for oversight and be able to bargain in good faith over the best labor practices. And I think that this sets us up to do that so I can be on the winning or losing end of different votes on community oversight, but then we can hopefully have a labor contract that is good for our officers and good for the city while making sure we have a good community oversight process the best that we can in or outside of a contract. But I think that if we're going to get to that difficult goal it seems like this level of research is necessary so I appreciate us taking the time to do that between now

and October. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool. >> Pool: Yeah, thanks for your continuing efforts. I know this is probably the most complicated, complex and multilayered piece that you're working on. Will you be bringing us information when you come back after having done a survey of other practices in other cities and show us where the city of Austin -- what the city has done in the past, including its

[9:51:47 AM]

evolution to get to where we were last year and then show any similarities or differences or how much miss aligned we may or may not be with the standards that you're going to bring to us that show areas where we think we need improvement? >> Yes. I've started that process of my synthesis of all the information that I've gotten from the 28 cities. So I have done that. It's basically a comparative analysis with Austin, right? And so it is a little tricky, for example. Let me just give you an example. San Diego has a review focused board. They get in cases from internal affairs and they review them and they make their recommendations from the chief. So we would probably check the box for civilian board for San Diego. However, in Oakland they have a police commission which is civilian appointed by the mayor, approved by council, but they also review cases of misconduct when there's a disagreement between the agency director, oversight agency director and the chief of police. And it's a panel of three. So I could check the box technically for Oakland for having a civilian board, but you see they operate completely different. So I will do a comparative analysis, but I'm going to have to explain it a little bit in detail because it is layered and it may give -- I don't want to give misinformation because it's not all -- when you say civilian boards they're not all created equal. >> Pool: That's great and a comparative analysis is I think what we need. Thank you for that and I realize that will take some time. We may find that the practices and standards that we have been -- that we have achieved and been working on here in Austin for many years are actually really good and I think we've talked about how there isn't any other system like ours in the country, which is obviously why it was hard to find similar -- >> In the state. We're the only civilian police monitor's office in the state of Texas, but

[9:53:49 AM]

San Antonio, Houston, Dallas have boards that review cases of misconduct. Our most similar, I call them our fraternal twins in terms of oversight, is Denver. They're very similar to our model. But I do want to say that the state law plays a significant role in this. So for example, we are allowed to post our discipline and we post it on our website. None of their -- there are several oversight agencies in California. They're not allowed to do that based on the peace officer bill of rights. So state law plays a significant role in terms of what the oversight agency, their purview. >> Pool: So I guess where I was going with all that is that we may have some really good elements already that we have achieved here in Austin. And so I want to make sure that the ones that work here, that we know, and that have had good outcomes that we don't inadvertently lose them because maybe there's something else out there that sounds better, but we know that something has worked here. So that will be part of the analysis that I hope you all will bring to us. >> Absolutely. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Garza. >> Garza: I'm sorry, I

didn't hear what you were saying. I was talking to staff. I don't know if you talked about timeline of the contract or how this intersects with that. I want to remind everyone that oversight plays a very important part of police accountability. So does how we hire our police officers, and without a contract we are hiring our police officers based on a 100 question test and that is not the best way to hire our police officers. So whatever the next steps are, I hope we can get to some kind of -- as you continue to do your work, I hope we get to some kind of interim process that allows us to have more flexibility in hiring because a 100 question test isn't the best way to determine who our police officers are. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. In that regard --

[9:55:49 AM]

councilmember alter? I was going to say in that regard because there's kind of overlay between what we're doing here and the police contract issue generally, managers sent us something out that indicates that conversations are ongoing, but you don't anticipate being able to actually get into a long-term contract, which makes sense to me because we have to resolve these kinds of issues. The council took action. Lapse lapse. [Lapse in audio]. ... Indefinitely. And five of the stipends for just a period of time running through the end of may. I signed an ordinance that was presented by staff to effect that, but it conflated those two groups accidentally, so I've just recently signed an amended, corrected ordinance to make it clear that two of the stipends continue indefinitely and only five of them stop at the end of may. As you continue in those negotiations. If there were colleagues who wanted to visit extending those five stipends further, operationally, because of the operational benefit I think that the chief had indicated, I would join with colleagues to do that by ifc, but it would require an ifc for supplemental direction to do something like that. Councilmember alter. >> Alter: I wanted to go >> I wanted to go back to the other conversation if I might. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Pool: And I have a question on what you just talked about. >> Mayor Adler: Go ahead. >> Alter: So I wanted to go back to the oversight briefing and thank you to your office for all your work and I know you've spent a lot of time and had a lot

[9:57:49 AM]

of really important conversations. I want to agree with councilmember Casar in the general direction of thinking about how we decouple what's appropriate pay for our police officer from the question of what is the oversight that we need. And I really appreciated your framing of this as we need to do what's unique to Austin and what's right for our community. And I want to just remind us that we had a very long hearing and we heard a lot of discontent in the community with the current process so my hope is that we will move to evolve that process within the constraints that we face being in Texas, but that we will evolve and be creative to come up with a solution that fits our community, and I appreciate that direction. I was curious in this process when the community will be able to provide input. We have a lot of people in our community who have been working really hard on these issues and have a lot of different ideas and have also been doing research, and I was wondering how that fits into the time frame and your process, that community input. >> So I -- after the resolution was passed I contacted

every entity that was listed to say this is a resolution coming, I'm going to do some research and get back to you. But I really wanted to do some preliminary research first just so we had a footing and a basic understanding of oversight and what's out there, but the next step is community engagement for sure, particularly with the organizations that were named specifically in the resolution, and then also the oversight community coalition and other stakeholders. So I wanted to do this presentation first and do the preliminary -- have kind of the baseline preliminary information and then reach out. I plan to reach out to

[9:59:50 AM]

various stakeholders and have meetings between now and then our next presentation. And then that is going to take another forum over the summer when we do, you know, community, more outreach and forums to get input on some recommendations before we come back to council. >> Alter: See, that's great. I hope that will be an extensive amount of community engagement with those folks who have been really focused on this issue. Can you tell me a little bit more about the visits that you have planned and how those will be structured and why those are necessary and who is going to be going on those and what you're hoping to accomplish with those visits? >> So it's still being decided who, when, how, you know, all the details that you asked -- that you're asking. So with this preliminary research I think that I have a better understanding of the oversight models across the country. And this is where the community engagement, the stakeholder engagement is going to be important because their input is going to be needed in terms of how we narrow it down. I spoke to 28 cities but I don't expect us to visit 28 cities. >> Alter: Right. >> I think their input will help to wield it down to something more manageable, five or six, just throwing that out there, and then a conversation of the pros and cons of actually site visits as opposed to maybe doing video conferencing with various directors and their staff. And really the point is to have the stakeholders get the information directly from the directors of the various oversight agencies, have the ability to answer questions, talk about the strengths and weaknesses of their models. Because all of them can speak very, very in-depth about kind of their organizational view, how they work, challenges they're facing in the respective models and I think it's important that various stakeholders hear that from another messenger, aside from me. I can speak to those but I think it's also good to hear

[10:01:51 AM]

it from the source. That work I've started doing but will finalize this work and then will come back with you in June with these are the specific cities, this is a site visit team, and the plan is to really actually do that in July. >> Alter: I have some reflections on that I don't need to go into now during work session but would love to have a further conversation with you on that. The other question, I'm not sure if this is for you or legal or the city manager, I have some questions with respect to 143 and what has to be within the contract and what doesn't. That seemed to be legal of nature. I don't need to ask them today in executive session but I would like an opportunity to have an executive session where we can focus on

some of the legal issues with respect to 143 and what needs to be in the contract and wharves to be out of the contract. So if we could make that happen maybe at a next council meeting or work session time period. >> Okay. >> Councilmember, labor relations office. Councilmember alter, when you ask that question are you referring broadly to all 143 or just as it relates to oversight? >> Alter: Definitely with respect to oversight and I may have other questions and would be happy to work with you before the session to make sure you have a sense of the kinds of concerns so you have an opportunity to be prepared for that certainly. I just don't have all of the questions. >> Right, that's fine. >> Alter: Today, in front of me. >> Mayor Adler: On a timing beakers you're saying you want it to happen quickly and the reason you want to have that happen quickly -- help me understand why you want to have that? Just because there's lots of other stuff? >> Alter: Well, there's an underlying assumption we're moving forward with a model that has to be negotiated in a contract and I have questions about whether the

[10:03:52 AM]

oversight model belongs in the contract or not and I need to have those legal questions explored and I think that the council, since this is key to those conversations, ought to have that conversation before we get too far in setting up a process. I don't have the answers to my question, so I don't -- >> Mayor Adler: I understand. Thank you. Anything else on this? Yes, councilmember pool. >> Pool: When you were talking about the five stipends that would expire may 24 -- I have a question for either legal or our city manager. My question is I would -- does council have to bring that extension of those five stipends or can that come from staff since y'all are the ones who are negotiating it and we are not? And if it is council, help me understand why. Because I was thinking that would would be an action that staff could bring to us. >> Mayor, councilmember, certainly the original resolution came from council and so if they were to be extended the expectation would be that would come from council as well. >> Pool: Okay. So you're saying because it was originally begun with council, although there were elements of the contract negotiating that did come from staff -- I just -- all right. ING my point is that we are not the ones who are at the negotiating table so we have not had anything really to do with the fact that the may 24 deadline is in front of us. Possibly we should not have made it such a short dine knowing, you know, how protracted these negotiations should be and I think we should probably internalize that if we do extend it. But I can't help feeling partially that this would also be appropriate for staff to bring to council.

[10:05:55 AM]

As you are saying, we have not yet completed this. We understand that council wanted to continue these stipends. We thought at the time that may 24 would be a sufficient a time. It's clear it is not. To say that we would like you to consider giving us additional time and allowing the stipends to continue. >> Mayor Adler: So we've been noticed here on the police oversight issue so not really an opportunity for us to discuss the merits of the stipend issue. I understand the question that you requested. >> Pool: So I would just put that question in. >> Mayor Adler: And give him the chance to be able to answer that question. Anyone else on oversight? Mr. Flannigan, go ahead. >> Flannigan: I'll remind my colleagues

that decision about extending those police stipends was the good-faith effort to sign an interim agreement and the association came to the table and said, no, they don't want an interim agreement. That's it. So there was no -- I agree with the manager. It's not appropriate for staff to bring this item up because it was council making the policy decision and in that context. I think it's important to reiterate that those were not extended because we thought they were good. We extended them in order to get an interim and the association said they didn't want an interim. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Yes, Mr. Renteria. >> Renteria: You know, I want to support the extension. You know, because of what happened, you know, here last month, couple months ago when the bomber came and it distracted everybody and, you know, we needed to catch this person, which we did, but it also stopped the negotiation and I don't think it would be fair if we didn't extend the stipends. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's hold off further discussion about the stipend issue until it gets Teed up for us and put on the agenda. Anything else on police oversight? Thank you very much. All right, let's have the workforce development

[10:07:55 AM]

upgrade. Update. >> Good morning, mayor, council, economic development. I'm joined this morning with CEO of workforce solutions capital area. Also in the audience is Stephanie Hayden joining from Austin public health. We're going to tackle this conversation with you today. We were asked by council during the audit process to return in May to provide an update on workforce development as it exists across the organization, so today I'm going to give you some context as to how it is that conversation was developed back in 2013 and '14. And how it is we've been able to move forward through the audit that was posted back this past year in November of 2017. And looking forward to the city's roadmap for workforce development moving toward, Tim will provide you an overview of the workforce solutions master plan so you can see how it will be in support of our efforts as a city. Back in 2013, during the budget process, council heard from the community that there was a need to be able to remove some of the contracts from Austin public health and bring those services into economic investment for specific needs. So we went through the process of engage some of those stakeholders because the contracts were currently at term and we needed to renew or solicit for renewals of those services. We brought in different groups like capital idea, Easter seals, skill point alliance, goodwill and workforce solutions as well as life works to help us

[10:09:55 AM]

delineate how it is workforce development was different from economic development and Austin public health. You can see here the lifetime continuum that we used as kind of a model to be able to work with our providers within the community to better define those different services. So we took a complete inventory of all of the different programs that exist within the community and a presentation was delivered by Austin public health and economic development in February of 2014. In that presentation we delineated how it is workforce was -- workforce development was different across our different departments, and you can see here some of the determining factors in how it is we were looking to

work with service providers to deliver these benefits to the community. We were very focused on the same population. Our audience was that of those who had economic barriers, both economic and socioeconomic disadvantages within the market. But you can see economic development was focused on how it is we could provide skill sets to individuals to bring them into employment while health and human services was providing more of the basic skills needed to connect with the workforce. So a you little different in terms of skill sets verses things like learning English as a second language. We also focused on different educational levels, and we had different areas for focus for job placement. We were working very closely with our minority chambers to better understand the connection to industry and how they could be a conduit for connecting those industry needs to different users. Our outcomes were different as well. You can see at the outputs were a different focus than what we've been hearing around workforce development around the organization recently. Bringing us to present date we had our audit that took place November 2017 but we were cited for three areas we needed to focus on for organizational delivery of

[10:11:56 AM]

services. The auditor said we had similar programs in a number of departments across the organization that weren't working in concert with one another. They also vied that our goals and our measurements were different from department to department, and they thought we needed to better streamline some of that information to be able to validate our programs as well as our ability to meet our own goals and that of the goals of industry. So in looking at the auditor's report, economic development stepped back and we took the lead of this process for forming an interdepartmental team. Since that time we've brought in more of those service providers, fallen outside of the scope since the time economic development and Austin public health initially came together to -- and the rest of the organization can look at this strategic investment strategy around workforce services. This of course will be aligned with image Austin findings as well as your strategic direction provided 2023. We conducted a series of interviews with our service providers. We've been working with them to better understand how it is they can deliver data as requested by the auditor's office. And what were some of their concerns with being able to provide that data to the city? I think what you'll learn later from Tamara is something that can cyst us in how it is -- assist us in how we remedy some of those concerns. We explored pay for performance as a model as well which we'll be coming back to you with whenever we have the full workforce roadmap prepared on behalf of the city and we're looking to make stronger connections with external entities but to make sure that our plan connects with some of the past goals articulated by the community. Some of the lessons that

[10:13:56 AM]

we've learned. We need to make sure that the goals and roles are streamlined across the organization. As we've invited more departments into this workforce department conversation. We also need to make sure you're terms are aligned as well. Some of the vocabulary have gotten a little lost in translation

especially since we were able to work through those definitions with community service providers and as we stretched the conversation to engage new areas. But also we need to look at data versus participation. We've always reached the point where we could look at how it is the return on our investment for these different services is actually providing what it is we seek. However we've always looked at how it is we can increase participation rather than spending the dollars needed to be able to collect that data through a third party. It can be costly. And of course the city would not want to own some of the different types of data sets that would be needed to review these types of contracts which we can find more of that type of help within our work with the strategic master plan by workforce solutions. So in delineating the two, the workforce roadmap for the city of Austin, we can see how we are continuing to focus on our strategic plan alignment of deliverables from our service providers into the community and how we you continue to focus on our audience barracks which are those who are economically disadvantaged but also helping to meet the needs of industry and businesses here within the market. We're looking at framing up our categorizing some of the different outcomes in the future, but we are also working with other groups outside of the city such as Travis county and others to make sure there is alignment as well. Again, as I stated earlier we're looking at this as more of an investment strategy to be able to offer to council for weighing more of these services in the future. The workforce solutions master plan which Tamara is going to take you through

[10:15:58 AM]

shortly looks at how it is we are working within industry's needs today in addressing some of those short-term outcomes. Of course what we've heard you articulate through the strategy of 2023 is a much wider definition of workforce developmental services so what you're going to see the team come to the table with in bringing forward this roadmap are delivery of service that's extend from childhood services all the way through that lifetime continuum. You will definitely find through this presentation that the work workforce solutions is doing, especially in focusing on the strategic plan, is in support of what it is the city will do with our workforce roadmap. Now Tamara will provide you more insight on workforce solutions capital area as well as the strategic plan. >> Thank you. Thank you so much, David, councilmembers, Mr. Mayor. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today. I thought it would be useful to start briefly with the context of what a workforce development board is how we function in this community and how it relates to the plan I'm going to talk about. On the slide that you see, you see the state of Texas, there are 28 workforce boards. Workforce solutions capital area is number 14 on that map. We serve Austin, Travis county. We have a sister workforce board that serves the nine counties around austin/travis county so we are one of 28. I work with my peers in the state and most importantly to you all work regionally with our sister board, the rural capital board. A workforce development board is a regional governmental entity responsible for oversight of a workforce system. Now, a workforce system is a system overseen by the board that is operated by private contractors and training providers to serve employers, job seekers, and special populations. Our unique value proposition as a workforce board is that we are not in competition with any of the service providers, the

[10:17:59 AM]

community-based organizations, Austin community college, any of the other educators. We are -- think of us as an oversight body that has the unique mission to provide comprehensive planning, oversight and evaluation of what's working in our talent pipeline system and whether we've got gaps and what we need to do to improve that. The workforce development board is a hybrid entity, part federal part state. The federal law creates our structure but the state law governs the board and its operations. Therefore, there are both federal and state resources that workforce solutions administers on our community's behalf. Our entity workforce solutions allows those federal and state resources to flow into our community specifically to meet the needs that we have for early childhood education, youth development, and for labor market exchange for serving the adult population. At its core -- I'm sorry. In addition to the core functions that we're mandated to serve through those contracts our workforce development board has gone above and beyond what those contracts require in four ways. One, our board is one of the only workforce boards in the country leading a community plan to close a skills gap to see that local individuals can vie for local jobs. In addition to that we have taken on the additional responsibility of serving as a backbone entity for education and employment system change on behalf of opportunity youth. So we really have cared about for a long time and put resources toward developing specific opportunities for 16-24-year-olds who are not sufficiently engaged in education or employment. The workforce board also contractually manages city and county workforce development dollars. We serve as a broker for contracts to see that the work is done and evaluate and provide oversight for that work.

[10:20:00 AM]

And we manage private philanthropic funds in support of the master community workforce plan. Chief elected officials in our community create the board and provide some limited oversight. In Austin/Travis county our chief elected officials collide the county judge and the mayor, the CEOs with a written interlocal agreement and CEOs are required to -- that's a little context. Now I'd like to talk about that above and beyond and what we're so proud to present to you today. I heard in a previous presentation you talked about the need for community input. I'm proud to say that we spent -- workforce solutions and the community spent over a year creating this workforce plan. We intentionally worked with community organizations, educators, businesses, business groups and job seekers themselves to understand what is getting in the way of local people competing for local jobs. The master community workforce plan is Austin's hire local campaign aiming to meet our growing economy's needs for skilled talent by ensuring that local workers can qualify for these jobs. Another way to think about it is this is our answer to Austin's affordability challenges. While workforce solutions is the backbone for the plan and I appreciate David mentions it's workforce solutions' plan, we really see this as the community's plan. In order for it to be successful, us to be successful in seeing that local people can vie for local jobs it's going to take as you of us working together. Through this master plan we're specifically focused on individuals who are living at or below poverty and providing support, most likely and usually in the form of training support to assist these economically disadvantaged individuals in securing middle skill or think of them as middle class jobs. The plan is organized into four strategies, each with measurable outcome goals that will tell us if we're making the level of progress that we've outlined.

