

Minutes

Parks and Recreation Board
July 17, 1990 - Special Meeting

The special meeting of the Parks and Recreation Board was called to order by Mrs. Beverly Griffith, Chair. Board Members present: Beverly Griffith, Terry Colgan, Doug Matthews, Charles Heimsath, Ruby Williams, Sue Robinson and . Staff present: Manuel Mollinedo, Jody Hamilton, Ron Sparks, and .

CITIZENS COMMUNICATIONS

Stuart Snyder addressed the Board regarding the AMEGO proposal. Mr. Snyder was a representative from the Sierra Club.

ITEMS FROM A PREVIOUS AGENDA

AMEGO

Mr. Mollinedo updated the Board Members on the staff's current position on the proposed AMEGO proposal. He expressed concerns about the fiscal implications of the plan as it is currently envisioned. He also expressed reservations about the use of an ombudsman as a liaison between the City and County. Board Members discussed the problems associated with having two groups of elected officials trying to guide the Parks Department. They also discussed the possibility of transfer of ownership of the County parkland. After considerable discussion between members of the Board and staff, the following resolution was passed with Terry Colgan abstaining.

RESOLUTION

JULY 17, 1990

AMEGO

WHEREAS the Parks and Recreation Board has studied the consolidation proposal submitted by the ACTION FOR METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE (AMEGO), and

WHEREAS the AMEGO proposal concentrated exclusively on maintenance (grass cutting/mowing, cleaning) of park acreage and facilities, planning and personnel transfers, and

WHEREAS the AMEGO proposal failed to address the following aspects of public policy issues, namely,

- 1) The vast differences in land areas between the city and county (226 vs. 1,012 square miles);
- 2) The differences in distribution of tax base between the city and the county;

- 3) The population distribution between the city and the county (rural residents vs city residents);
- 4) The fact that county residents enjoy the sharing the tax burden;
- 5) The fact that city residents pay a disproportionate share of county tax money spent on rural parks;
- 6) That the city could be formally obligated to extend free parks programs and services to an additional 90,000 persons;
- 7) The vast differences in actual parks services and programs delivered to residents by each governmental entity; and
- 8) Neither a real tax rate reduction nor tax savings is guaranteed to residents of either political entity;
- 9) Acquisition and replacement of capital assets;
- 10) Considerable concern about Parks and Recreation Department staff's ability to respond to two different governing bodies; and
- 11) Reduced maintenance expenditures affecting the life expectancy of capital equipment.

WHEREAS, the Parks and Recreation Board has recommended and submitted a modified consolidation plan for consideration by the Austin City Council and the Travis County Commissioners; and

WHEREAS, the County Commissioners have adopted the AMEGO proposal without addressing the broader public policy issues inherent in the proposed consolidation;

WHEREAS, the County Commissioners have not addressed the issue of a possible transfer of ownership;

WHEREAS, the AMEGO proposal is on the agenda for the next scheduled session of the Austin City Council, and the Council has not held a public hearing on the plan;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Parks and Recreation Board finds the AMEGO proposal to be seriously flawed, advantageous solely to the County and not in the best interests of the taxpayers of the City of Austin, and further that the Parks and Recreation Board recommends the Austin City Council:

- 1) Not approve the AMEGO proposal in its present form;
- 2) Not direct city staff to draft a contract until the policy issue aspects listed above are resolved; and
- 3) Not approve any parks consolidation proposal without benefit of a public hearing.

This resolution passed on consent with 1 abstention.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

Mt. Bonnell/Watersedge

Mrs. Griffith opened the discussion for public comments. Mrs. Young addressed the Board. She detailed how the rock throwing intervention was going from the resident's perspective.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.