[10:22:01 AM]

The goal itself is by the year 2021 we will move at least 10,000 people living at our below poster into those middle -- poverty into middle skill jobs and to do that we know we have to raise awareness about what industries and occupations are driving our economy and how someone can access the many, many of the -- any of the number of job training programs that are available to them. We're going to measure ourselves on how many actually enroll in job training. That's strategy one. Strategy two is around training completion that leads to an industry-valued credential. So we know when we look at the data that too few people that start a job training program actually finish. And so we want to increase the number of people that complete with a credential that's valued. Our third strategy is around employment. Those first two are a means to an end and the end is we want to see people get jobs that pay a living wage and our fourth strategy is recognizing that many people can get an entry-level job but struggle to advance on the job, struggle to move beyond that entry-level job into a family-supporting wage so we will specifically through strategy four work on upskill, working with business, and the entry-level workers to provide any variety of supports to see people can advance in their workplaces to increase their earning exponential also show value for their employers. The key to this work in part is business and business basement. So part of what workforce solutions in coordination with the community has done is we are building out and have built out already some industry-sector hubs that are engaging businesses so that we can hear first and foremost from them what is it that they need, what are their pain points that are keeping them from being able to find the workers they need and be able to grow their workers internally. Too often as a community historically those of us -- those who have worked in the service industry have gone to business and tried to sell them a product or

[10:24:02 AM]

project that they have rather than listening to business first. We're changing that approach. It's revolutionarily but not revolutionarily. We're listening to business first and we're following their lead. An example of that to drill down quickly is within our health care hub we brought together more than 18 health care employers, including three representatives from the city of Austin's H.R. Department to talk about what their common pain points were. This was by business/for business. We had representatives from the three largest hospital systems. Long-term care was represented as well. What they told us collectively they want to work together to address current skill shortages, they want to build an awareness campaign about the value of the jobs in health care, and they want to grow the capacity of education and training pipelines to meet their growing needs within the health care sector. So in the master plan we talk about middle-skill jobs. I wanted to quickly define what we consider to be a middle-skill job. A middle-skill job requires more than a high school level of education but less than a 4-year university degree. This isn't a hard and fast rule but generally is a rule, definition, to show where we believe people did move beyond that entry-level job. When we did our market analysis we saw Austin is creating an abundance of jobs in this middle skill space. More than 60,000 jobs in this space will be

created in these five years under the plan. Further we've identified three industry sectors, information technology, health care, and advanced manufacturing skill trade that we are showing are creating the best jobs, both in terms of quantity and the quality in terms of pay and sustainability. We're focusing on those. It's very important to us that it's not just me or David talking about great success we're going to have. We have to have data to back up what we're saying.

[10:26:03 AM]

So as part of this work we have contracted with the university of Texas ray marshal center to be our independent data evaluator through this work of the master plan for the first time ever with the help of the center we will be collecting up through data sharing agreements information on the outcomes of training providers, community-based organizations, Austin community college, what is all of the students that are taking, enrolling in workforce solutions training programs and then what is happening to them, what kind of outcomes they're getting, so that we as a community of policy makers and funders can know how are we doing overall as a community in building a tighter talent pipeline. I wanted to note quickly on that too with the data aggregation and evaluation, this will allow us to disaggregate the data to take an equity perspective to see who are receiving the best benefits as a result of our skills pipeline and where do we have opportunities and frankly a need to close the gap in seeing that all people that live and prosper in Austin have that opportunity to get ahead. So what are our long-term impacts? Workforce solutions broadly with the help of the community sees five long-term impacts that we're shooting for with this plan. One first and foremost we want to meet business needs for reduce cycle time to hire. Over and over again we heard business say they need workers and they need workers today or they need them yesterday. We also hear from our economically disadvantaged individuals in the community they're having trouble paying rent today, they need help today. So we need to close the cycle time and how long it takes for people to connect to those jobs. We need to build efficiencies into our public policy and funding alignment. We need to make it easier to help those organizations that are providing those services to the workers/employers, make sure they've got what they need to do their jobs well.

[10:28:03 AM]

We need to articulate the value proposition. Over and over again in our focus groups we heard for some of the most vulnerable individuals the one key that helped them be successful in getting that job and being able to support their family was someone that cared enough to stick with them through the process. That's the value of supportive workforce development. Going to measurably reduce poverty and break cycles of poverty. We believe that work and having a job is one of the fundamental ways you do that. Finally we want to apply and will apply a data lens to focus our equity perspective. So data will underscore and be the foundation of all of the work that we do within this master plan. Finally for me, where are we now in the master plan? The master plan is at its core a public-private partnership. We have to date been able to secure adoptions and endorsements from a variety of organizations and

municipalities. In December workforce solutions our board of directors unanimously endorsed the master workforce solutions plan as our plan. I want to sunder score this is different. Most in the state or country see their federal funding stream as their reason to do the work that they do. Austin and our board of directors we had we need to have a higher calling and they adopted the master plan as our strategic plan. In other words our federal and state resources should align with and support our desire to close the skills gap in our community. In January Travis county commissioners court I'm sorrily endorsed the master plan. February Austin community college and the greater Austin chamber of commerce and finally in March goodwill industries of central Texas also provided their endorsement for the plan. Again, our intent is to show this is a new way of doing business, it's a common agenda for how we collectively want to close the skills gap. To date we have -- we are really proud we have created

[10:30:04 AM]

a public-private partnership insofar as we've raised over \$663,000 in philanthropic and public contributions to support particularly the data collection and backbone support for this master plan. The plan thus far has been supported primarily through public and private partnerships. Support by the city council for this master community workforce plan is not binding for funding from the city. However, other communities that have successfully launched similar plans have only ultimately done so through a public-private supported partnership. Thank you. >> In closing out our part of the conversation I wanted to provide more context in terms of moving forward, what this time line looks like. Today we are looking at -- all of this information in concert so you can have a better understanding how staff is working through the audit findings in the development of our roadmap and how this plan helps us to look at some of the different solutions, especially around that of data collection and measuring return on our different programs. On Thursday we have a public hearing that is set to be able to take a vote and connect the workforce solutions master plan to imagine Austin as requested through priority program three. So this helps to provide direction and close out a request made on behalf of that exercise. On June 14 you'll have your vote for approving the attached plan, and in September we will look to come back as staff to show you the roadmap that we've developed by working throughout the entire organization. Again, if you have any questions, Tamara is here to join us. We've also got Stephanie Hayden from Austin public health and I will be here as well. >> Mayor Adler: I think there were two different directions that were happening. I think you did a good job of merging them. First was the year-long

[10:32:05 AM]

community process, and I think we really need to recognize and express appreciation to Travis county, judge Eckhardt was one of the leers in that effort. But also ACC and a lot of the other governmental entities that have no endorsed this. As I recollect going back a year and a half, we had lots of people involved in workforce, doing lots of different things, and your ability to get everybody under one roof to say let's really focus, can we come up with a metric -- and I like the metric that you came up with and it

looks like it could be really meaningful if you hit that. So I want to thank you for that. At the same time we were getting an audit from our auditor's office that indicated that we, too, in the city were working on lots of different programs and lots of different departments, and there was no coordination so I'm excited, David, to see the single point of contact and the interdepartmental kind of focus to make sure that we know -- everybody knows what's happening and it's a holistic approach to that. And both those I think are real important. We make things more affordable in this city two ways. We make things cost less, subsidize things, hopefully we'll have a big bond, but we also make things more affordable by helping people have more money to spend. So I know this has been a lot of work and I just want to say thanks. I really appreciate it. Councilmember pool. >> Pool: Yeah, thanks for the coordinated effort. It's really important to the piece that you brought to us higher. I'm curious if you might be able, before bringing the plan back for us to approve next month, if you might be able to provide some more information or maybe beef up the section that shows expectations for employers. And specifically -- I mean, I know that they have the jobs, but I'm specifically keying on the upscaling of the workers that you were talking about, Tamara.

[10:34:05 AM]

For me that would be salaries so that when someone decides to retrain they have a relative expectation of a career ladder they are they might then be able to climb and that is -- salaries is key. For me, frankly, that's the biggest obstacle for being being able to afford to continue to live in Austin, is how much are they learning. Then -- are they earning. The second piece is retention. I'd like to see some commitment by employers about keeping these employees so that they can actually climb that career ladder. I noticed on the slide toward the end where you're showing the public-private partnership that I don't see any company names in there. I see government. I see the chamber. But I don't -- I would have expected to -- and I know the chamber represents business, but we've got government, nonprofit, which is goodwill, and then the chamber, which is also, you know, the trade group. So, again, I recognize that business and other organizations are behind that, but I'm calling on all of us with this plan to put clear-cut responsibility and calls to action at the step of employers. It's -- workers have to do their and it we've known that for decades and they work really hard. Some people maybe can't leave the jobs that they have because they can't afford not to be earning any money in order to go back to school or go into a training program. Then there are people who are possibly older and may not be able to physically or for any other reason be able to retrain but yet need an [indiscernible] So I recognize that we may not be reaching those folks but they're out there as well. So what commitment do we have from individual employers to come to the table and really help mentor and nurture the workforce that clearly would like to work for them? And they're just missing that commitment from the employers.

[10:36:11 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember alter? >> Alter: Thank you. I understand that there's a 2gen plan with United Way to align chair with this master plan but that won't be done until December. Can you

speak to when and how that will be added? >> Thank you very much. Absolutely. So with United Way, they are working on a plan for two gen as you mentioned can be. Early in the process before they even launched I met with key staff from united Way, and I asked them about the ability for us to intentionally align the master community workforce plan with their two gen plan in the same way our master community workforce plan recognized and aligned with United Way success by six, their school readiness action plan that is the community strategic plan for early childhood education. So we absolutely are at the table with United Way. Workforce solutions plays two roles, if you will, as we think about United Way and the two gen approach. One as a workforce board 60% of my budget, over \$18 million a year, is devoted to early childhood education for direct care and quality so we are serving many of the vulnerale children in the community. At the same time our second biggest investment as a workforce board is with the adults, the parents of those children. So we as an agency have a vested interest in seeing we are coordinated from a two gen approach. The second hat is a backbone for the master plan and recognizing through the for adults, individuals to be able to access and be successful in skills training programs is access to child care. We know we need to solve that. We are at the table working with them and I have every

[10:38:11 AM]

reason to believe the plan that will emerge in December when United Way is able to produce that will show clear alignment with the master plan and how early childhood education supports, dovetails and can be better supported through adult workforce training programs including on-site care. So we're at the table with them. In fact I met with the CEO of United Way just yesterday on this specific topic. >> Alter: Great. Thank you. Another person -- I'm not sure who would be best able to address this. So the proposal is that this would be adopted into image Austin and -- imagine Austin so we did that with the strategic housing blueprint, with D no do that with echo, we're doing it with this one. Can someone explain, a, what requirements imagine Austin has for us to be able to adopt something into the comprehensive plan with respect to the none of readings so we have a hearing and we have the passage of it. At some point I remembered there were multiple readings to go into imagine Austin. Also what does it mean when you put a plan into imagine Austin and how do we decide which plans go in, which ones don't? >> Sure. I can describe that to the best of my ability by learning through the process from planning. We are having the two different hearings as we indicated on the last slide. The first of which would take place on Thursday, and then the final -- I'm sorry, I don't have the date with me. Would take place, I believe, in June. >> Alter: June 14. >> Adoption of this plan helps us to provide some strategy and framework around workforce development as articulated through priority program three as I mentioned. So, you know, we are -- as Tamara mentioned, not looking for any financial contributions at this point in time. It's just a matter of showing the community that this is a framework for how it is we can support what it is they requested for stronger workforce development alignment.

[10:40:12 AM]

Back during imagine Austin. >> Alter: So what does it mean though if it's adopted into imagine Austin or if we just adopt the plan? I'm not saying I don't want it in imagine Austin. I'm just trying to understand if there's additional import to that step. Greg Guernsey, planning and zoning. It's brought forward in a blueprint. With this document which becomes like an addendum or attachment to imagine Austin, so it updates that and we start monitoring those through my team and through the other priority teams that look at each of those programs through time and we report out on those. So echo I think could be something I think we were just speaking of that could be attached along just like the blueprint was and we can get with staff that worked on that and ask them if they're interested in bringing that forward and attaching that. >> Mayor Adler: My recollection was that the echo plan was one part of the overall strategy so there was some pushback adopting that as the strategy because it was one part, which is why we endorsed that and supported that but it wasn't broad enough to be the strategy. This was intended to be the broader strategic plan so it had to go to the planning commission as required by things that are that broad and part of the strategy, and it did this did. It went to the planning commission and was approved. It also went to the -- I think the difference was where the one was really a broad strategic plan or more narrowly focused strategic plan for part of the continuum. >> I understand the broader question, councilmember, and I'll get back to you on how we can ensure that as different plans come forward if they're going to be adopted into imagine Austin or not that we have a better answer for you moving

[10:42:13 AM]

forward. I'll get back to you on that. >> Alter: I appreciate that. I wasn't trying to go back to the echo plan and reopen that and suggest that should be in there. I want to understand if we're adopting this into imagine Austin what additional weight is that giving to this plan and I would appreciate further clarification sort of on the process. Because if we amend imagine Austin we have certain rules and processes but I'm not sure if we're following those same rules to -- rules to add these attachments. For instance I don't know if the posting suggested this was going into imagine Austin eventually for this this - public hearing or not. I would have to look back at those. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ms. Kitchen and then Ms. Houston. >> Kitchen: You have a question about the stakeholders. I know you -- you may have talked about that some. My question specifically is about whether you were involved -- you guys included or talked with any of the -- engaged with any of the union apprentice -- I can't sate word, you know what I mean, the apprenticeship programs, middle skill jobs. I'm sure you're well aware there's federally recognized programs for that so I'd just like to understand how they have been included in the process. >> Thank you for the question. So we have two labor representatives on workforce solutions board. Ibeu, the electrical workers are represented and consulted during the planning process, as were the plumbers and pipe fitters. We worked with them and continued to work with them. So they've been part of the process, were engaged in stakeholder meetings during the planning process.

[10:44:13 AM]

In fact we launched last week a preapprenticeship program with our plumbers and pipe fitters union to provide opportunities for high school students over the summer to be able to work in -- to learn about the industry and to be able to gain some skills and we're recognizing that and supporting that under this master workforce plan. So broadly speaking work-based learning opportunities are a key strategic or tactic I should say within our overall strategies and clearly is a bridge. We see earn and learn or work-based learning that many of the unions help represent as a key tactic in how we're going to help people be able to afford to upskill while they still need to put food on their tables. >> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you. That's very helpful. For are the apprentice programs themselves included in this plan? >> Absolutely. So part of the plan we have recognized, as I mentioned, three industry sectors, including skilled trades, and our work most closely has been with the apprenticeship programs in the skills trade area. Workforce solutions is one of the only entities in the state as well that is currently working with a large hospital provider to bring a nursing program as an apprenticeship occupation into our area. So we are leaning in, if you will, councilmember, into apprenticeship and working with the traditional apprenticeship programs primarily through unions as well expanding to other employers. >> Kitchen: Let's drill down for a minute so I can what support means. Does that mean we fund those kinds of inflames what does that mean when we say we -- as part of the plan these programs -- Clyde or supported? >> What that means is we are

[10:46:15 AM]

making sure their voice is at the table along with the private sector employers so the management, if you will, part of the equation. So we're bringing them to the table, understanding their needs. Many times they share the same kind of recruitment needs that many apprenticeship programs say, the desire and need to be able to recruit and inform, raise awareness about the opportunities they provide, not unlike goodwill or Austin community college also does. So they share that. In terms of financial support, the apprenticeship programs are listed on workforce solutions' eligible training provider list, which means a person who is eligible -- an individual who is eligible can enroll in an apprenticeship program and receive a portion of their tuition, portion of their preapprenticeship cost paid through the federal resources that workforce solutions administers. All workforce boards have that ability and that's something we are also recognizing and counting, if you will, under this master plan. >> Kitchen: Okay. Do we have -- one last question just so I can understand. I'm not as familiar with how the funding flows. So are there state dollars that we can use or local dollars we can use to -- like, for example, in that circumstance to assist with tuition or only federal dollars. >> To date we've leveraged federal funds primarily. I'm not aware of there's prohibition against using state or local funds. The way we typically try to work is try to preserve our local, city and county, local government dollars, to be the funder of last resort when it comes to workforce department because we find that the city and county, local dollars, have more flexibility typically than federal funds do. So while federal funds will pay for or offset part of the tuition for preapprenticeship programs we're going to go to that first so that is how we have used that. The capital area workforce solutions was also one of a handful of workforce boards

[10:48:15 AM]

last year that received funding from the Texas workforce commission, so a state agency, to grow preapprenticeship opportunities in our area. Ultimately those funds were federal funds, councilmember, but administered through a state agency and down to our local area to pilot how we can grow preapprenticeship and, therefore, also look at ways to offset tuition costs in our local area. >> Kitchen: Okay. Then so the plan that's coming back to us to vote on on June 14, does the plan collide the level of detail in other words, when we vote on the planning are we also voting on funding priorities or anything like that or is it higher level than that? >> It's higher level than that. >> Kitchen: Okay. Does the -- well, so the council's opportunity to make requests or provide any kind of, you know, policy support or whatever for the particulars of particular programs, that would just come in play with any dollars that we spend? Is that right? Is that where that would be addressed? >> Yes, and we may address that through the roadmap that we provide to council. If there are certain areas that you were looking to invest more heavily, I think that would be the appropriate time to look at that. >> Kitchen: Okay, all right. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: I think that roadmap comes back in September. >> Correct. >> Mayor Adler: Ask it may be we want to engage in this conversation earlier than that as part of this budget relative to the strategic plan because I think we have some things that speak to this. So it may be, manager, that you take a look at whether there are opportunities that you're considering as you're pulling together your budget consistent with the strategic work that the council did. Anyone else on? Ms. Houston. >> Houston: Thank you. Thank you. And thank you for all the work that you've put into this. As you've given us this kind of overview of the plan, I'm

[10:50:17 AM]

sure they're in there but there's certain populations that I'm particularly interested in that don't seem to be included in it because they're not identified and maybe that's on purpose. But formula -- I think we all have it, councilmember kitchen, formerly incarcerated individuals, I don't see where they are in this mix of economic development. Of course I have so many people who come back from the criminal justice system that are unable to be employed for any number of reasons. And then the individuals who are living on the streets who want jobs, and I don't see any reference to those populations. And I want to thank councilmember alter for mentioning the various ways we intersect with imagine Austin and how we add things to it because if that's something that we're going to do then I would like to consider adding something about the anti-displacement task force. I mean, that's something that is very appropriate in Austin and how we -- it's even mentioned displacement in one of the parts of it. I don't remember it off the top of my head but I had a it was that works on that -- task force that worked on that for a very long time and, again, there's nothing -- how do we insert their recommendations into imagine Austin. But that's an aside. One other thing that I had that I didn't see mentioned -- or when you talk to businesses about how they can contribute to this workforce solutions plan, do you talk -- well, you need to talk to some businesses, objection, but the other part of that is to provide paid internships as an opportunity to -- for young people and old people to get a feel for what the tasks are and whether

they can perform those tasks appropriately. Flying back from someplace yesterday, a young man was here on a paid internship, a

[10:52:18 AM]

Visa, so I'm thinking do we do that in our city with all the technology and the companies that we have here? Do we go out to those companies and say, "Could you provide us five slots so that we could put five people in paid internships?" I'm not sure, and, David, you can perhaps answer this, whether we ask our companies to give back to the community in a way that would help this plan without us always asking the public citizens to put more money into something. >> Absolutely. First I'll look to speak to the definition of those that we do connect with. Back in 2013, we were looking at those who did have those economic disadvantages. Of course those are our at our below 200% poverty guideline standards immediately connect with our services. But we also asked our service providers to go out and connect with a different group of individuals that have some of those socioeconomic barriers, such as veterans, previously incarcerated individuals as well. In casting the net, again, this past year through our chapter 380 process we've broadened that definition because we were hearing about a number of individuals in the community who are experiencing issues finding employment and retaining employment as well because of some of those barriers. So we can provide you that definition of those that fall within the services that we're describing today. And in terms of internships we do have a strong focus as to how it is the city can work with industry to be able to cultivate more of those learning opportunities so we can continue to build the pipeline of workforce for the city of Austin. It's certainly something that we approached in formalizing more of those conversations for internships and preapprenticeships through the chapter 380 update. I'll see information there. And we're working with Tamara's group so they can understand what funds may be available to them through workforce solutions as well and we're working with

[10:54:19 AM]

groups lining the school boards, as well as e3 and others to better understand how we can make stronger connections for internships and mentoring opportunities as well. >> I can address that as well. So when it comes to internships for example, workforce solutions through the plan sees that as a very important strategic in our work-based learning. So work-based learning we see as a brought umbrella term that encompasses preapprenticeship as a way to earn and learn and paid internship as an opportunity to also earn and learn and to your point gain awareness about jobs and industries and as we were going through our focus groups and subsequent to that, councilmember, when I was able to meet with the area superintendents from the schools, the number 1 request they had of us as it relates to this master plan is please, we need more internships for our students so they can get exposed to the jobs and industries that are driving our economy. So we've heard that loud and clear. And David is right, we have and will continue to work closely with our partners at the city and the county and our educators in the community to bridge that gap between those of us that are working with students that are looking

for internships and the businesses that have open jobs to cultivate those learning opportunities for our students and for job seekers. With regards to special populations, you're absolutely right. Formerly incarcerated individuals, veterans, individuals with disabilities, as we went through our focus group process over and over again we heard and we listened to groups that really focus on providing workforce development services to those -- to populations, special populations. And as we considered what it meant for the master plan, a common thread that we saw for those who are most vulnerable in nearly all of those populations was that they're living at our below

[10:56:19 AM]

poverty, they're struggling to make ends meet. And so the way that we were able to gain some agreement from groups that -- including workforce solutions that care about special populations, including the formerly incarcerated as you mentioned is to look at an economic threshold and recognize that by having the plan be broad enough that it is targeting lifting people out of poverty and into jobs. We saw that we could also be able to provide services to populations that are specifically in need because with this plan we wanted it to be specific enough that, as the mayor mentioned, for the first time in our community we could have a common focus on where do we want to go with our workforce development strategy but wanted every group to see themselves fitting into this plan even while agreeing this is where we want to go. So it's both broad and focused at the same time, if that makes sense, which is why we are working with groups that have a specific population focus but the plan doesn't specifically say this is our number 1 priority population. We knew as soon as we did that if we called out a specific group we could unintentionally alienate other population groups -- alienate other population groups and this is about local jobs for local people is really what this plan is about. >> Houston: And I understand that, but sometimes when we've become so broad people don't see themselves represented in the plan. >> Correct. >> Houston: So that explanation explains it to me, but if I'm just getting out of the criminal justice system or have been out for 15 years, that 200% below poverty level may not say this is something that I could look forward to. But as long as you all understand that that's an issue. And then the last thing I want to say, and I'm glad you mentioned that you've been talking with the superintendents in the area schools, because reducing poverty does break one -- when -- it's one of those keys, but so is education.

[10:58:19 AM]

>> Absolutely. >> Houston: And we're having a deficit in education. In the communities that doctor the schools that my kids go to, there's a deficit in the quality of education. So I'm glad that you're having those conversation -- glad that you're having those conversations because the kids have to be educated in order to get that next step, which is where you are. >> Thank you. >> Houston: So keep having those conversations with >> I just wanted to note about the special populations. Part of working with UT's Marshall center with the work that they're doing is that we will be collecting information on special population characteristics through our data sharing agreements and be able therefore to disaggregate

the data, councilmember, to look at special populations, including those who are formerly incarcerated, and again taking an equity perspective, be able to see how well are we currently doing and where do we need improvements for seeing outcomes for special populations and using that to create a communication campaign to your point to be able to market or communicate to special populations. Here are the services that are available to you to help you get ahead in life. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Anything else on this? So we'll conclude with -- there was discussion about internships and I think that's something that is key to this. So critically -- so critically important. One of the biggest challenges in workforce is that a lot of the people that we want to give these opportunities to are not aware of them and don't see themselves in those positions and the internships deal with that and those opportunities. So I just want to say out loud that I want to recognize the companies that are stepping forward right now and are creating the internship positions. I know that you're soliciting and going to them and I want to continue to offer my continuing support in that and have participated in that. But companies like Visa and certain affinity and other

[11:00:23 AM]

companies are certainly stepping up to the place to do this and a lot of this is privately sourced. Right now those are some of the heroes in our community for doing that. And we need lots more folks to join in on that effort. So thank you very much for this presentation. Council, I would propose that we have a few pulled items and let's do the pulled items and then we'll conclude, get into the codenext issue. Let's see how long it takes us to go through this. The first items that were pulled were items 11 will you 16. >> Alter:, you pulled those. They were related to waller creek. >> Alter: Yes, thank you. Let me say that I'm excited about this project and what it will mean for our city now and in the future. I have had some conversations with Mr. Canally about some of the physical safeguards and they were not reflected in the backup because many of them are to be dealt with in the agreement that is still to be negotiated. So I wanted to for the record have an opportunity to ask some of those questions so that what was explained to me would be in the agreement moving forward. So my first question is over time what kind of safeguards do we have if faced with shifting economic conditions that limit the amount of actual tax revenue generated by the tirz. >> The amendment before the council this week for the tax increment reinvestment zone is to extend the duration of the zone timeline as well as put a maximum additional amount of \$110 million. These are based on conservative assumptions and something I think that is unlike the original amendment for the tunnel,

[11:02:25 AM]

the \$110 million is really a six to eight year plan, the appropriations and the subsequent bond sales would occur over a time. As we've indicated in the presentations before is that every time we come forward to do an appropriation, we will be looking at the valuations in the tirz and how we are performing. And again, we have approximate put in conservative assumptions about those. So that is a key area of safety. And in that case under a sensitivity where we really hit an unforeseen downturn, we

would be in a position just to pause before we make sure we have the value on those efforts. Again because we're not putting all \$110 million on the table from day one. So that's really the key safety measure that we have to address any economic issues. >> Alter: At each point when we had to approve the 125 million for Waterloo park, would we at each of those points as a council have to approve the issuing of the bonds. >> So again the way that -- the way we handle all of a city's debt as we talked about last week related to our bond election from a financial policy in our -- the way we manage our cash position, we have appropriations so we can begin projects, get contracts in place, but the bond sales happen once a year in August and those bond sales are set to match the cash flow of the projects. Typically a bond sale happens about a year after the appropriations occur. So this in case the bond sales for the item on the agenda this week for the Waterloo park, the first installment of the 110 million is 25 million for Waterloo park to match the fund-raising that's been in place. We would anticipate that bond sale would probably occur August of 2019. >> Alter: But in the future we would still have to do an appropriation

[11:04:27 AM]

before those sales could move forward at the appropriate time? >> Yes. Ultimately council sits in a spot where all the funding for this has to be approved by an appropriation. That typically happens in this case either a budget amendment, but during the annual budgeting process for the capital budget. So that is the first kind of kickoff, your appropriation of the funds. And then subsequently we would have the bond sales. >> So one of the things that's wonderful about this project is the contribution from the philanthropic community that out weighs the city's contribution. I think it's roughly two to one. What guarantees or other mechanisms are built into the tirz to ensure the private match materializes. >> I could speak to that, but I think Joe has actual about the actual process. One of the items is to look at the amendments from the joint development agreement to make sure that the fund-raising is in place, that -- is in place in accordance with city funding. And then there's a process that occurs in a local government corporation and Joe pantalion actually sits as the president of the local government corporation as projects move through that effort. He can speak to that. >> Sure. Joe pantalion, interim assistant city manager. As Greg said, I also serve as the president of the waller creek local government corporation. As far as the execution of projects and the proving up of funding for the projects from the conservancy, the program has a mechanism, what's called a phase plan. So when you look at a project to be constructed there are different phase plans that are really just kind of a scope of work, and the corresponding funding commitment from the parties that come before the lgc for approval. And there are multiple phases per project. You could have kind of the conceptual design, what we call the design phase, design concept phase. Then you get into schematic

[11:06:28 AM]

design and construction drawings and ultimately construction. And each phase must have a funding letter from the conservancy which proves up the demonstration that they have funds available. So it's

almost a checkpoint at every phase of a project that the conservancy actually does have that commitment of private funds. >> Alter: So that would be in the joint development agreement which we are authorizing this week to negotiate and execute. >> Yes. It's currently already in the existing joint development agreement that was initially set up, that's correct. >> Alter: Great. Thank you. Mr. Mull 15 - Mr. Mullin, can you speak to how much has already been raised? >> Peter Mullin, CEO of the waller creek conservancy. So the 200 plus million that's being pledged, part of that is capital funds, which would be used to help construct the parks. Some of that -- actually more than half of it is for operating. >> Flannigan: Would be provided over time as the operations of the parks is required. So that later portion comes from year by year as we operate the park. On the capital side I think the 94 million that's committed, we've raised about almost half of that. So about 46 million. So we're doing pretty well. Still a big lift, but we think that we're in a good position with this action to be able to move forward. >> Alter: Well, it's wonderful that so many in our community believe in this investment and it would be great for us as a council to show our support this Thursday. I had a couple other questions I submitted to Q and a and I'll just let you answer those there. I'm sorry to have kept you here this long for those few questions, but I did want us to communicate to the public that there were these fiscal safeguards that were not in the backup because they're

[11:08:28 AM]

in the agreement and that they were part of how we're approaching this as a city in partnership with the waller creek conservancy. So thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you for delineating those. Mr. Flannigan. >> >> Flannigan: Thank you. I've asked similar questions versus email and the other 30 questions that I'm waiting for staff to come back to me on. I'll talk more about Thursday as I get the answers to some of my specific questions, but there's a lot of risk involved in committing 30 years of future tax revenues to a project. And in some regards we're overdue for an economic downturn. We're riding high on a kind of unstable economic footing sometimes. It's not hard to imagine that scenario in the future. One question since councilmember alter brought it up in terms of the private fund-raising, has there been anything in our history where a private entity raised \$200 million? >> Sorry. Anecdotally I don't know. I don't have hard data on that. Certainly there are organizations that have very robust fund-raising over time. That does represent a big number but again I want to point out this is something that would be raised over the period of time of the tif. Not all at once. Nor would we be able to. In the context of Austin philanthropy, sure, it's a whether -- your question is framed as concern about the viability or is it applauding the courage involved? >> I have no qualms about taking a big swing and trying for big things. And as long as we're fully understanding of the risks that we're taking on, I

[11:10:28 AM]

think the community has been very clear to us, especially recently, that they just don't want to be plans, they want to see the city council take action. I think we will take action on this, I feel. I'm glad to see councilmember alter doing her due diligence as much as I am. And I hope that we continue to do big

things as a city because our city is demanding it and our city needs it. >> I'll just add on one of the ways in which we're able to make this commitment is that we're not doing it by ourselves. We have partnerships with the private sector who have made major -- with the property owners who have made major commitments who have ongoing maintenance as part of this plan. I think it gives us a much greater sense of confidence in the ability to deliver on this, which is something that we take with the utmost gravity. But that's an important part of this plan. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem and then Ms. Houston? >> Tovo: Just to follow up on councilmember alter's questions, I'm not sure what questions you submitted, but I did submit that question through the Q and a about how the fund-raising piece would work and how the city would verify it because I've gotten questions too. So that information if we receive questions from the public should be available through our Q and a. We can point them there to see the process that the city will use to verify those funding amounts. And it as if I think the long center raised about \$77 million, so that was also a big amount. And 46 million is as well, which is what -- which is what I think you've said you've already raised, is that right, Mr. Mullen? >> That's correct. >> Tovo: Great. Thanks again. >> Mayor Adler: It would be that 76 plus millions of dollars raised operationally sense then similarly to the ongoing raise with the long center. Councilmember pool. >> Pool: And also at a time as far as the value of money. That 70 million would be some different larger number. 77 would be some different larger number. I am really appreciative of

[11:12:30 AM]

the organization that is in place, working with Peter. And thanks for coming down to do this work. And also to the board. And I don't know if Melba Whatley is here today, but extend our thanks to her again. You guys are doing really good work. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston. >> Houston: Thank you, mayor. Mr. Mullen, while you're here and the mic is open, would you like to tell those benefactors who are out there with billions how to get in touch with you? [Laughter]. >> Is there like a banner, a scroll? [Overlapping speakers]. >> Houston: To contributing to this wonderful thing we could have a naming opportunity for you. >> Yeah. So we're available whenever and faults. And so yes. The more the merrier. >> Houston: Good. And I hope you get more because I think this is an opportunity. Again, we've got a lot of philanthropic folks in there in the city of Austin and I'm sure UT has raised that much or more, but we're not UT. So we've got to go out and ask in a different way. So thank you for being here and I hope this passes on Thursday. >> Thanks for your support. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Councilmember alter. >> Alter: I wanted to add that I went through the numbers with Mr. Canally in terms of the assumptions for the valuations for the tif, and the assumptions that we're using in calculating the amounts that are available to us are much more conservative than the amount that the economist has put forward, which is another safeguard on that. And as time goes on we may find that there's other opportunities to make investments that the city wants to make through this. So I think it's important to understand that there's quite on -- we are underestimating how much valuation will be coming relative to those estimates relative to another economist's estimates

[11:14:31 AM]

through the waller creek process as well. >> Thank you for that. >> Mayor Adler: Great. Thank you all very much. Mr. Flannigan, you pulled item number 35, which relates to fire stations? >> Flannigan: Yes. So the three things I pulled should be pretty quick just because I'm not in the folks who wrote it. On the fire stations, I want to -- I'm putting an amendment together to explore the impact of new signal technology on response times that we funded through campo. So I wanted to make sure there wasn't -- anybody had an issue with that before I bring it on Thursday. >> Mayor Adler: Say it again? >> Flannigan: Mayor pro tem? I'm just making sure. That we are exploring the impact of new signal technology that we got funded through campo on what response times look like because when I spoke to some of the fire department and the fire association folks they were saying that we might be able to improve those response times just based through signal technology that we just got funded through campo. So I want to make sure that's included in future analysis. >> I didn't know what Mr. Flannigan's questions were going to be and I prepared a brief little powerpoint to provide some context because I frankly don't know where -- if there are six votes to pass this as is with your added amendment. So I'll just go through that really quickly. I wanted to give some background on this. The original resolution for the five needed fire stations, it was reported in 2016 that said -- please excuse the cough drop in my mouth. The 2016 report showed that we were in need of five fire stations in 2016. So that was the impetus of this resolution that passed. The report back date, we didn't get anything back. We just got a memo back two

[11:16:35 AM]

years later showing this timeline, which showed -- this shows the priority of which stations, Travis country, del valle. You can see them there. I in conversations with staff, I said that this is unacceptable if we need -- in 2016 we needed five, by 2028 we should be building those quickly. At the end I'll show you that in 1986 because of the council resolution we were able to build six fire stations in two years. So I don't know what the political issue was there, but there was the political will and the ability of the city to build six fire stations in two years. And here we have a timeline. Continuing to work through staff -- I want to give some background on this. When I asked what the report back was I had several meetings with staff, what's taking so long, the original resolution asked let's -- a p3 model, anything, bonds, what can we do to get these fire stations as quickly as possible. From the time of this resolution to the memo, I've had several meetings with staff. Staff said well, I heard different things. I heard it's a bandwidth issue. We're trying to do the p3 model with the development services. I heard I'm going to go talk to banks today. And I want to give this context because this comes from frankly a little bit of frustration with this process in that we asked for this two years ago and didn't get a timeline for 10 years for those stations. This is the real important part. I know it's small. This is not just about public safety coverage. This started as that. This started as we needed five fire stations. About a year ago I hear from the fire department that we are -- that families are getting increased insurance premiums because they do not have a fire station close to

[11:18:36 AM]

them. And really total coincidence it's my district. I was the lead sponsor on the 2016. You will see there it's 1 -- I know it's small. 100 something addresses are going to be receiving or have received an increase in their insurance premiums because our city annexed them and hasn't kept up with providing basic public safety resources for them. Before I forget, I want to give a shout-out to Christine teez with the fire department because they actually went through individually these addresses to measure -- to get some of these addresses off of this list so they wouldn't have to have that extra increase in their insurance premium. I want to thank her for that to taking that extra time to go through individually. So this is an example of one of my will be seeing an increase of \$709 to their premium because we have not built fire stations the way we should have. I just looked at my city taxes from what changed from 2016 to 2017. I saw 100-dollar increase for the year. This is seven times that. So in addition to year over year of getting city increases on their property tax bill, they're facing a seven times increase and there was also a news story a couple of years ago, the yes said that -- we aren't able to find him, but he was getting a thousand dollar increase on his insurance premium because there are too far from a fire station. The one could be that they are facing higher insurance premiums because there are too far from a fire hydrant. The tens are they are receiving a higher insurance premium because there are too far from a fire station. The priority area is one, two, three, you will see that 88% of the time it takes more than eight

[11:20:37 AM]

minutes to get out to the del valle area for first responders calls. And this was after a meeting I had with the -- so it's a department of insurance that determines these iso ratings. I may not have that all correctly. They provided us with this and said look, this is why. This is why we have to raise people's insurance premiums because if you see at the bottom it shows when you reach the time of flashover no one survives flashover. It talks about fire growth. That's why they do that because the long are it takes for a fire engine to respond the more likelihood that you could have severe injury, possibly death or if nobody is home, hopefully nobody is home and then you would have structure issues. So I've had meeting after meeting. I've heard let's put it in the bond, no, let's not put it in the bond. Maybe we can issue cos. So this came as a suggestion from different folks sake let's put temperature stations. Other cities have done temporary stations. There is funding available. We still have 6.1 million. I've heard anything from one to two million for temporary station. I think there's still room to work with city staff and try to determine something. If we can get to a place where we can break ground -- so we own the land in del valle. That's the number two priority. We own the land. We don't own the land in Travis country. We would have to go find the land. If we could break ground on a permanent station in the next six months, then obviously that's the route that we should go if we could get a permanent station. But after hearing time and time again that it's going to take two to five years for one fire station, I don't know -- to have these families face an insurance premium like that for another two to three years is really concerning to me.

[11:22:40 AM]

There's also this money, you know, we went and try to find different buckets of money. There is also the memo that we got recently that there's five million dollars leftover and I believe that at least -- I know we have to get an opinion from our bond counsel, but it does talk about buying land for public safety and stations. So maybe we could use this bucket to buy the land for Travis country. Had we started -- councilmember Flannigan, you made the point about action, not plans. I really hope we can move in that direction. Had we started in this process if it's going to take two years to put one fire station down, had we started this in 2016 we would all be getting invitations right now to hopefully a ribbon cutting, but we're not there. We're at a place now that now families are receiving these bills. I know that you know I often lead because of my former background on these issues, but really had I not been a former firefighter, this would have been an issue for my constituents receiving these increased insurance bills. So I think I covered everything. Again, just to reiterate, if you could put that one -- the sheet up that shows in 1986 there was a council -- it doesn't show the council resolution, but it shows the timeline of stations and you will see that stations 28 through 33, six stations were built in less than two years after council passed a resolution. So wish two years ago we would have been here where we would now be in a place where we have six stations, but we're not. So I please ask for your support on temporary stations or on whatever middle ground we can come to. I'm sure if constituents in your districts were facing similar situations, you would appreciate that support. So thanks.

[11:24:40 AM]

>> Mayor Adler: I find the arguments very compelling. If there are people in our community that have higher insurance rates because we don't have a certain amount of coverage is concerning. I know it was part of the original actions. I am one of the constant voices about trying to do something off budget. So that it marks it hardtory have the overall feel for not only this expenditure, but what this expenditure means in terms of other priorities that we have because ultimately we're having to choose priorities. So to have something where we're considering without the wider picture is something that I often raise my hand about. So manager, if you could speak to that. If this sounds to me very much like an emergency item that makes sense to consider off budget because it goes to the fundamental work that we do as a city I -- I don't know how this impacts this other really basic, serious, perhaps other safety issues as well. So can you speak to this request in terms of the larger budget issues? >> Sure. Mayor and councilmembers, I first want to acknowledge and thank councilmember Garza for raising this critical issue because we -- although I'm new to this process, I certainly am becoming more aware of the need and the need to address it quickly. So we've appreciated the conversation that we've started and we'll continue over the next coming days to ensure that in an ideal world we would be building permanent stations. So we want do do that as quickly as possible and we've been working with city staff to look at alternative methods than just using general obligation bonds and cos and other methods to allow that to happen much quicker. Over the next couple of days, maybe before Thursday, we would have an update to you so you can have a better

[11:26:41 AM]

understanding of what that timeline looks like. Staff might be able to provide more context on what that time frame could be, but I want to thank you for raising this because this has been discussed for two years. I certainly think that it could be rising to the level of needing immediate action. >> Okay. Councilmember kitchen and then Ms. Houston, mayor pro tem and then councilmember pool. >> Kitchen: So -- thank you, councilmember Garza, for putting together this information. It's really helpful and really gets to the point very well. So I support this also and as the mayor said I view this as compelling. I think it's unacceptable that we have so many -- any for that matter, but we have a significant number of homes or families that are facing these rising costs. So what I would like to ask the city manager is of course I know you're working towards Thursday, and you may be able to give us complete information by Thursday. But what I would like to be doing on Thursday is designating dollars. So it may be that what we're voting on is two options but I'm curious about the five million leftover from the bond. That appears to be a statement that we could immediately make. Or we could immediately provide direction to go get five million or whatever the amount is in our cos. I think in our timeline and the very few meetings we have remaining and these kinds of things have to be approved, that I'm hopeful you can bring us something on Thursday. If not I would like to be able to vote on something that gives you sufficient options so that we're actually identifying the funding we can go forward. I appreciate the concern

[11:28:43 AM]

about the owe you know, about the budget process. And normally I would say this during the process, but this is months away. And this is really key and we'd still like to deal with the same issue in the budget process, which is generally speaking because we fund these things out of bonds or cos, we'll still have to deal with the same issue. It's not like it's all going to be funded out of general revenue. So I guess what I'm trying to say just to make that more succinct is I'm hopeful that on Thursday there's something that we can vote on that will provide the direction. Whether that's really specific or whether it's enough direction to go go get the money and proceed. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston. >> Garza: May I follow up on councilmember kitchen? So it's my understanding, and Mr. Van eenoo can -- staff is prepared to issue cos for the two stations it's my understanding. The problem is the length it takes -- I've heard different things, but we've never done fire stations in less than three years. Well, we have. What I'm concerned about is if the responses, they said we're going to issue the co, so there's the money. We don't have a funding issue for the permanent stations, but if it's going to take two to three years, there needs to be the contingency plan of the temporary stations unless staff can provide some assurances that they're going to do the design-build model, if it's hiring an fte to be a project manager for fire. Parks is able to get projects done quicker because we have a project manager. It's been frustrating how the process is what's holding this up. It's a long process for permanent fire station. So if by Thursday there's -- we figured it out. We've stem lined the process, issued the co's,

[11:30:45 AM]

we're going to be breaking ground in del valle in six months. That gives me comfort. But if that's not the comfort, then we need the temporary stations. We have the funding, we need the temporary stations. >> I'm prepared to vote on moving the temporary stations forward. If we're not at a place where we can have some certainty about a quick time frame for permanent stations or at least the highest priority one in del valle. >> Mayor Adler: A so it's capital expenditures too, but it's the increasing staffing. And that's what -- I don't have a feel for how that impacts all the other priorities in the budget. Ms. Houston? >> Houston: Thank you, councilmember Garza, for mentioning the temporary stations because I've submitted a budget question, but I can ask you how do you define temporary station? What does that look like and where do you find those? >> Sure. Cities have done different things. Some cities have done a manufactured home. There's actually companies that specialize in temporary fire stations for like natural disasters. If they come in, they put up a fire station. If there's a hurricane or tornado kind of situation. San Antonio bought a house, an old house and used that. Austin has done a temporary station. The Parmer lane it's my understanding was a temporary station and then became a permanent. There's discussions with if there's a vacant toll booth -- not just the booth, but like a whole entire building that's not being used on 130 near Elroy road that there's conversations, maybe that could be a temporary station and you don't have to have the capital for the actual building of a temporary station. So parks has portable buildings. The library has used portable buildings. So there's lots of options. >> Houston: I'm sure that the mayor has said this or someone else said this. If we can't find the permanent structures confirmed and go to the

[11:32:45 AM]

temperature structures, then what do we do about staffing and vehicles? Is that already baked into the fire department's budgets? >> It's my understanding, and fire is that they have two engines available to use for temporary stations. They have reserve engines that come in when other engines are out of service. It's my understanding that they know they have two. The staffing is the issue. Part of that is this could be done incrementally because even if we get a temporary station in let's say eight months, that would be 15 ftes, but not a full budget session. So it would be like we would have to find funding for 15 ftes for nine months in the next budget and then as we get the other temporary station we find the land we would have to get an additional ftes. But fire can confirm. >> Tom Dodds, chief of staff. We have reserve apparatus. We could put a unit in service today. Staff can employ firefighters on overtime and put them into service. What we would have to do is like any new station, there would be a new apparatus that would be purchased and we would have to go into that station and so there would be additional funding for an apparatus and the additional staffing for that station. Those would be costs. If you told us to put a unit in service today we could do it. >> Houston: And we would have the staff to operate that unit? >> We would have the staff based on overtime, absolutely. >> Houston: This is not posted, but after the meeting can you tell me the status of the acquisition of that fire station from esd 4 off of Springdale road. >> That's actually an ems question. >> Houston: Okay, I'm sorry. >> >> I can get you that. >> Mayor Adler: Mayor pro tem? >> Tovo: I want to be shown on this -- the

[11:34:47 AM]

information on -- on the iso research. And thank you both, councilmember Garza, thank you for putting together the presentation and pulling together this information. It's really valuable. The iso research, say, for example, district 1, class 1y, which you said means it's too far from the hydrant. So there are -- the number is 150 and there's a percentage of 24%. What does that mean exactly? Does that mean 24% of the 150 fall within that category or it's 150 of the total number of residences in that area and that leads to 24%? >> Christine teez, planning manager for the Austin fire department. I did the research. Hopefully I can answer your question. So about the 125 addresses under the class 1ys that are in district 1, it's 24% of the 616. Addresses which have the class one Y designation. >> Tovo: So the 616 I thought was the number for full purpose. >> Correct. >> Tovo: In district 1 where 150 is the number that means that there are 24 percent -- that that 150 represents 24% of the addresses -- E in district 1 of the 616. Okay. Of the full purpose addresses that fall within class 1y, 24% are in district 1, 38% are in 22 and that equates to 33. Okay. I wasn't understanding the chart right, but now I am.

[11:36:48 AM]

So I guess I'm wondering -- so we're talking today about the fire station -- >> Which is class 10's. >> Tovo: -- Issue. But I wonder -- obviously this isn't a field I know very much about, but it would seem like the fire hydrants would be a relatively less expensive thing to address and I guess I'm wondering whether this is in the works too to get fire hydrants within closer proximity to our residents. >> In a sense we went for the most pressing issue, which was class 10's. And so what I've done is I've worked with iso to try to better understand this. It's an extremely complicated process that we went through. I wasn't part of the original process. So I had to -- I was the one receiving the phone calls from the residents in class 10 saying my residence has changed. I said I don't know why. That doesn't make any sense. I didn't even understand what a 1y was, it used to be an 8b. So this 1y we didn't really understand what it meant. Now that I have kind of gone through this and I know what the solution is for a class 10 I have to go back through on the 1 Y's and try to figure out really and truly are -- they're issued addresses, but is there a structure there. I did it on the class 10's. So the class 10's I know on these particular issue addresses there's a particular structure. Is there someone living there, I don't know. I research it had heavily in the del valle area because those were the phone calls that we were receiving. But on the class 1 Y's, I now need to go back, look at every single address and say is there actually a structure or was is just an issued address. Normally the hydrants get resolved through development. So all of these one Y's may just end up getting fixed once there is development in the water lines have been extended. So that's the next level of research that I have to do. >> Tovo: So let me jump back for a minute. As I understood the discussion, the one ys would

[11:38:51 AM]

be subject to a change in their insurance if they are indeed residential structures on those lots. So if you find a good number of these aren't empty lots, but are actually structures that people are living in that are too far from a hydrant, does the fire department have a plan? Will the fire department then take the next step in getting fire hydrants out to those areas. >> We will be reaching out to awu and determining the best solution. But I need to go through and the next level research is-- what homes are impacted and then what is the mitigation. And the mitigation would be collaboration with awu. We don't put in fire hydrants, we just use them and maintain them. So that's kind of the next step that we're hoping to do. >> Tovo: And I don't remember now if the resolution talks about that issue in terms of following up. Will you follow back up with us with the council to let us know the results of that analysis or what the next steps are? >> I personally will be expected by all means. It is on the list of things I need to go through. And the fire department does that in general. When we do our analysis annually to see what is our service delivery to the residents, when we're not meeting that, we start to go through different levels of analysis to determine why. And a fire station is not always the solution. Sometimes it's just an additional unit to a station. And so this is no different than how we run our normal analysis. >> Tovo: Thank you very much. >> We will report back to you on that. >> Tovo: Thanks to the research and thanks for councilmember Garza for bringing this forward. I'm a co-sponsor and I tend to support it. >> Mayor Adler: Awu is the Austin water department. >> Yes. It is Austin water. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Pool. >> Pool: I've been in support of this issue for awhile and I'm glad that we're getting an extra emphasis and push on it. I have two questions. One is design, prep and status and financials. And I think councilmember Garza brought this up with regard to, say we locate the

[11:40:52 AM]

money, where are we with regard to having the plans drawn up and do we know where either temporary or full term. So I don't know if my staff has submitted those as questions, but those would be questions. Chief Dodds? Or whomever. >> Yes. So as we've gone through in our discussion for council before the five different sites that we say -- or areas of town that we say we could use fire stations, we do have land located at some of them and some we do not for a permanent station. It's no different with the temporary. So in the del valle Moores crossing area we actually do have a lot there to construct a fire station today if we can move that project forward. So as far as logically thinking if you already own the land it should be faster and it should be true. So it logically to be the next fire station that we see in the city of Austin. In the Travis country area we don't have a permanent location for a station. We have been working for awhile to locate areas that we could place temporary structures or structures that are there that we could use temporarily. We do have some lines on some different things. We do not have anything that we could present to you today as an option that we knew we could roll out. And that's on the temporary side. But on those two different sites, one is Travis country, we don't have land for that yet. Moore's crossing we do. >> Pool: How about the design plans? >> If we work on what we're talking about, where the station is under construction right now, which is the onion creek station down in southeast Austin off of 535, that actually is going to -- we're going to try to use that station template to roll forward. We've got more expert opinions or knowledge on that. >> Real quick, if the question is

it shovel ready, it's not because they haven't been able to find the funding so there's no design. There's nothing because they've been asking for funding, haven't gotten funding, so that process --

[11:42:57 AM]

that's what apparently takes a long time period. I'm confident we can figure out a way do this quicker. We have to. >> Correct. >> So let me jump to that piece. So the 2006 bond election funding seems to be a lingering question. And this particular bond proposal is also the focus, the targeted focus for funding if there is any left for the new muny courthouse. This is some of the conversation we've already had. So I am still waiting to see how much of the bond funding is left for 2006. Do we know when we will get that information. I believe that we have not spent all that money, but I don't know for sure and I don't know what it is. And I know that the oversight committee wasn't able to get that information and discuss it recently. So this is a lingering request he that I would like to just push again on that. Can we get some sense of what funds have been yet been encumbered or spent? >> I believe the available funds from the '06 public safety proposition are five to seven million dollars is what's available. We have asked our attorneys. I know I've reached out to our bond counsel to term what can we used the funds for if they're not going to be needed in the future for a municipal court building since we have a lease agreement on that building and a longer term solution may look at a p3 model like we did the services center. It may not require the bond funds. What are the other things we might be able to use that \$5.7 million of remaining funds for. We don't have an answer for that yet. The proposition language was written broadly as they typically are, but in that broad language there's no reference to the fire department or fire station. So we just need to get that opinion on what those funds could be used for. >> Pool: It does talk about emergency service facilities. Emergency medical service buildings and facilities.

[11:44:57 AM]

Maybe there's a stretch there. >> Ems may be clear, but I don't want to say we can or can't, but we should be able to get that opinion before bond counsel. I don't know if we can do it before Thursday, but I'll try. >> Pool: I am looking at moving forward with the temporary stations, but I would also Lou see if we could -- knowing we will be looking for the money, could we maybe accelerate the design? So I get there's all kinds of reasons. I know you won't know what it's located, how it would have to be where's the road and that sort of thing, how it would have to be oriented. But it seems to me that there are some things that we can do to get ready so that we don't have such a long lag in time between having money assessed and then actually breaking ground. That's a gap that I would like to close, not only on this project, but on a lot of other projects. >> Mayor Adler: Thank you. Anything else on this? Councilmember alter. >> Alter: Thank you. I appreciate councilmember Garza and the staff helping to educate us on this complex and difficult situation. I have a lot of questions. I'm are trying to parse out a high value associated with a complex situation. There's a lot of money involved here and there's no fiscal note. And that concerns me. We have upward of \$30 million that we're talking about here without a clear sense of what we're spending on. We have no idea what the temporary stations would cost. We

don't know whether ems is included in those or not. And so for me I'm interested in getting to a permanent solution that delivers the public safety. I'm concerned that if we start getting sidetracked with a temporary situation at a time period where we might be in a position to move forward with the permanent that we will be not getting to the permanent as fast as we can.

[11:46:57 AM]

But I'm also concerned that we have recently received funding through campo for some signaling changes which we have data from our own systems that say that could reduce the response times in the range of 50% potentially, but we don't know what that is for any of these particular stations. We have a limited amount of money. We have just five stations here that are listed as the top priority and there are other stations. I would really like to know what we're expecting from those signals and how that affects the output for that. I have some questions about the iso ratings. We've been dealing with the iso ratings through the sd 4 merger and we've been having some conversations and it's my understanding that those ratings are not always accurate. So I appreciate Ms. Teez going after the ratings on behalf of our citizens, but those are not the measure that I feel like we should be using for making our public safety decisions because there are a lot of problems with those ratings and our own fire department has said there are issues with those ratings. And so as we approach this and also from a fiscal perspective, while I appreciate that these individual people are suffering from having a higher rating, I'm very concerned about them having the public safety and the response times than I am how much they're paying for their iso because it doesn't make sense for me to spend \$15 million to save them \$120,000 a year if they're not getting more public safety. That is what matters, or if there are better ways to get them to the public safety. I appreciate councilmember Garza's concern about the speed with which this is going. But we have a budget process and this is going to override that for an enormous amount of money. We don't have the facts that we need nor do we have our

[11:48:58 AM]

ducks in a row to make sure we're getting a permanent solution for these stations. We just got a memo saying we can use the certificate of obligation instead of bonds for these fire stations. We have not gotten much explanation about that. Again, I want to be clear. I'm looking for a permanent solution here, but there are too many open questions here about how we fund this. I am -- I do want to ask a question about the base budget. It's my understanding that this request is already in the base budget for next year, is that correct? In terms of the request being made by AFD. So I'm not sure what we're accomplishing with this, if it's already in the base budget request at this point in time. >> The base budget is what we presented to council on April 4th. This was not in the base budget, but the fire department has submitted a request for budget proposal response that would add these temporary stations. >> Right. That's what I meant. >> So that's being reviewed with requests from other departments as we speak. >> And how much does a temporary station cost? Do we even know that? >> So I believe the range the fire department has talked about for just the facility itself, the temporary

facility in the neighborhood of one to two million dollars depending on the multiple options that we might pursue on that. >> So we added that up and that's half of a station for another place when we -- I mean, -- >> If I could maybe speak to some of the funding issues because the way the resolution is written is for staff within six months to establish through some mechanism, including a temporary station, two new stations within six months. That's a high bar. And I think to give us even a possible chance of achieving it staff would want to come back at the very next council meeting following this direction. We would need to come back at your June 14th meeting with budgetary actions that

[11:50:58 AM]

would put us in a position to possibly achieve a six-month turnaround time. That would be by December 1st we would have two temporary stations standing up. I think there are four actions, four things that would need to occur. One is in the neighborhood of two to four million dollars. We'll work with the fire department between now and June 14th. Between now and with the budget amendment to start moving forward with acquiring temporary stations. That may be an rfp, getting an rfp out on the street in short order for some of these firms that are experienced withstanding up a temporary station. We do have funds in our reserves above and beyond what the 12% would call for that we could tap into for that purpose. That wouldn't be an appropriate bond capture because these are temporary stations, not permanent bond facilities. But we do have a funding fund source to acquire the temporary stations. The second would be northward to the staffing. Even though these facilities wouldn't be staffed this year, I would suggest that you could add the 32 positions or the 30. Typically we add 16 for a four person unit with three shifts. Somewhere between 30 and 32 new firefighters that we would add those, even though we wouldn't need to fund them in fiscal year 18, I don't want to be in a situation where there's any questions about the needed firefighters being added to the '19 budget. So I would want the ftes added now. It also gives the fire department the ability to start recruiting those positions and have them available as soon as possible so we're not running those temporary stations on an overtime basis. There's the additional issue of the trucks which they do have trucks and reserves, but I think that in itself is a very temporary solution that they would need the permanent equipment so we would -- we could do a budget amendment for that. And do a reimbursement resolution. We essentially would not issue debt, we wouldn't issue contractual obligations until such time we needed the equipment. Again, we would want the

[11:52:59 AM]

authorities because these just aren't the shelf vehicles. It takes awhile to get these vehicles from the manufacturer. And finally there's a question of the permanent station. And we could likewise come forward to council with the design piece of those permanent stations. It might be one or two million dollars per station to do the design work. And again, under a reimbursement resolution we would set up the capital budget, we could do the budget amendment and state our intent to reimburse ourselves with bonds when that time comes. And those bonds could either be voter approved bonds or

certificates of application. That would not need to be absolutely determined on the 14th. I think for staff to comply with this resolution we would want to come back at your very next meeting with some set of those actions so that we can start working on this. >> Alter: That was a lot of information. >> It is a lot. >> Alter: That's a lot of money. I'm trying to get my head around this. I'd like to get to a permanent solution, but I don't know what we have to spend on what. I mean, there's no -- there's so many unknowns here that we need a little bit of time for this to marinate and get us to a permanent solution without knowing what these fiscal ramifications are. This is kind of challenging. >> Maybe the ramifications for the fiscal year '19 budget is funding 30 firefighters for nine months. The annual cost of a fire complement company is 1.9 million. So for two it would be 3.8 million. Take three-quarters of that if we only need it for nine months in the first year, but the annual amount would be 8-point nine million dollars annually. And \$2.4 million from our reserves in order to move forward with some version of a temporary station. And those would be funds that would be dedicated in the fy19 budget that

[11:55:00 AM]

wouldn't be able for other priorities. But that's kind of the short version of I think the financial decision before you. >> Alter: Is there any way we can get some of that in writing to understand kind of what -- I mean, it's a lot of numbers to absorb and, you know, I'd like to see some of that in writing if we can so we understand what choices we would be making by setting this in motion. Again, I'd like to see us do a permanent solution, but we also have to understand what the fiscal ramifications are. And does this even cover ems for these temporary stations or is this just fire? >> I can speak to that. It does not cover ems. This resolution is aimed at getting fire response. However, with the fire department you do get a first responder that is going to deliver medical service. Ems is included in all the permanent facilities, so the ongoing cost for the ems would be included with that. In the temporary station it's not, it's fire only. The other point we wanted to make is we envision that a potential use of these temporary stations could be beyond these first two, they would give us the ability as a city to respond to an area of need with a temporary station. So these could be rolled over to leap frog, if we cannot get the permanent stations in a sequential line of a short enough time frame, to meet council's direction, we could roll these temporary stations over to those other areas to start delivering service in those areas sooner while these stations are being built. So we see this as a leap frog potentially as we move forward over the next, you know, 10 years. >> Alter: But it doesn't include ems, but if you just look at the numbers for del valle, 73% of the incidents are medical. >> But remember the fire department is also -- the first responders will be responding. They'll be receiving medical service delivery. >> Alter: Again, we come

[11:57:01 AM]

back to this question of delivery of fire versus medical that we've been seeing about what is the public safety need. And that's a broader question than for today, but it does relate to are we providing the infrastructure that is needed to address the public safety problems that we're actually facing in those areas? And I'm not seeing those questions answered here. We've included the iso rating now into the

ranking of the stations. There's a lot of things here that are not particularly -- >> Councilmember, remember, the isoranking, that just shifted the ranking in priority. It didn't identify new sites around the city. The same five areas that we identified that need additional response relief are still the same five areas. So it just shifted the priority between one section of town and another. >> I'm aware of that, thank >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Garza. >> Garza: Yeah, I would disagree the information isn't there. We do know. I appreciate the concern that it's not in front of us so if staff could provide what those numbers are. I know temporary stations are 1 million to 2 million, I also know it's 1.8 million for 15 ftes and double that for 30, I'm sorry. We know that there's funding available through cos. There's a funding stream available. There's a funding stream available for the temp stations. That'sy offered the two slides that show either you can use reserve money, use that bucket, and then I offered the bond money. Those are two different buckets. It wasn't both. My point was there is available funding through different buckets to fund the temporary -- the temp stations. Firefighters are first responders for medical issues. They are the first ones that start getting cpr. Research shows the quicker you get someone doing cpr, the higher likely someone will survive and firefighters are the first

[11:59:02 AM]

ones to start doing that, to provide ventilations, to provide for auto accidents, to provide safety not only for the scene but to package the patient, to get the patient ready as soon as the ambulance gets there, they're available to put them on there. So it's not just about fire response. If we have -- if we don't agree with how our isr ratings are, regardless of, that folks are receiving higher insurance bills and it's based on the distance from the house to the fire stations. It's not the response time. So regardless if we include signalization that helps the fire station -- the fire truck get 6 miles from the fire station there, it doesn't matter. The ratings are based on the distance from the house to the -- to the fire station. So signalization is irrelevant to this issue. I know there's a lot of information. I know I know a lot of the information because I've been in the thick of it but really, you know, at the -- it is a large amount. It is a huge investment. I absolutely agree. But at the very basic level, a city should provide public safety resources. At the very basic and we go above and beyond that. We go above and beyond providing wonderful things like paid sick leave and, you know, parks funding and all kinds of fund we go above and beyond but at a basic level we should be able to provide this. That's why it is so much of our budget. That's why it's almost 70% of our budget because it is a labor-intensive, expensive thing. But when you're on the other side of that 911 call and waiting for that fire truck or whatever to get there, that's -- you know, I guess I hope you look at that perspective. When -- and if constituents in your district were facing this increase in their insurance premium. I'm glad that you appreciate

[12:01:03 PM]

it, councilmember alter. I want to offer my constituents more than an appreciation for the fact that they are receiving higher insurance premiums. >> Kitchen: Mr. Mayor. >> Mayor Adler: Manager, for me, and Ms. Houston and then Ms. Kitchen. For me on this, I continue to find very compelling the fact that -- of

the functions the city needs to provide this is basic and core and it does point out the expense to the city generally of sprawl when we have people that are further away from the institutions we have 37 it's just expensive to porter that but it's happening so I find very compelling that. But I do want to make sure when we take this action we're doing it with very open eyes, we understand what it is that we're doing. I support going to the cos to be able to do those stations and taking it off that and would support that. But we are talking about additional \$4 million a year for staffing, and I don't remember how much money there was extra on the budget forecast but this probably exhausts what it was that we had in the forecast, that is the discretionary spending. And it seems to me that if we were going to exhaust the discretionary spending this might be something we want to exhaust it on. But we also have the strategic planning work that was done from the council, which also addressed taking a look at programs we were doing that maybe we shouldn't be continuing to do, legacy programs that made sense 20 carriers ago that we don't necessarily need to do. But whatever it is, I think that going to what councilmember alter said -- and while I find very compelling, think it's a priority and would imagine voting at the very least for the permit and would like to see that sped up and the additional staffing associated with that, I think we need to understand what the ramifications are, how much money we have identified, is this going to take all of that? Where does this money come from? What impact is this going to have on the other things that council has indicated they have a desire to spend money on so that when we take this action we understand what it is that we're doing.

[12:03:05 PM]

Ms. Houston, and then Ms. Kitchen. >> Houston: Thank you. This is a question because I don't have a map in front of me. So what are the emergency service districts? Are there any close to the two areas where you're looking at that could offer aid? Do we have mutual aid agreements with them? >> We do. We have agreements with all of them but they do not address this need. They are factored in when we talk about response to it. So in the esd11 -- >> Houston: Where is Morris cross? >> I'm sorry, southeast, out in the del valle area. And esd11 is one that borders out there. From their stations they do not provide leaf, cannot get there any faster than we can so they can't serve to meet this requirement. >> Houston: You probably have told us this in the past. How do you decide -- how do you determine the response time? I mean, is there something in from the time you get the call to the time -- who captures that data? >> Dispatch, the cad system, and then we analyze the data, from the time the fire dispatcher gets the call to the time our first unit arrives on scene, the eight-minute mark 90% of the time. >> Houston: Okay. You all made that 8-minute mark? >> That's a national standard. >> Houston: That's what I needed to know. Councilmember, I certainly understand your frustration and the frustration of the people who are having to pay exorbitant insurance rates. For me it's about where -- the ongoing staffing for the money. I can understand cos and I can understand bonds and all that but it's the staffing issue and how much is that going to cost on an ongoing basis, and you're going to get us that information. I mean, I'm heard you talk about in roundabout numbers that it would cost 3.8 million for staff for nine months. What is that for a 12-month period? And that's ongoing. I mean, that doesn't stop.

[12:05:05 PM]

So I think -- >> I can summarize any verbal comments in writing, just knowing that, you know, the specific details if this were to move forward and staff were to come back on June 14, the specifics may look a little different by June 14, as I get more information, but I can certainly summarize the big picture in a memo to you all this afternoon. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Kitchen. >> Kitchen: I would also just go back and reiterate that what's before us is not a question of whether or not there's a need in these five areas. That's already been identified and it was identified years ago, and we took action on it years ago, which is what councilmember Garza is speaking to. So it's not a question of whether we need these five. And also im-- I'm making note of the fact that these are identified as five areas of immediate need, as councilmember Garza said before. So immediate need now has been, you know, a long time for immediate need. So I think that it's -- it is -- while it is true that we do need to consider the cost and all the details related to that and we do need to consider our other priorities, as we always do, the bottom line is this is one of our infrastructure needs that has been identified for a long time and it's one of our public safety infrastructure needs. So I don't want to -- to me it's not part of the conversation to go back and say do we need these five or not. We do. The question is how do we get from here to there now in a most expeditious way. So I appreciate councilmember Garza bringing forward a temporary solution as one way as you said before, if we could find a path to moving much more quickly with permanent or maybe it's a combination of permanent and temporary, then that might be the way to go. But I just want to reiterate, to my mind, we already established the need. That's not the question in front of us.

[12:07:06 PM]

>> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Flannigan and then councilmember Casar. >> Flannigan: Yeah. I just wanted to make sure that it's clear that the amendment I'm bringing is not about the iso issue. It's just about that map moving forward. I also find that a very compelling argument. And also another unintended consequence of very aggressive annexation as you get into these sprawl areas and you have to build fire stations and when you see the annexation report when fire council made those decision it's didn't say we were going to have to build fire stations in future and here we are, again, faced with those situations. So I intend to support this on Thursday, and, I mean, I agree with councilmember alter that we want to make sure all the numbers are worked out. But it is, I think, time to do things when it comes to this issue and the impact on your constituents, councilmember Garza, and others that may be facing this insurance issue is something we can't ignore. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Casar. >> Casar: Yeah. I also, you know -- putting myself in your insures, councilmember Garza -- your shoes, independent this is the kind of thing I myself would be advocating for and doing so I appreciate you bringing the issue up. I hope between now and Thursday the manager can look at if there are ways for us to build permanent fire stations more quickly so if we are using cos we use it as effectively as possible because I would hate for us to spend on a temporary station and then a permanent station right afterwards just because we you can't figure out how to get our own permits from ourselves quickly enough. And I have heard the potential argument that if we get temporary stations that are mobile we could move those around, but if really we have the ability to put capital down and do a permanent station and that's our preferred way of doing it and we've done it before, it just seems like a more sustainable path for us so that we're staffing a fire

[12:09:08 PM]

station that's permanent because we aren't getting stuck in our own permitting process for multiple years. So I'll -- you know, I have taken meetings with staff or with many of my colleagues about this this yet but if there's a way for us to just put in a permanent fire station where we already have the land I would urge we try our best to do that. It sounds like from councilmember Garza's comments that that's something that is a potential for you. It's just that waiting two or three years to do that is not acceptable. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember Renteria. >> Renteria: I am also going to be supporting this resolution here. You know, having -- I have to go down every Sunday over to 814 where our church is located at. You know, I've seen all the development that's going on out there. It's just amazing how many homes are being built all around Morris crossing, all in that area. I mean, it's just a big boom. A lot of people just cannot afford the prices and now they're having to move out there. And there's a big community out there. So we need to provide those kind of service, you know, and it's really urgent, you know, because a lot of these homes are more -- they're smaller lots now, and they're -- the homes are very close to each other. So I hope that we could find a way to really get this on the fast track. >> Mayor Adler: Great. >> Mayor, quickly. >> Mayor Adler: Go ahead. >> With me, my cosponsors and councilmembers Flannigan, Renteria, and pool, I believe that makes six, seven if councilmember troxclair was here so I appreciate that. I'd love to move those of you who have not been counted on the yes side and just remind, as I'm sure

[12:11:08 PM]

we're all aware, that budget time it's not an additional -- if we did 15 and it was a 3.9 -- or three point something, close to 4 million, it's not like -- I'm sure you all know it's not like we're moving something. We get additional revenue. We have additional money when we get a proposed budget. We're not using the exact same money we had last year. I just want to remind folks we have extra money in the budget. It is a large -- a big ticket item. But it is a need, a basic need, and so I look forward to the conversations in the coming days to see if we can get -- if I can get, you know, more than six, but I appreciate those supporting it now. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's go on to the next item. Thank you, guys, very much. Mr. Flannigan, you pulled item 3. >> Flannigan: Right. I wanted to get a sense if this was something we expected substantial debate on. I have some issues with some of the whereas clauses I'm willing to bring an amendment but if we don't think that's what's going to happen then I'm not going to waste everybody's time with it. If it's possible to get a sense if we really want to dig into the details on this item or if we expect to not to have to do that. I know it's kind of an awkward question to ask in work session. >> Houston: Yeah. I'm not sure exactly what you're asking. >> Flannigan: So if it's gonna fail anyway because the votes aren't there I'm not going to bring a bunch of millimeters. But if we think -- bunch of amendments. But if we think it might pass I've got changes to the whereases that I might prefer. >> Houston: I'm a pollyanna person, I think it's gonna pass so why don't you go ahead and talk about the amendments that you plan to bring forward. >> Flannigan: I'm happy to do that. Happy to do that. So --

>> Houston: Are you going to post them? >> Flannigan: I'm happy to post them on the message board but I can daylight

[12:13:08 PM]

this very quickly. Part of the whereas where it references the city charter, I think it leaves out a little bit of detail there, it leaves out additional conflicts that I think exist in the ordinance language. The whereases I think are to the -- they say that we're doing repeal and replace but we're not doing repeal and replace so I'd want to change where those phrases are desisting. That's primarily my issue. So I'm happy to post those amendments to the message board for y'all to review before Thursday if we want to go down that road. >> Houston: I would appreciate that. >> Flannigan: Sure thing. >> Mayor Adler: That would be good. >> Houston: For the public as well. >> Mayor Adler: Councilmember pool. >> Pool: And maybe our staff could let us know if we are repealing and replacing. Maybe you could respond on the -- by memo or something. >> Flannigan: Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> Pool: If you can't today, that would be fine. My understanding is we are -- it's a comprehensive rewrite and the whole thing is going to be replaced and whether we specifically repeal it to replace it, the end result is the same. >> Flannigan: Mayor? >> Mayor Adler: Yes. >> Flannigan: I think -- but just to preempt staff response on that, for as long as there is a single f25 zone on the map, we are not actually repealing anything. All of the code still exists. As we know it's a plurality of the Zones are f25 so we're not actually repealing section 2569 code. It will exist as long as those f25 Zones exist so there's actually no repeal happening. I would love to do that and if you're in support of that I would be 100% behind you of removing all the F25s but I don't think that's what we're doing. >> Pool: Is the f25 chapter, is that the zoning piece? >> Brett Lloyd, assistantstone. I'm not prepared to speak to

[12:15:09 PM]

this item in depth but to a few of the logical questions, first off, it is a comprehensive revision and the current land development code is not being repealed. It will be there in the background and it's something that could come up not only in declaration with f25 but in connection with other older agreements or certain enactments that are dependent upon the continued use of the current land development code. And then to the other question, f25 is a new zoning district. It's not -- the city -- the new zoning -- the new zoning map does not retain title 25 zoning districts, per se, but f25 is a new district and the text that accompanies that district just sort of incorporates by reference whatever zoning regulations existed prior to the adoption of codenext. That's fundamentally how f25 works. But in I think working on -- working on the zoning map and working with our consultants and looking at how other cities around the country have, you know, both adopted a new zoning map but at the same time preserved areas where there's been a lot of negotiation and there's been very specialized enactments, that's the general trend, is you don't want to retain your old zoning nomenclature so you have piecemeal of new districts and old districts so there's sort of a catch-all category that is sort of preserving the status quo, but fundamentally it is a new zoning district. >> Pool: Thanks. >> Mayor Adler:

Okay. Ms. Houston. >> Houston: Mr. Guernsey, before you leave, of course I have not memorized all 1400 pages, so with f25 districts, where are the majority of those properties located on the map? >> They're -- Greg Guernsey, planning and zoning. They're scattered throughout

[12:17:09 PM]

the city, representing about 24, 25 in the city, those things you might be familiar, with planning and developments, land development agreements, nccds, neighborhood concentration combining districts, certain conditional overlays that might be attached to individual zoning cases which are very specific and maybe would not be common to language you might find in new code. They would go beyond setbacks and uses and heights and might be talking about access and physical appears of structures. D. >> Houston: That include compatibility standards, design standards? >> For those properties that lie within the areas designated at f25, if it's adopted, they would operate under the rules, under zoning rules that exist in the prior code. Yes, they would operate under the current compatibility standards, and those areas that are outside of f25 would operate under the new compatibility standards. >> Houston: Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Let's move on to the next thing. >> Houston: Before we move on to the next thing, mayor, I would like to see if we can set a time certain to have this conversation if -- before noon. >> Mayor Adler: Before noon? >> Houston: Before noon. >> Mayor Adler: Let's see if we can get there. >> Houston: Okay. >> Mayor Adler: Mr. Flannigan, next item? Item number 38. >> Flannigan: All right. There is one more. This one is simple. I'm just going to bring two things, one amendments just to broaden the language that references counties to make sure we're being fully inclusive. One of the whereas clauses even acknowledges some of this data doesn't exist in other counties that contain city jurisdiction. I wanted to call that out. Mover as a question to the

[12:19:10 PM]

sponsors, the resolution seems to focus pretty heavily on music, the music industry. This seems to affect the high school kids in my district so I want to make sure we're including that in the direction to the staff. >> Mayor Adler: I think the intent was to make it broadly. It original daylighted through the music commission and other work but it's to address that broadly. >> Flannigan: Great. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston. >> Houston: She had -- >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: Thank you. Yeah, thanks to the mayor for bringing this forward. And I'm a cosponsor and I appreciate the broadness of it but I did want to just say -- I know we're not directing the city manager to take specific action but one of the recommendations I'm really interested in the city manager considering is something that other cities have done, Denver and San Francisco and some -- now some places in New York have [indiscernible] Available and have trained librarians in their facilities. I attended a Denver -- summit of downtown associations in Denver, and there was a presentation from the Denver -- from someone associated with the Denver librarians so I'm going to look and see if I can find the stats before Thursday but let me say they have trained their librarians. They're using it and have saved lives as a result. I don't know to what extent our librarians have been experiencing overdoses. I think at this point we haven't

been, and that's a wonderful thing, but I did think in particular -- I do think in particular we should look at our librarians. I wanted to call my colleagues' attention to the memo that we received from our city attorney this week or last week. I think all the council received it, possibly not. Anyway there's a very relevant attorney-client memo that maybe was shared with individuals -- I think I'll let her describe who

[12:21:10 PM]

received it. Anyway, it's relevant to this question and relevant to the issue and I would just suggest that if everybody hasn't received it that that become available for our council. >> I'll make sure we circulate it. I think it was for the downtown Austin community core. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. Ms. Houston. >> Houston: Let me think. I forgot what I was going to say. >> Mayor Adler: Opioid? Librarians. >> Houston: Yes. The other place I think it would be important to have would be at the arch, if they don't already have it at the arch. I guess I don't get a feel for what -- I'm one of the cosponsors so I appreciate this being brought forth, mayor, because it's been a problem in our community for a long time. But we got the war on drugs instead of trying to help people stop using drugs. So I'm glad we're addressing that issue. How many actual incidents have we had in the city of Austin? I see citywide -- I mean, Travis county statistics and national statistics, but how many have we actually had in the city of Austin? Opioid deaths. >> Mayor Adler: My understanding is that -- and I don't know if this is citywide or just the incidents that are concerning the music-related Sims effort. It's not as many people as are having substance abuse problems generally in the community. It's not as many people who have alcohol abuse dependency issues in the community. But going from 2016 to 2017, we see a 5-fold increase so it's the acceleration of the moment and we know that in other cities around the country it's become their number 1 public health issue. So it gives us here in the city and surrounding areas

[12:23:11 PM]

the ability to really target this before it really gets out of hand and to set up the institutions, maybe things like the librarians, so that we can -- we're better positioned maybe than some other cities have been. Best as I can tell it's the fastest-growing public health challenge I'm aware of that we're facing. >> Houston: Are we partnering with our school districts around the area to ensure that they're included in this if we've got young folks -- and I don't know what the age range. You may know, Ms. Hayden, whether or not we've got young folks who are beginning this process that we need to intervene before they -- >> Mayor Adler: And this resolution isn't prescribing anything like that. It's going to manager and saying tell us what we need to do and I would certainly hope they would come back with all the community partners we need to be working with, including suggestions like the one the mayor pro tem made that sound interesting to me as well. So we just identified the issue, problem, challenge, say we want to address this, asked the manager to tell us how best we should do that to be proactive. >> Houston: The only way I can do all of that is to have that conversation here, like the arch and school districts. >> Mayor Adler: Right. And on Thursday as well. Any other questions on this? Okay. All right. Thank you very much. Colleagues, the last thing that we have is the codenext discussion. It is 12:25. We

have some executive session I'm sorry. I would suggest one of two courses of action. Either we ask staff to give us the presentation so we receive the presentation, don't discuss it, then we go into executive session and then we come back out to discuss codenext. Or we break for executive session now and then come out and get the presentation and the discussion? Yes, councilmember kitchen. >> Kitchen: My preference would be to go ahead and break because I think it would be useful to have the

[12:25:14 PM]

discussion right at the time we get the presentation. I think if we have a break between the presentation and the discussion we're going to -- we're either going to forget -- it's not we're going to forget but we don't have them together and I think it would be good to do them at once. >> Mayor Adler: Anyone feel differently? Mayor pro tem. >> Tovo: I don't feel different LI. I wanted to remind everyone I have a hard stop at just about 3:00 and I hope -- I would ask if we could try to get through executive session in time. I sure want to have that conversation with you all and if not I hope we'll have another opportunity. I think we're posted for discussion on Thursday so at least maybe we can make space to follow up with it on Thursday. >> Mayor Adler: I want anticipate probably discussing this issue both days. But let's make sure that we fly through executive session. Let's do that. So we're now gog into closed session to take up items pursuant to 551.071 of the government code related to e2, November 2018 election, and e3, Austin country club versus city of Austin e1 and e4 withdrawn. I guess e4 do we discuss that Thursday? We're going to discuss e4 on Thursday. Without objection we're now going to into executive session. It is 12:28. [Executive session]

[2:01:06 PM]

..

[2:20:04 PM]

Hi, we have a quorum in the room. We're at closed session and closed session we discussed legal matters related to items e2 and e3. It's 2:20. We're back in the room. We're going to loose mayor pro tem at 3:00. So let's see how far we can get by 3:00. We have Thursday to discuss this issue. As well. If staff will make your presentation. Cover what you need to cover. >> Sure this is a short presentation. Good afternoon. City manager's office. With me is Jerry rusthoven. Assistant director. Brent Lloyd is here as well as some staff from consultant team as you are aware the commission is working through review of draft 3 of codenext. In tact they are meeting right next door. According to the planning commission chair they anticipate to be completed with their work this week. Next week there's two council hearings one on Tuesday and the following Saturday. Ahead of those hearings at your April 26th meeting council passed resolution setting public hearings. As you get that your deliberations and voting on codenext.

Staff set item 22 on this week's agenda as a place holder for council should you decide to establish a similar set of procedures for deliberations in voting. Jerry will go over some of those voting options. What we like to get out of this discussion is really, does council want to Vey set of guidelines to establish

[2:22:05 PM]

parameters for these meetings and if there is interest what would those guidelines look like. With that, Jerry can you walk us through? >> Sure. I'm Jerry rust however with the planning zoning department. The first we want to discuss is dates. Council dates. First we want to talk about options for the deliberation sessions and next discussions options on voting process and then highlight wreefly some things we would anticipate doing post adoption if codenext were to pass. With regard to dates we have two dates set by city council. We build up post cards to every resident and renter in the city of Austin. Those public hearing dates for city council are Tuesday, may 29th a week from today. 10:00 A.M. Here in the council chambers and one Saturday June 2nd in the council chambers at 10:00 A.M. The process for that has been set by council action. The dates that we have been discussing with various council offices availability of council members and two dates that we have right now for deliberation S on code next, we don't anticipate actual voting. Just to have discussions and get your questions answered, et cetera. Will be on June 5th, a Tuesday, and June 12th. The important thing to note about June 12th you do have a regularly scheduled council work session for the June 14th meeting that day. It would be up to council whether they want to work on codenext that whole day or for only the remainder of whatever is left after the work session concludes. Anticipated dates for first reading would be Wednesday, June 13th and Thursday June 21st. These are the dates which everybody is available and I'm still working with council

[2:24:05 PM]

member troxclair to check on her availability. We need to know if those dates worth with the city council or not. >> I have a question. >> Mayor Adler: Do you want to keep going in the presentation? >> Maybe we should keep going. Mayor pro tem has to leave. That will give her time. >> With regard to deliberation, some options we were looking at two days of deliberations and discussions. And in the schedule I laid out for you that would be a day and a half right now or a day and whatever is left over from the work session. We were considering, or actually I'm not saying considering. These were options thrown out for the city council. One would be limit deliberation time per topic that we have variety of topics that everyone cares deeply about. If we talk about them too long we won't get to the rest of them. The idea is time limit ourselves and talk about this topic for that long. The question is, when we start the discussion do we want to start the order laid out in codenext or would you prefer to discuss it on a topic basis a big broader topic basis in which case we jump around in the code or go in order that is already laid out? Staff could also work with city council on preparing a list of suggested topics that we would discuss. Staff has considered that a little bit and what we were considering was that we move through a process whereby we talk about a topic, how that topic aligns in city goals and policies such as

imagine Austin. And other adopted policies where there seems to be general consensus in areas within that topic and also areas where there is not and we discuss what the planning commission did with regard to that particular topic. And then, have the discussion move forward from there with the city council. Another thing that's been discussed with regard to the deliberation sessions is if council members have amendments they know they'll be making. When they get to the voting

[2:26:06 PM]

stage, they let those be known so everybody would have as much head's up as possible so a particular amendment regarding a certain topic was going to come up when the voting actually occurred. When we actually get to the voting and we contemplated first reading as being the possibility here of course. We have to start with a main motion and the question would be what would that main motion be would it be planning commission recommendation, if it were staff recommendation we ask you include the addendum and air rat that we've been working on since draft 3 came out. Or, you can start with the planning commission recommendation. Then after that, we anticipate there being a variety of amendments. With regard to amendments, we think it would be best to come up with a form, if you will. That you guys would fill out prior to. An amendment being considered. That sheet could lay out things such as who is the maker. What is the topic, what is the session number that is amended and possibly a link to the council message board because I think there would be a desire to have amendments posted so everybody could read the language. Before we get to that, though, however, one question that's still out there, is whether amendments would be required to be laid out in advance. Whether would be just stated that it was very desirable to be laid out in advance but not actually required. If they were required to be laid out in advance however in advance would they need to be laid out. A day, two days, longer than that? That's something council needs to consider. Again we think it's best for everybody if possible for all amendments to be uploaded to the message board. At one point we're considering a separate codenext but we're

[2:28:06 PM]

told that's not possible. We have to stick with the message board council has. Committing the amendment benefits the public and allows them to read the exact language. It benefits the other city council members for the same reason. It's also important to the staff because we have a chance -- we anticipate being asked what does the staff think of this amendment and by everything it ahead of time allows us to look at it, analyze it and give our recommendation. We anticipate members have questions related to the same topic coming from two council members who didn't know the other one was doing the same thing. If we get amendments ahead of time staff can look at these amendments and bundle them if you will so when we're considering amendments maybe we consider all of the Adu amendments at one time or parking amendments at one time so we can be more efficient. One big question whether we start with the text of codenext or start with the map. It's important to start with the text. The map is based upon the text of course. You don't want to do the map, because then skru to

do the map all over again. Similar to the issue of the deliberations. When we're doing amendments are we going to do amendments by topic or chapter, in order that they already exist in codenext. That is the question that we need to get resolved by the council. Another thing, that we have discussed. Has been the issue of allowing each council member the opportunity to make amendments so that there's a fairness issue. I guess involved. One idea would be to actually allow each council member to make an amendment that you then have the discussion, the vote and then move on down the dais so everybody has an equal chance to offer amendments. . As of a couple of hours ago,

[2:30:08 PM]

there were three public hearings with the zoning planning commission, so one thing we as staff would discourage would be a lot of council members calling up members of the public to make statements or discuss and amendment. We understand you guys want to hear from constituents who may be out in the audience, we also feel if we have if they want to speak in favor. We will call three people who want to give comments on the amendment and it would be difficult if we had a lot of post public hearing input from the dais. Also, we are considering that the complexity of the amendments I think will come into play here as well. Codenext can be a very technical. Very complex topic in and of itself. We talk about amendment to that amendment that we may lose track of what we're voting on so one idea might be to actually keep amendments as simple as possible ab you might have more votes and you can also keep better track of what we're voting on for clarity of both coupe sill and public. We also, staff ask that we actually make a clear distinction this time between a directions for the city's staff to go out and do further research or come up with alternatives versus an actual vote on an amendment, so sometimes in zoning cases we have a simple direction. Can you get accident data for an intersection near a zoning case. Yeah, sure we can do that. What we can't afford. Staff will have a lot of work to come back for a second reading, coming up with language, et cetera. So what we can't afford to have is to have a council member from the dais saying, staff can

[2:32:09 PM]

you come up with three alternative zoning maps beyond the one you presented and another comes up and says I need three maps to do the exact opposite thing than what that one said and we have individual members to do stuff that could take months or years. In this case we're asking you to refrain from doing that. Also another idea has come up in my discussions had been the concept there's issues that come up after discussing codenext that are valid community issues that may not be directly impacted. Codenext does not address those issue, so you may have a topic that the council says this is what we've been hearing as we discuss in codenext. This is something the community cares about. This is something I care about and you may hear from us saying we care too but that's not a land development code issue. To make sure those things don't get kind of lost that we actually as we're going through this record those issue, and prepare a certain document these are things council discussed and they still want to work on. They are not a bard of a code like codenext. The planning commission meet

something across the hall as we speak. I want you to know how they are doing it. They are going into great detail. They have created whereby they presuspended their amendments. Chair created a website. The commissioners presented their amendments ahead of time. They've been compiled into a single spread sheet. What happens you have a commissioner making a motion for an amendment if that gets a second. Three commissioners have been are in favor. Three speak for a minute apiece. And then there's a vote in the amendment. They created a system where they are self timing themselves. This is FYI. It's rather efficient.

[2:34:09 PM]

They've been blowing through hundreds upon hundreds of amendments and are doing it right now to go see it. I want to throw this out there as an idea. This is how planning commission is handling it. Finally, one idea we've discussed the map amendment process. The idea is map amendments will be many. Sometimes they are rather detailed and minute in the bigger picture of things. One thing, each council member can look at properties within their district. They, would like to see the zoning in draft three. That they then take those recommendations, from each council all ten council members. From the districts. These are then uploaded to a web page and other council members as well as staff could look at proposed amendments and council many could say that particular property is a property I would like to discuss more. But the other two dozen, properties that are proposed. That the council member wants to change in that district I'm fine with and other members fine with. We can create a process whereby council members can probe changes within their district. Everybody has a chance to look at them, but then if there were no disagreement about them, we could vote on those all at one time like you vote on zoning agenda. So you would not have to go parcel by parcel. District by district. Voting on changes that may be in the big picture, other people, other council members do not care about? That's one idea I try to do when it comes to the map. The text is parcel by parcel

[2:36:11 PM]

level. That's more difficult to discuss individually. We got to post adoption presuming codenext were to pass, the staff, I want to make it real clear has been discussing already an adoption period that would be a minimum of six months after the code were adopted. We do have a lot of work to do after it's adopted. We have to retool what is known as Amanda our database. Which is the code, I would have to totally reconfigure it. We have to embark on testing of the code, using outside city resources to try to come to us and try to look for a possible conflicts within the code that maybe we didn't realize as we're going through the process of creating it and opportunity to fix those issues before it actually takes effect so they hopefully would not affect people in the real world. We also ask the council to approve an idea that Mr. Lloyd had here was to open -- I know this doesn't sound right, but immediately after passage, open the code amendment process to code next. The idea we know there's going to be some typos, inadvertent thinks in the code that we didn't notice as we go Lou this process. Instead of coming back to council and say can we get permission to fix some of these mistakes or errors we acknowledge right

off the bat we'll start working on that right away so we can start compiling a list of those things and come back to ask them to have them fixed without coming back to ask for permission to have emthem fixed. So we acknowledge immediately start whatever tweaking we'll do. And this is a major change. It will take time for everyone to be brought up to speed on it. We do our outreach to the public and let them though it's not something we're talking about anymore. This is the new law of the land and here's how it affects you and new processes, et cetera.

[2:38:14 PM]

And we have viral at criteria manual, et cetera, that have to be retooled in order to reflect codenext. So these are things we would be working on in a post codenext world. So, with that, if you have questions. I reiterate what Joe said, one of the most important things today is to, if the council wants to vote on an item on Thursday, like I said e-they have a place holder. There is no backup, no document associated with it. I have provided this document to you all. On the dais. Simply the effect of the slides I went through. Just so we have a refurber, we discuss that now. If council doesn't want to take action Thursday and set specific rules as opposed to broader guidelines, if you will. Then the staff needs time tomorrow frankly to put that together for a Thursday vote. We need to know whether you need us to prepare something for Thursday. Thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. I want to go first. >> Before you go it's another subject and I have to leave, I'm sorry. Item 35 the community asked for a 6:30 time certain. I -- but I will let them know that it appears there's six votes and possibly, my understanding the mayor is willing to sign as as a co-sponsor so possibly seven with them understanding that I will ask if they are okay not having a time certain, because it seems like it will pass, but I just wanted to please mention that I tried to convince them 10:00, sorry, they -- they won't need that but I have to go. [Lost audio] >> Mayor Adler: And please, if you continue your work with the manager on some of the -- some issues that were raised, possible work-through, still some concern about the budget, conversations with interim permits, so please stay engaged

[2:40:15 PM]

with the manager on that. Thank you. All right. On codenext. Obviously, I'm not sure in my almost four years on here, we've had an issue that is dividing the community as visibly or emphatically as this one seems to be. And I say that with also the belief that there is really strong consensus among us, and probably within the community as I go around the community, as to what it is that we're trying to accomplish with the rewrite of the development code as well as consensus that we need to rewrite the development code. Obviously a difference in opinions as to the path we follow or how we do that. So, I'm sure we have all been kind of racking our brains to figure out how when this comes to us we can be most constructive to the process and in a perfect world we come up with something that actually brings the community together. Because this is a remarkable place. I still believe that's within our capacity as a community to do that. I have been impressed on the times we have begun deliberations on issues here at the dais, the degree to which I have sensed consensus on issues. When we started talking about how

we would apply affordability or how we would do different things, I was again encouraged with that, when Alison and Ann and I sat down to come up with policy kind of statements that we published, that also seemed to have support beyond the dais for those kind of statements,

[2:42:15 PM]

and I keep thinking about where we have been our best selves as a council on things that we anticipate would be really widely divisive, and I think the process we went through with Steve and strategic planning exercise, where we were able to work through a process and sit down and discuss issues and actually come up with something that worked. So, I know each of us had been talking and part of the problem with one of the inherent challenges of being on the council, we all can't talk to each other before we get to the day yarks so a lot of what happens here, we're thinking out loud and we can't talk to each other before we get here. I know there have been conversations going on. So I want to share a conversation that was going on with me and Ann and Greg as one possible way to look at June, and then, give a chance to quickly comment on it and hear what other ideas people have, thinking that on Thursday, we actually sit down and really talk through the options. But one idea we would like the dais to consider, is thinking about June, as an opportunity, not to be spending our time and our efforts, trying to win close votes. How we can figure out how to win close votes but rather using June to find where we have the opportunities for consensus. And if we spend June that way, I think that that would enable us to be furthest along and learn the most about where this process would go. To be specific, I think it's really important that as a council we get into the thorniest, hairiest issues and we discuss them together as a council. So that we can either give,

[2:44:17 PM]

either approved language or more probably provide direction. And that we are in constant search for an 8-3 or eight-vote group that can agree on something in a particular area. That we identify the 10, 15, whatever it is, issues, that are perhaps untettled. The hardest ones and go through each one much those issue, and we see whether or not, looking at the work the planning commission did. The work other people have done, where we come from and people we talked to and we see if we can get eight votes on a specific answer to a specific question, as part of those issues, and if we can't, then we start trying to see if there's a range we fall on that issue and start working on that to see where it is we pick up eight people and we bookmark that and we go on to a differ issue. And we spend the month of June collectively as a group trying to work with each other, not to win again close votes not to put people through that, not parsing, language, onon line by line attempts to the cog, but let's pick up the issues and let's see where we can drive to consensus. I think it's really important the work that planning commission is doing and I think we need them to finish that work, because they are pointing out to us, in some instances where there is consensus and they are able to reach some pretty interesting consensus points but they are also pointing out to us where there is not consensus, as well as some arguments on both sides of

[2:46:19 PM]

those or as many sides as there are where there is not consensus. It is really important they finish this work even with the conversation they're everything on the dais as council and because that's incredibly valuable stuff. We don't decide right now, whether we'll vote on first reading at the end of June or not because we don't know the answer to that question. Let's spend June trying to work with each other, and we can make that call toward the end of June as we see how that process goes. I see the dates that you have set up. I would have us suggest -- we would suggest that on Thursday, one, we post ideas on the board, on Thursday, we try to come up with what that issue list might be. People might post things. And that we -- that we start in discussing those issues. You help us understand, what you recommended, where planning commission is, help us under what the issues are. Consultants help us understand the issues and let us try to work through those issues and see where the eight vote place is on those things. But as a process where we're focused, not so much on winning votes as trying to find -- to discuss and learn and try to find a place where we have consensus. Ann, you want to -- >> Thank you, mayor. I think you did a good job of laying out my thinking on that, and I would say that I agree with the way that you laid all of that out and I would emphasize, I think that this moves the ball forward. I know there's many in the community, all of us really, who want to take definitive steps to move the ball forward. To my mind this is very

[2:48:19 PM]

different than the kind of conversations we've had at the work session and it's designed to be specific to find where we have consensus, and as you said, mayor, to be focused on voting to get that consensus defined here, at least eight votes and as opposed to spending our time butting our heads against each other to the detriment of the community with really close votes. It's not time to go there. I think we owe it to ourselves -- actually not ourselves. We owe it to the community to explore where we have consensus and I think there's, as you said, there's more consensus than we may realize. So I like this approach. We MI post -- Jerry, you had mentioned that we will need a document to potentially vote on on Thursday if people are ready, so we may post a document that reflects what the mayor laid out just for purposes of discussion that people can react to and we understand others may do that, too. So that's the points that I wanted to emphasize. >> And I -- in knowing our group, we're clearly going to have to have a lot of delay days of deliberation on code nec and I think that there will eventually certainly be moments where there are 6-5 and 7-4 decisions and I recognize I, myself, will be on either end of the losing end of some of those closer votes but for June, since we have two days of worth of votes, I have to believe and I do think that we have at least two days in us worth of decisions that are 8-3 or 9-2 or unanimous decisions because it's a pretty big code as it's been publicized.

[2:50:21 PM]

There's lots of decision to be made by new year's day. I think seeing the planning commissions work, there have been some really important decisions they've made where they have actually found a lot of consensus, so I'd like to -- I think the idea of us starting there makes sense. And starting there on hard issues to sort out sort of where the range of the group's opinions are, as much as we can in a context that's really substantive, and related around the code and trying to understand where everybody is coming from. So I don't see this as us kicking the can down the road on our work, but actually just ordering our work, where we're trying to order our work to try to get some consensus stuff done first. Mayor, I do think that might mean sometimes we can't get policy language, because we may not have the consensus on some of that stuff yet. But there very well may be and I'm sure there is, some decent chunk of policy in code next that we could actually have eight, nine, ten, 11 of us comfortable with and feeling good about, so I wouldn't want to preclude our ability to do that, because I do think that they are actually stuff that, once we get into it, we'll recognize that there is consensus on. So, I'm open to doing it like this. I'm also open to just going through the code and taking votes but this ordering, I think, might inspire us to work sort of like we were on some of those strategic sessions in the beginning of what is a challenge -- going to naturally be a challenging process for us to go through. One quick elevation, I want to hear from others. So that might mean on one of these biggest policy issues that we have, that we're not hearing yet in terms of the ability to speak to all of the parameters of it, but we may be able to take a vote on, you

[2:52:21 PM]

know, an 8, 9, 10 vote that gets us closer to what those parameters are and that make take the form of direction to staff. We'll have to see. >> Mayor Adler: Or range of options. >> Or range of options. >> Mayor Adler: To the degree that we could actually agree on language with that, that would be great. To the degree we're saying to the community the eventual solution will be somewhere between these parameters then at least the community hopes it's not going to be here and it's not going to be here. >> So what is intended is really hard work in June but trying to chase 8-3 votes rather than 6-5 votes. Councilman Alder. >> Alder: I appreciate the desire to set us up for success. If that vein I want to take us down to the nitty-gritty of the date. I'm concerned about us having a deliberation on the 12th, first reading on the 13th and council meeting on the 14th and I am wondering if there's a possibility to move the first reading vote from the 13th to the next week sometime, maybe the 19th, because we don't even yet have the planning commission's output, and if we're going to use that to guide, where there is perhaps consensus, I know that I'm going to need some time to figure out how to digest it, may need to have to go back to their deliberations to understand what they were trying to say and I'm concerned about us having time to do that on a week that we will have a council meeting, and doing that, and I don't know if there's a particular reason that we can't do that all in the third week if someone's traveling or what not. If you can think about, if there's a way to work around commitments that might be that

[2:54:22 PM]

third or fourth week. >> Mayor Adler: So, we had talked about not deciding at this point whether there would be a first reading vote in June. That we would start the process and see if we get to that place. So the concept of not having a third reading until -- if we had one, until the very end of June, makes sense to me. And if we're looking at dates, I also note that we're all here on the 26th because that's a work session day and we're all here on the 27th because that's Austin energy day. So I would like for us to at least keep open the possibility that we might want to meet or discuss or vote on this, on the 26th, and/or 27th. Because I think those are also opportunities. So, I agree with what you say. But I even go further than that, to say, let's see if we're in a position to be able to do that. >> Alter: I guess it doesn't matter if we call the June 13th one under first reading votes a first reading or not but in terms of our third meeting, if it's going to be an all-day kind of thing, having that in the middle of a week, we're not going to have a work session for that or we'll have a truncated work session, we have to still vote on the 14th, and if we want to set us up for success and being able to focus, I think it would be easier for all of our schedules if we plotted out the times. That's not to say we can't do a couple hours on the 1th if we need it, but, but -- expecting that we're going to call that a full day's meeting, I think it's unrealistic and I rather relay out some time an additional day the week of the 21st where we have that opportunity. >> Mayor Adler: Maybe one way to do that is look on June 5th. One, for everybody to keep June

[2:56:22 PM]

13th open on their Cal didders to the degree they can and as we get closer on the 5th and we see what happens as we get into that. As we get closer to see if we don't want to meet at all on the 13th or two hours on the 13th, I think we'll have more information and data once we see how the process works. >> Can I just add, I think our staff checked. I think June 21st is the only day that week because people are in and out of town that week. So I think that's why. >> That's correct. I polled every office for availability and the 21st was the only day I could get that. >> And the thought people were out of town, and this he have -- okay. >> Mayor Adler: I don't know the answer to that. I would be available on the 19th and 20th. >> I'm not. But the 26th and 27th, I could be available. >> Mayor Adler: Okay. >> And I don't know if you -- I don't know if staff looked at the next week. >> I did not look at the next week. >> Alter: And then the other thing, without everything the planning commission's output be really helpful to get a sense of what you have in mind as the area's where we might have consensus of that level. I think perhaps the watershed would be one that comes to mind to me, but I would like to get a better sense of what you have in mind and I don't -- I haven't memorized the planning commission's output, so I -- maybe there are a lot of those votes, but I've been hearing more about the 7-6 votes, so I would like to have a sense of the areas where you're anticipating the consensus is there from your reading. >> Mayor Adler: I don't know the answer to that question. I don't want to pre judge that question. Because as a council we haven't had a chance to talk but the first thing we want to do is identify the universe of the tough issues, the parking, and sub questions under those, to agree that there are, and then

[2:58:24 PM]

sit down and start talking. I don't know the answer to that question. I recognize with some agreement the planning commission made with respect to requiring all alcohol uses to be required to actually go through and add minute -- an appeal process. That passed, I think 12-1 or something on the planning commission, so I know that one. And there have been others of those that we should take a look at, but I don't want to infer that necessarily we would be in consensus on that. But I think we try to identify the hardest issues, and then let's get together and see where we can fashion eight votes. >> And I would add my thinking would be the starting point is foot -- not necessarily the -- well, I was trying to respond to her question. Shall I do that, or -- >> Mayor Adler: Let's give Leslie a chance >> Pool: My light's been on since you started talking. A couple of things, and I appreciate the efforts to find consensus, and I think that's a positive thing and we had talked about that previously trying to find the easy step, right? So that's the easy thing. I think. The harder stuff is going to be the areas where there was clear division on both the land use commissions. And let me just take a little sidetrack on this piece and remind everybody that the zoning and platting commission is one of the city's land use commissions. It was separated off from the planning commission by Bettie baker back in like 2000 or 2002. And so to the extent that we only referred to the planning commission, I want to make sure that -- and we did a big deal with a resolution to include them in the recommendations. Now, they have taken a different path in expressing their support or opposition to the various approaches

[3:00:25 PM]

on codenext, but it is no less valuable than the planning commission. And they have put out their opinions on things. And I want to find a way to bring those in and so far I don't hear us talking in terms of zap. They need to have a seat at this table as well because they are a land use commission. So I would ask for that. I would like to see how we pull in the zap recommendations. So that's the first thing. And I recognize that may be a little bit discomforting to some folks, but I think that it's hard to be -- to exclude that body. >> Mayor Adler: And I don't think we would. When we hit an issue, I think getting that input will be a real valuable thing too. >> Pool: Well, they are by resolution supposed to have their recommendations as an addendum just like the planning commission to codenext. So I don't think we have given any different direction to staff. So that should be. >> Mayor Adler: I agree. >> Pool: Good. I just wanted to bring that back up. The second thing is what I'm concerned about with the approach that you guys are taking -- and remember, I actually was one of the people who was actually arguing for having our first reading be later in the month of June. So I'm supportive of that because I think we need the additional time and oxygen to talk about these issues. I worry that we start using up all that time in June on the easy stuff and we don't get to the hard stuff, but then we come back in August and we're going to be doing budget. We've got to set bond election, those packages. There's all the other stuff that we always do in August and the first part of September. And even when we were talking about second and third reading of codenext, that calendar looked pretty difficult. So the only way that worked is if we were taking some of the more difficult issues in June. Now, that's not what I'm hearing you guys say, and so

[3:02:26 PM]

I need to get that exposition out there and have a conversation about that because I don't see how we do that, have the easier stuff and take on the next five weeks for that and then try to shoe horn the really hard stuff in because I think there was real interest by some of my colleagues to have the vote on codenext be complete in the early part of September. Clearly not going into October. And I gather that that has kind of changed so I want to talk about that because in my mind -- I've always kind of argued for take the time we need. Let's not rush a really important conversation, but I didn't get support for that from various quarters at the time I was voicing it and now I find that is actually what people are arguing for. And so I want to understand why this -- why the horizon have changed. >> Mayor Adler: What I've heard most of the people say is they weren't be ready to attack a vote until things were ready. So I've generally heard a consensus in the group going back that we would make sure that we constructed a time frame. >> I would agree with you that everybody wants to take the vote when it's ready and it's the process of getting to ready that was in question. And the issue being how much time do we allow ourselves to have some pretty difficult conversations. >> Mayor Adler: So to that point I think the concept was to tee up, to identify what are the 15 -- I say 15. 2015, 20, -- 10, 20, hardest issues, topics, and make sure that we work through those in June. >> Pool: Okay. That wasn't what you were saying earlier. >> Kitchen: It is what he was saying. >> Pool: You were saying -- okay. >> Mayor Adler: No, no. Take the issues, but then try to find the place that is -- we can get eight votes

[3:04:27 PM]

for. So some of the issues we won't be able to agree on the answer or the language. But -- because we're divided. So the question is how divided are we on that issue? So if we can't get to a specific issue and language, decision and language, let's see if we can come to a decision that would provide direction that would say collectively there are eight of us who think that the answer will be somewhere in this range. That we disagree with each other about where we are on that continuum, but let's figure out where we get to eight votes and we can say it's going to be somewhere in here. That way the community knows it's not going to be outside of that range because there are eight people that are in there. They don't agree yet, but we will have talked through the issue and we will have figured out where that continuum of eight might be. >> Pool: That helps. It was in the context that I think you had addressed that as being the easy step that we would get the eight votes, but you are also saying that that approach would also be on the more difficult policy issues -- >> Mayor Adler: If I said that I was mistaken. I think the goal is to find where there are eight votes, either because it's an individual decision or because we can agree even though we disagree we're all in a continuum with these limits. >> Pool: So I would be supportive of that approach as long as we are taking up the -- we have to do that sorting in June. >> Mayor Adler: I agree. >> Pool: And also try to get -- completely get and have advocated for dispensing with the easy stuff. Local and consent, let's get it out of the way. I don't know how much will be on there, but it will -- there will be hard conversations and difficult deliberations on transition Zones just -- and parking just as -- right off the top, which we have already identified as deep concerns. >> Mayor Adler: We're talking about identifying what are the 10, 15 -- >> >> Pool: Or whatever the

[3:06:27 PM]

number is. >> Mayor Adler: The hardest ones. And let's go straight into them as a council and let's start talking about them and seeing where we are and if there's a place that can pull the community together, if that makes sense. >> Pool: Good. To wrap this piece up for me, that work really has to happen in June because we take -- we then move into focusing on budget. And if we are going to have second and third readings before October or by early October, which was my understanding what was kind of the -- kind of the intent in the informal conversations that we had had, we will have to do the heavy lift in June. >> Mayor Adler: I think that -- I like what staff was proposing. I think we try to do this in June. June is an exercise to try to figure out how we limit limit issues, decide issues if we can and talk about the hardest, thorniest questions, areas that are presented. Beyond that let's talk to each other at the end of June as to where we are and what has to happen after that. So I'm not presupposing anything that happens after June other than Ann had raised several points that I see in the staff's thing, which is -- whatever we do, even if we decide on something, there will be at least a half year before it gets implemented, that we immediately start an amendment process so that people can be making changes. The one thing that hasn't been mentioned that I think would be really helpful that Ann had mentioned earlier was a very public testing. So they're like testing concepts, but make it a very public testing of tracks so that everybody can be involved in it, which I think would also be helpful. But beyond that let's just

[3:08:28 PM]

really hit this really hard issues collectively as a group in June and then let's see where we are. >> Pool: Okay. Thank you for indulging that. I did just now pass out one thing that I wanted to focus on from the staff's presentation, which is the amendment portal. It wasn't clear to me, Jerry, in your presentation about an amendment portal. Did you say that the law said we couldn't do that. >> We actually discussed that issue with the clerk's office and they told us that the -- I don't understand the exact reasoning, but we could use the existing city council message board and it was not possible to create a second message board only relating to codenext. >> Pool: I think there may be -- I would like to work on that topic. I think there may be another approach. I passed out a proposal on the amendment portal. I think this is going to be a key public information and transparency piece. It establishes a public-facing portal that's similar to budget questions and also the codenext questions portals. Council offices can submit directly to the portal. We do that now for codenext. And then have these key fields. So this is more specific, not just a general conversation. And I want to make sure that we capture councilmember sponsors on amendments for any council item, we always see the lead sponsor and who the sponsors are. When it was received, the section and so forth. It's on this sheet of paper and maybe we can put it up on the overhead so the community can see it. And the benefit just for clarity, transparency and structure so that we all have an official record that it's easy to determine what the initial record is and it will help us to also be stay organized and keep track of everything. So I would like to see if we maybe give this to the city manager and see if we can't move in the direction of creating a specific dedicated portal for this. >> Mayor Adler: And let's

[3:10:29 PM]

think through for when we discuss this on Thursday the degree to which if we're going to proceed the way that it's been described whether we need to go to this formal an extent and let's discuss that on Thursday. I know that one of the reasons why people wanted to make sure that we had all amendments ahead of time is because it was perceived we could be taking 6-5 votes on language. We would be parsing language and people wanted to be able to have that well in advance to be able to vet and to discuss. And while it would still be very useful for everyone to put things up on the message board or give comment as to these 15 or whatever the number is areas, if we're trying to find the place with eight, then everybody knows we're not necessarily parsing the language, we're talking about the concepts where there's going to be agreement that we could eventually ask staff to come back with specific language on. Kind of remove some of the pressure to be really up on is it an end or is it an or except insofar as we need to be discussing that issue and getting a feel for where there's a group of people. Jimmy? >> Pool: So I worry that if we're not writing down what our amendments were, our approaches are and if we're not memorializing who it is and the dates and the detail that's in here, that it's subject to interpretation. And we won't have a clear record. To the the extent that we're talking on the dais, obviously -- if you're getting eight votes you can't do that anywhere else but in public and on camera, but it does get a little bit thready sometimes when we're having conversation. People lose track of who said what and where we're at. So I think we still have to

[3:12:30 PM]

have things written down. >> Mayor Adler: And I see the value in this too. Let me think on this. Jimmy and then Alison. >> Flannigan: I'm struggling to understand the value of requiring the eight votes. It feels a little too much like what gets the U.S. Senate into trouble where you end up with gridlock because if you have seven votes and the thing you use to get the eighth vote you lose the vote on the other side. I'm hesitant to lock us into a process where we're doing anything but the six votes that we need to do things. You think even in an all-three reading scenario it's six votes, not seven votes. I'm not necessarily on board with that. I understand, mayor, what you're saying is that what I think I understand what you're saying is that it would just be a framework in which to order the conversation, the easy things with -- I think there was more consensus would go first. >> Mayor Adler: No. We hit the really hard issues. And it could be that we can't get eight people or seven people or six people or even five people to agree on a specific answer, but we might be able to get eight people even though they don't agree with each other and couldn't agree on a single solution. We may be able to get eight people to say, well, I'm here and I'm here so I know that this is the full extent of the range within which we need to work, so the community knows these things are never going to happen and a they know things outside that range are never going happen. It doesn't necessarily mean we've got eight people to agree on a specific point. But maybe we can get then in the alternative eight people to agree on a range of solutions. So that we can identify for ourselves. >> Flannigan: Then let me restate so that I can see if I'm interpreting this

correctly. So the order in which we would take up items would still be by topic or chapter is the way staff is trying to figure out. So the order would still be

[3:14:31 PM]

the order. But we would find ourselves either passing amendments because there was somewhat of a broad consensus or passing some version of a direction document that directed staff to come back with options for us to vote on either later in the month or in August. >> Mayor Adler: Or some other process at the end of the month to figure out what happens next. But yes, we would be either approving by eight a specific amendment language or by eight we would be giving direction that said we're going to be somewhere in this range and we haven't been able to decide that or we need options or further clarification, but we know generally we're going to be within these parameters, and we would be able to give that direction and the community would know that. >> Flannigan: That's different than the way I first heard it. I don't think if we should be requiring eight votes for things, but I think we may be situations where even six might be difficult if there's agreement to do something. I think it should be fine to say at least we have six votes to send up a parameter and drill down to where the end point is. I don't necessarily know where the council is in terms of the starting point which staff is latin out. Is it ther Atta, planning commission, if we wanted to stake up the zap recommendation to just scrap the whole thing, I suppose we could and dispense with that and then move on to the actual work. But my general sense is I want to -- I want to make sure and I know, councilmember kitchen, you kind of said it this way, that we are still moving the ball forward. We will always take up the amount of space we give ourselves and a little bit more. So if we don't set a goal and work really hard to do it, then we will miss it for sure. So even if we push really hard to get to a first

[3:16:31 PM]

reading by the end of June and we get to the end of June, we go man, we are 85% of the way there. Great, we will take up that last 15% at the end. But if we say we're only going to get to 50% then we'll only get to 35% and we'll just be rolling the ball. So that's the thing I want to make sure we're avoiding. >> Mayor Adler: Ms. Houston. >> Houston: Thank you, mayor. And you all may have had this conversation. I had to step out for a minute. But we're talking about a process. And somebody remind me what the 2.5 approach was that was passed by the prior council and reaffirmed by us us, this council. >> Mayor, I could take a stab at that if you would like. The previous council and then separately this council, previous to the 10-1 council, did take a vote on the issue of whether to go with a -- it was a three-two-one or two-three-one approach. One would be take the existing code, toss in the wastebasket and write a brand new code. Two would be to make major changes, but keep elements of the existing code. , Policy, et cetera. And then number one would be just make refinements to the existing code, kind of fix some patches if you will. So those were the three from minor changes to a wholesale rewrite. And the previous council chose 2.5, which I would say is somewhere between make major changes, but don't start over and starting over. So they chose the halfway point between those

two. And then we came to the 10-1 council and asked the same question and we received the same 2.5 approach. But exactly what 2.5 means is kind of in the eye of the beholder to a degree, but that was a direction we got

[3:18:31 PM]

was somewhere between a wholesale rewrite and make major changes, but don't start from scratch. >> Houston: So what would you call the process that we're going through now? >> I think the only correct answer is 2.5. [Laughter]. >> Houston: I would disagree. >> Mayor Adler: Ann? >> Kitchen: I wanted to -- maybe I had two things. To go back to I think a couple of people mentioned this, but I'm not sure if we got clear. And the document that we're going to have that not only we look at, but I'm more concerned about the public at this point, I'll need to understand and maybe that's something you can tell us on Thursday, what's realistic, because right now we have a couple of documents to look at which makes it really hard for the public to understand what we're doing. If I'm understanding correctly we have draft 3, we have addendum, we have errata and then we're going to have the commission's recommendation so that's two commission's recommendations. So that's a lot of documents for people to keep track of. So my request is to help us understand what's possible in terms of putting that stuff together, and really the only thing I need there is can we possible put draft 3, the addendum and the errata together. I think we need to keep the commissions separate. Again, that's-- you don't have to answer that right now unless you can flat out tell me no way, but I guess I'm hoping that as much as possible we can do that just for clarity for the public's purposes. >> Councilmember, I understand your concern. I would have to speak to some folks at the office who actually prepare the document, but specifically with regard to, say, the addendum, identified heard before it's 400 pages. That's because we've taken the page that was changed and we've highlighted that change on the addendum page.

[3:20:31 PM]

So our desire was that if we have an addendum, we didn't want to stitch it into the staff recommendation because you would have to go there to find it, if you will, whereas having it stand out on a page and say on this page these words are changing kind of brings it more to your attention, exactly what is changing. You don't have to find it within the full page of text. So we are trying to kind of having the addendum stand out as opposed to bleed into the text. >> Kitchen: I certainly understand that as a way for people who are trying to do like the track changes kind of thing. The difficulty is that I think -- I'm just asking you to think about it and let us know what you think. But the difficulty is I've talked to a good number of people that have thrown up their hands and said I'm not reading this until I know there's something in front of me to read that is the latest iteration. So that's the universe which I think is more people than the people that are just tracking. But it's not an either/or. If you already have it separated the way you have it for those people who are tracking, they probably already tracking. Anyway, you have to think about what's possible and I know that we have logistical issues. I'm just relaying the concern that I've heard about the difficulty that people are having. Some people are having.

>> I understand. And one idea would be that we leave it like it is now to bring more attention to what the staff has been changing, but if the council were to move to include the addendum and the errata in their motion, which we certainly hope they would, especially the errata, those are just obvious mistakes, but even if they move for the planning commission approval that the addendum and errata could also be incorporated into that motion. But also for second reading we could actually put everything together. >> So that's the point at which you think it might be logistically possible? >> Yes, because we would be having to do major rewrites anyway because of the amendments we had at first reading. We would be retooling the document at that time.

[3:22:33 PM]

>> Kitchen: Ecosystem not sure if that gets us to with where we need to be, but I understand the reasoning. The second thing I will say real quickly is that -- councilmember Flannigan, I understand the question that you're asking on y8, but my thinking about that is that first off that I want to reiterate we're taking the hardest questions so we're not pushing them off. We take the hardest questions and go through this exercise and I think there's value to the community to identify where we can get closer together. And we may find -- we may surprise ourselves. So I just think it's premature to start taking 6-5 votes or 7-4 votes or whatever, whatever you want to call them, close votes, because we haven't as a group tried to get closer to consensus. And I'm thinking that as a community we're going to be better off if if we at the end of the day to the extent that it's possible we can be better as a community to have come together and pulled off a code that is -- that represents that kind of community consensus. I'll just say one thing. I think the mayor said it better when you started talking. That's when we're the best that we can be. I strongly feel that way. And whether we can get there or not, I think we need to try. So that's -- I think June is where we try. And if we can't get there, then later, September, October, whenever we're taking up the rest of it, then we'll take -- it's not an attempt to avoid hard votes. It's an attempt to say the best that we can be for our community and to bring people together in our community is to try to get that consensus where we can.

[3:24:37 PM]

>> Alter: Thank you. I just wanted to ask the city manager if you could see about getting some other dates on our calendar as blocks of time for council activities, whether they're codenext or something else. We still polling potentially have to take a vote on mls in June. We have to get our bond together so they can prepare the language. We'll have to consider the charter commissions mandates that they've come back with. I'm hoping that all the work we've done with the strategic planning with lead us to having to spend less time on budget than we spent last year because we've captured thing in a new way, but that sort of remains to be scene. But we need to get these things on our calendar and if we have to cancel them, that's fine, but if we don't have them on our calendars we're not going to be able to have those dates after a certain point. I will remind my colleagues that don't know that I will be leading the city's delegation to India September 22nd to 29th. I don't have the firm dates on either end of that, so

that will have a constraining effect on September. Respect to that. And so I want to make sure that that is out there. I agree with councilmember kitchen that we need to try to see if we can come to consensus but I think we do have to be willing to tackle some of the hard issues. Part of the anxiety that we're hearing out in the community is because people don't know where we stand. They can't figure out how we're going to vote on compatibility, how we're going to vote on transition Zones, where we're going to be on mcmansion. And we need to make progress on those issues to identify how we're going to move forward. A lot of the anxiety is because people don't understand the process and they don't know where we are

[3:26:39 PM]

with respect to the votes. So I'm willing to work to try to see if we can have consensus and move in that direction, but we have to be able to take some decisions on these things to move the ball forward or the community is going to continue to be in this limbo where the fear is there because they have no idea what direction we're going. And I would love for us to come out with an 8-3 vote on things, but we do need to be making decisions on one of those real big issues and we should be spending our time on the important things first. And to the extent that through the course of this that's what you've laid out we can move in that direction. Who is going to decide in what order and which chapters and where those things are and how we're going to get to that point to be setting the agenda for what are right now four days that we have laid out. >> Mayor Adler: So my hope would be that we could post hopefully tomorrow kind of a stocking course list of issues. Staff could certainly help us with that on Thursday. We ought to be able to discuss that. People can certainly add issues. It's not like if it's not on the list on Thursday, it can't be aided, but if we can come up with kind of a working list that we can add to of what we think are the toughest, thorniest issues, then when we have the public testimony on the 31st and on the second. We could ask the public to speak to those issues because that's where we're going to be spending our June. That's a possibility. But I think that we see if we can be looking at a list and discussing it on Thursday and then adding to it. But to your first point I

[3:28:39 PM]

agree with you 1,000%. We're only constructive in June to the degree that we are making decisions or narrowing issues so that the community can see that. And so that we can see where we really are too. We don't know as a group where the group is. Ms. Houston. >> Houston: Thank you, mayor. And what I would like from staff is on those 7, 6 votes that happen sometimes, I would like to know the difference in those because the reasoning behind win group of seven voted one way and one voted -- six voted something else. So if there's a way to be able to say what the differences were. >> Councilmember, you're referring to the pce actions? >> Planning commission? >> Yes, sorry. That would be difficult, councilmember, only because at last count they were voting on 800 plus amendments. So I think to give the reasoning behind it I think we could work on that for some of the larger bigger picture issues. Like they were closely voting on parking and here's what they were saying, but to actually go through nine

hundred or a thousand actual amendments and tell you exactly why the votes came out the way they did. >> Houston: Not all the votes, but those that were 7-6, the key ones. The key ones. Because otherwise I will have to go through thousands of hours of testimony and I -- >> Somebody has to, right. >> Houston: Somebody has to do it. And you were sitting there. I saw you sitting there. [Laughter] >> Mayor? I'd like to offer just a couple of brief observations related to some issues that have been brought up. And the first just that codenext is going to be an exhibit to an ordinance and you all are ultimately what you're going to pass on first reading is going to be the actual ordinance. So I just want to-- there will have to be a process by which councilmembers vote on amendments to individual chapters, but then at the end of that process once the

[3:30:42 PM]

individual chapters as documents have been amended there will have to be a holistic vote on the ordinance. And we will work with you to try to come up with a process by which that all can happen. I don't think we have to work out the details of it here today, but I just want to -- want you all to be aware that ultimately there will have to be a holistic vote on the ordinance as a whole. And then the second point I wanted to make is just that as you all are working on amendments, we northridge you not to get overly into wordsmithing. If you give us direction as to what you want to see and some of that direction will be very specific, some of the amendments may be a little bit more general, but either way if you can express what you would like to see in your amendment that will let us work on language that achieves your objectives within the context of the code. It's a complicated code. All codes are complicated on some level. And making sure that it syncs up with all the other pieces of the code is an important and sometimes difficult task. So just as you're writing your amendments we encourage you to think in those terms. >> Mayor Adler: That sounds good. A we've also gone through the drill a lot here over the last year and three and a half years where will to first reading on ordinances. Sometimes we don't have everything worked out and we give direction. And then staff works on that and then comes back with resolutions or suggestions when we come back for second reading. Obviously the more specific that we're able to get the better. And we'll know at the end of the month where we are on that and how close we're getting. Councilmember alter. >> Alter: To the extent that you're providing the planning commission votes if you can also give us a sense of who voted on each side.

[3:32:42 PM]

>> Yes, councilmember. We are working on that. We're one meeting behind. We have to go back and sometimes rewatch the tape and see who raised their hands and things like that. But yes, we are recording every vote by who voted and not just the vote count. >> Alter: And that will be shared with us? >> Yes. >> Alter: Great, thank you. >> Mayor Adler: Any further discussion before we end the meeting? >> Mayor, if I understand, direct me, make sure I got my assignment right for Thursday. It would be that you're asking us to work on a proposed list of the 10 items to be discussed in the future, is that correct? >> Mayor Adler: 10 or whatever it is. You go through the process, but make sure on there

are the major issue headings, but make sure that you put on there the tough questions, the ones that people are laboring over to make sure that we hit all of those. >> And then any proposals as far as a possible vote to be taken on Thursday would come from the councilmember who uploaded that to the message board, correct? >> Mayor Adler: Right. We have the placeholder, so councilmembers could bring different things. Ann will make sure that we at least have this proposal in front of the folks. >> Got it. Thank you. >> Kitchen: Mayor, I'll post it and people can comment on it. >> Alter: We will we have a discussion over the base motion? >> Mayor Adler: Over what the base motion is? >> Alter: Yeah. >> Mayor Adler: You could throw open that topic now if you wanted to. >> Alter: Woman, I don't actually know what the planning commission has voted on, but -- >> Mayor Adler: Then you want to have that conversation on Thursday about -- on Thursday what would the base motion be. I mean, to -- in my head I see us starting off by having a discussion on these major issues. And depending on how that conversation goes over the month of June it may or may not make a difference which one we use as our base

[3:34:42 PM]

motion. Because we will have tried to work through what the tough issues are. My primary focus at this point for me is to tee up the really hard, difficult questions and put us in search of finding out how specific or why the range is that eight of us can fit under a tent. Recognizing that that does not mean we're searching for solutions that all eight of us agree on. Ann. >> Kitchen: I would also add to that, I don't see us -- I don't see our first conversation or action putting forward a base motion. It doesn't have to be under this scenario. I mean, we will need to at some point, but we don't have to start with that. We can start with topic by topic going through this process. >> Alter: I think by the end of June we have to have a sense of that. >> Mayor Adler: Let's see -- >> Alter: At some point we are going to have to make that decision. >> Kitchen: In other words, I don't think we have to put a base motion out before we start our conversation of the tough issues. But we will of course by the end of June have to anything that out. -- Have to figure that out. >> Mayor Adler: Right. You look confused. >> Pool: Knowing what I know about the votes that are being taken and planning commission has not finished yet. And knowing what you were talking about with councilmember kitchen and Casar about finding large areas of consensus and building toward an 8-3 kind of a vote, a majority of the votes on the planning commission or a substantial number of them, were 7-6. And I would propose that we try to start however we do it, whether there's a base motion immediately or not, that we start with a more neutral document which for

[3:36:42 PM]

me would be the staff recommendation because we can add to that or amend that, but I'm deeply concerned over the lack of consensus. The lines of division are just as stark there as they are elsewhere. >> Mayor Adler: And my sense is that we don't have to decide that question now. It will be clearer to us what we want to do once we go through this conversation. And just by way of one last illustration.

Planning commission has taken a vote on whether 30 feet is the right number. And seven people agreed that 30 feet was the right number and six people said no. So we have a 7-6 vote approving 30 feet. If we stayed and talked, and we were trying to find out where there were eight people, we might find that there are eight of us -- while we do not have agreement on 30 feet, it may be that all eight of us are somewhere between 22 and 36. In which case we can say we don't know what the right number is, but we do know that there are eight people between 22 and 36. Which means that it's unlikely it will be less than 22 and it's unlikely it will be more than 36. And we still have some work to do, but it's that kind of thing. It's not trying to find the agreement point, it's trying to lower the -- to see how close we are. And where we have to do additional work. And then having decided that, then we'll put that aside and we'll go to the next really tough question. But for direction for the community, they'll know that it's not going to be 100 and it's not going to be 10. >> Pool: Right. And a good starting place for that conversation would be on the more neutral document. >> Mayor Adler: We're going to tee it off without even reference to a document. The topic will be -- in that height or width or whatever, 30 feet depends on, it will be talking about the issue. Let's talk parking.

[3:38:44 PM]

And let's talk about all the different places where people are engaging on the parking issue. And let's talk through the policy behind those and where we can -- what people are thinking about that issue and see how close we might be. Let's talk about transition Zones, let's talk about compatibility, let's talk about those things with a subheadings underneath them that are the issues under those headings that we need to eventually, ultimately, take votes on that could be 7-6 votes. But we're not there yet. That's not what June is about. Yes. >> Alter: We've spent a lot of our codenext time having the consultants or the staff speak to us. There's a certain amount of basic information we need to be able to have this conversation. That needs to be gotten to us beforehand and we need to be discussing things in here where we're discussing things. We can consult them if we have specific questions, but if we end up having them come in and for every one of those topics they have to do an hour long presentation to tell us all the differences of what's out there, we will not be able to get into the meat of what's going on. >> Mayor Adler: I agree, to the degree that we can annotate that list of issues that will be helpful and to the degree that we can come up with a very quick, this is the issue, this is what planning commission did, this is what zap did, this is what staff recommended, those were the points of issues on that, to kind of lead us off, but this is really June a time for us to be able to talk to one another. >> Mayor and council, just real quickly, there are a number of resources on the draft three website, including the policy tables that council at one point asked us to produce, which really illustrated and described a lot of the major policies that were in play. Of course, they will then be informed by the planning commission recommendation

[3:40:44 PM]

and votes which will come out on a separate spreadsheet, so we hope between those two documents and the additional presentations that are on the draft three site that would give you a starting point. >> Mayor Adler: Yes, Ms. Houston. >> Houston: My last thing is that one of the things that I thought was very helpful when the planning commission was meeting, especially when we have in the public hearings and the deliberations, is for us to schedule breaks. It just gets really unwieldy and difficult to stay focused when you're going from 10:00 in the morning until 10:00 at night, even with a lunch break you need to have time to -- every 45 minutes to get up and walk around or something. >> Mayor Adler: We'll do that. That's a good point. Very especialliful. Anything else? All right. That said, it is 3:42. And this meeting is adjourned.